



Third Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

28 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



VOL. XXVII No. 27B

8:00 P.M. Monday, March 26, 1979

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, March 26, 1979

Time: 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY — TOURISM AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee come to order. I'd like to refer the members of the committee to Page 77 of the Estimates of Tourism and Cultural Affairs, Resolution 105: 1.(b) — the Honourable Minister.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, before I start to speak on the Estimates of the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs, I would like, with great pleasure, to introduce our new Deputy, Mr. Rene Prefontaine.

I would also like to congratulate the Junior Men's Curling Champions from the Assiniboine Curling Rink. I don't think they were acknowledged in the House today and, while they are in Frank Johnston's constituency, they are from our neck of the woods and I would like to congratulate them on their success.

I would like to ask the members of the House not to assess the importance of Tourism and Culture only in terms of the relative importance of this department's budget to the overall budget of the provincial government. We are dealing with two sectors that should be recognized as important industrial sectors: The cultural sector which behaves as an industry and should be treated as such, and the tourism industry, which is considered as such but does not always get the attention that it so rightfully deserves.

The cultural industry is composed of the established media, i.e. films, books, broadcasting, records, etc.; the arts, both visual and performing; and the heritage institutions, galleries, museums and historic sites. Together their revenues for 1976 — and that's the latest year that I could get the figures on — in Canada amounted to \$5.7 billion or 3 percent of the Canadian GNP.

The arts and the heritage institutions are, of course, the areas of involvement on the cultural side of my department. Seen on their own, they represent a modest and often undervalued and unsupported sector but they are essential to the cultural industry and to the economic spinoffs that it generates and of course we can't underestimate the necessity of them, how essential they are to the quality of life in our community.

Governments on all levels are involved in a variety of support programs to the arts, but we lack a concerted effort. There is no broad or long-term programs by any of the governments and we feel that there should be more of a role and a responsibility taken by the Feds, the provincial and the municipal governments. And because of this lack of concerted effort, because of the myth that cultural affairs are certainly not viable, or economically viable, funds for cultural support generally seem to be the first that are the victims of any budget restraints. And that was very noticeable recently when the federal government was cutting off support in different areas to try to limit their increasing deficit. Those serious cutbacks of financing of cultural programs and institutions are going to have a very serious effect on our institutions and right now we are going through some series of discussions and negotiations which we hope will improve that situation.

We are currently reassessing our policies and programs and I hope in the next couple of months to announce a rational and cohesive policy of support to cultural activities. It's my strong conviction that we can improve revenue from tourism if we have a real strong and enthusiastic promotion of culture and we certainly must look on them as treasures in our community.

In the course of the past year, Cabinet named a liaison committee to work with the Art Gallery. They have a five year plan, and it's working very well and we're quite sure that by 1982, they will have erased their deficit. We also must give recognition to them for the marvelous work that they are doing as an Advisory Board to all the different museums in the province, and of course they are rated as probably one of the finest museums in all of Canada.

The area of multiculturalism is one of particular satisfaction. I have been making quite a tour around to the different areas in the city, and I have been very excited to see the increasing signs of self-sufficiency that they are having, these different organizations. There is new enthusiasm for that well-established and exciting institution, Folklorama, Festival Manitoba continues to be a very

attractive tourist draw, and of course the Winnipeg Folk Festival is well on its way to becoming one of the most outstanding events on the continent.

So on very practical terms, the investment that we make in the multicultural programs is paying handsome dividends. For instance, last year we invested \$54,000 in the Support program, which educated 5,500 students in the language of their ancestors, and had we conducted that same program through the formal educational system, the cost of it would have been well over \$1 million. There were 12 language camp programs that were conducted last year, and they serviced 2,000 children.

The Manitoba Arts Council is working with all the different major groups, performing arts groups, for the gradual elimination of their deficits. Also, in our efforts to serve the community, we have hired five volunteers, and after an intensive training, they are going out into the five regions, in fact they are out there now, in five different regions of the province, they will be paid a small honorarium and their expenses. We feel that if we have these people who are living right in the community that they will have a feel for what the people in the community really want, that we won't be foisting something down them if they would rather have some ethnic dancers instead of the Ballet, or whatever. We feel that we will be closer to it and we're looking to this pilot project with real interest.

The Ministers of Cultural Affairs held their very first convention conference last February, and we did find that regardless of whether we were from a have or a have-not province, we all had common problems and concerns. One very positive factor that came out of it, Manitoba suggested a year of the arts for the 1984, and it was unanimously accepted by all the provinces.

We feel that there will be every type of cultural program. Artists will be allowed to have an opportunity to display their talents. It'll be from coast to coast and border to border, and we feel that the spin-off for tourism will be something of major importance and necessary to our economy.

Under the Historic Resources Program, assistance will continue for the operation of the many community and regional museums throughout the province.

With regard to the tourist industry, we were pleased to sign the \$20 million DREE agreement, \$20 million over a five-year period and also the ARC Agreement concerning the Red River Corridor, and it's a \$13 million over a seven-year period. We are highly optimistic that both of these agreements will be of significant benefit to the tourism, cultural development and heritage preservation.

In addition, we have increased the tourism advertising budget by some 60 percent, a move that we felt was very necessary in order to turn around the decline in visitor traffic that has been occurring since 1973.

The 1979 tourism marketing campaign will concentrate efforts on the close-in markets and, particularly, we will try to encourage Manitobans to spend their vacations in Manitoba and much of the advertising has been geared in that effect.

With the help of the tourism industry, a tour book and a vacationer's coupon book is being produced and it will be distributed in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Northwest Ontario, and our neighbors immediately south of the border.

The total estimated budget for 1979-80 tourism advertising campaign is \$817,000.00. The market allocations are in-province 19.9 percent; Canadian campaign 9.5 percent; U.S. campaign 49.8 percent; production and agency fees 8 percent; and contingency and opportunity 12.8 percent.

The 1979-80 budget allocation is a \$303,000 increase compared to 1978-79. However, taking the inflationary dollar into consideration, it's really only \$246,000 compared to our 1977-78 level.

I'm sure that all of the members who are interested have had read the guidelines for the DREE Program that I mentioned earlier. If some of you haven't and are interested, I am sure that my department can get them for you.

The department is presently completing the criteria for the operations of each of the programs. We had the people from the industry in for an opening meeting and we invited them to bring forth any suggestions that they might have that they would feel would be an improvement in the program.

With the improved marketing programs being undertaken and with the initiatives for development under the tourism agreement, I feel very confident that we will see substantial improvements in the tourism industry over the next few years, improvements which will accelerate growth in employment, income and profit opportunities in this sector of our economy.

I would like to conclude by saying that even though both the cultural and tourism sectors of my department have had to face and deal with the economic realities that are facing everybody in Canada at this time, I am looking forward with great optimism to this coming year. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b)(1) — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by congratulating the Minister and her Deputy on their new assignments. I think that they are embarking on a fiscal year, and I think in a portfolio, which surely must be one of the most pleasant and interesting of all those in the Provincial Government.

I would like to ask the minister if she could give us a quick rundown to begin with on her annual reports because I have a list here of the reports of the department that are required and I see an Arts Council Report, which we all received but there are five others, which are required — the first four within 15 days of the session — and the Legislative Library Act during the session of the Legislature but I do not recall, I could be mistaken, but I do not recall receiving the Centennial Centre Corporation Report, the Centennial Cultural Franco Manitobain, the Heritage Manitoba, and the Horseracing Commission Act, all of which are required within 15 days of the session. So I wonder if the minister could answer as to why they're delayed and when we will receive them.

MRS. PRICE: I can't account for them all, Mr. Chairman, but I can say for instance the Franco Cultural Centre, the president resigned and their report hasn't been forthcoming yet. It'll be here. I would suggest that if we go over our line by line that we have here that as we come to them, hopefully that we will have them for you, or have something on them for you.

MR. DOERN: So, I say to the minister then that five of the six reports required by legislation are not here, and I would ask whether we could receive any information and/or draft reports in the next few days since we'll probably be spending two or three days this week, and it would be nice to have something.

MRS. PRICE: Yes, I'll get whatever information I can for the member.

MR. DOERN: I have a couple of general questions to begin with and then I would like to go into line by line, assuming my colleagues don't want to jump in in the first few minutes as they may wish to. One of the interesting changes that has come about in the past few months is that the Provincial Government has decided now to institute a policy of block funding to the City of Winnipeg, and we've been discussing that at this table for the past few days and week. One of the components that is in that block funding program is the Convention Centre, which was shared on a 50-50 basis and is now, I believe, thrown into the general block funding.

We had a couple of appointees on the board, perhaps your ADM is still one of them, and certainly was one of them, and I was just wondering if the minister could describe what will happen in terms of a continuing interest and input into the Convention Centre, because I believe that that facility plays a key role in terms of attracting conventions and tourists and delegates. So could the Minister indicate, first of all what will happen in terms of provincial government board appointees, as to who they are and what will happen in the next year or two.

MRS. PRICE: We have the same two government appointees as last year. We have Mr. Bob Wilson and Mr. Bob Yuel. They were there last year and they're on again.

MR. DOERN: Could the Minister indicate whether she expects that those provincial appointees will continue, either the same two or replacements in the years ahead, or because of the government's withdrawal or change of terms, will those people then not be reappointed or not continue to be members of the board?

MRS. PRICE: They were just reappointed in the last couple of months, Mr. Chairman, it's on a year-by-year. I can't tell you what's going to happen in the years to come, but they are certainly there for next year.

MR. DOERN: I was also wondering if the Minister had any views, or intends to be involved in any approaches to the federal government for potential grants to the Convention Centre. There have been news reports that the federal government is likely to approve a \$10 million grant for the construction of a Vancouver Convention Centre, and although our facility was constructed several years ago and cost some \$20-odd-million dollars, I was wondering, in view of that potential capital grant, and/or operating grants, whether the province and the Minister intends to approach Ottawa for some sort of ongoing operating grants for our Convention Centre.

MRS. PRICE: I was speaking to the people in Vancouver last Tuesday. They had just had a meeting

with Mr. Trudeau and he had turned them down at that point. They were quite upset about it and they weren't very hopeful that this was going to take place in the near future.

MR. DOERN: So I assume the Minister is keeping a close eye on that and if there are any moneys given anywhere in Canada for that purpose, that we will be second in line.

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. DOERN: The next general topic I wanted to raise with the Minister before I get into any line-to-line run-through, is the question of the handling of what was I think an opportunity for an unparalleled promotion in the province that was bungled, either by the present Minister or Deputy, or perhaps the previous Minister or Deputy, or perhaps some people in the department, and that is the handling of the Eclipse. Now, this was a totally unique possibility in terms of Manitoba history. It wasn't once in a lifetime, it was once in a century or more. And I asked the Minister a number of questions about this during the regular Question Period, and I'd just like to make a few general comments and then compare what I think could have been done with what was, in fact done by the department.

I asked the Minister whether the department had undertaken any special promotional programs to encourage visitors and I gather that the total effort on behalf of the department was to print 10,000 maps at a cost of \$619.00, I believe was the figure. Now, it just strikes me that somebody in the department, lower down, was asleep or else the information was passed up and vetoed higher up. I mean, this was not something that was known six or eight weeks ago or six or eight months ago, this is something that if someone was aware of it, it was known decades ago, but I assume that somebody in the department must have had the presence of mind, a year or two ago, to draw to the attention of the Minister and the Deputy, or the ADM or the Directors, the prospects of an unparalleled opportunity to attract people, not only from all over Canada and in the United States, but from all over the world. I know that the President of the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce was critical of the provincial government for not fully promoting and attracting people in regard to this particular effort.

I asked the Minister in the eleventh hour, or whatever, whether she would undertake a crash program and I guess the decision had been made in effect, and she was sticking with the decision. My honourable friend says, how do you guarantee a clear day? Well, the point is, Mr. Chairman, you can't. But it's no different than something that would appeal more to my honourable friend, which would be a Grey Cup or a major football final. There's no guarantee, when you go to the Super Bowl, if it's outdoors, that you're going to have weather. You can have blizzards, you can have hurricanes, you can have snow and sleet, you can have postponements. I was at the Olympic Games in 1972 in Munich, and there was a terrorist attack on the Village, and the Olympics were postponed for 24 hours.

So Mr. Chairman, that is not the issue. The issue is whether or not the government was up to, was aware of, and alive to the possibilities of promoting this event. I say that they weren't. The Minister, in her answer to me in the House said, well they thought that people who were largely interested in science would be the ones who would come and the ones who would be most interested. But I say, an event like that has possibilities for everyone, from the person who works in a planetarium as a professional person, right down to somebody who's only interested in maybe the sideshow or the once-in-a-lifetime opportunity.

Right after this occurrence in Manitoba, no sooner had it occurred than we came to hear of people in Manitoba who were planning to interest other Manitobans, through the planetarium, in taking a trip to Africa several years from now, at a cost of \$4,000 a piece. There has been sufficient interest generated in the community that they think, maybe they're overly optimistic, that there could be some kind of group of people or charter plane that would be interested in proceeding on that account.

I have a few more remarks, Mr. Chairman, but perhaps the Minister would like to make an initial comment about her handling, or her department's handling of this unique opportunity, and whether or not she feels that her government's — you know, the government tells us today, they're telling us they're spending \$800,000 on promoting Manitoba, in Canada, in the United States, and then they tell us that they're spending \$600 on this — I say somebody made a very bad judgment in that regard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is of a personal nature. I just received a note here, it has nothing to do with the Estimates. The federal parliament has been dissolved and an election has been called for May 22nd. The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: Firstly, Mr. Chairman, I disagree with the member that there was bungling on behalf of my department or myself with regard to promotion for the Eclipse. I would like to tell the member just a few of the things that took place with regard to the promotion of the Eclipse.

In February of 1978, the Tourist Branch staff met with the planetarium staff, and TCAM, to discuss promotional possibilities. A member of the planetarium staff and a tourist branch representative visited Brandon to determine suitable sites available for viewing the Eclipse. Discussions were held with the Brandon Chamber of Commerce to discuss hotel space availability during the Eclipse period, as well as to discuss the Brandon Winter Games to be held.

The Brandon University was approached to act as a liaison with the Brandon Chamber of Commerce. On February 6, 1978, the tourist branch informed TCAM of the Eclipse and requested that the whole provincial membership be informed. The tourist branch contacted the Department of Highways; we had some 20,000 copies of maps printed and distributed, indicating the Eclipse path through Manitoba, and they were distributed to all people who requested specific information. The tourist branch reprinted thousands of copies of the five page article on the Manitoba Eclipse prospects prepared by the Manitoba Planetarium for distribution and general mail-outs and for those requesting specific information. The article had been submitted to the Sky and Telescope magazine for further promotion.

The tourist branch further attended the planetarium's press meetings prior to the Eclipse date, and press kits were provided with reprinted copies of pertinent information for public distribution. Many hundreds of letters were individually responded to, providing whatever information the tourist branch had available on the Eclipse.

The tourist branch co-ordinated group bookings for tour wholesalers, universities and astronomical societies, so that they were offering special tours and chartered flights for the solar Eclipse that were originating from all over the United States. The Tourist Branch maintained a liaison with involved groups mentioned above, as well as the news media inside and outside of the province and Manitoba's suppliers. They encouraged and they assisted local companies, Watchorn Cameras, Wilson Enterprises, Interlake Development Corporation to provide special services for tourists visiting Manitoba during the Eclipse.

The branch co-ordinated a direct mailing of a special tabloid publication concerning the Eclipse, with Galt Publications of Toronto. This was sent to over 800 university and astronomical societies throughout the United States to encourage them to visit Manitoba during the Eclipse. They also published a souvenir map sheet of the solar Eclipse for free distribution. Besides that, we checked with the hotel accommodations wherever the Eclipse was going to be seen from, and we had been told that there was close to 100 percent occupancy in all the major hotels, some of them were overbooked.

Now, there's not much use in having a crash advertising campaign when you wouldn't have any place to have the people sleep, and as I mentioned to the member in the House, I didn't say, "I thought the people would," I said, "I'm sure that anybody interested in the sciences were very well aware that the Eclipse was taking place on that date, and that they would come, and as I said again, the hotel accommodation was all booked anyway."

MR. DOERN: Well, just on that point, Mr. Chairman, the minister is a person who is very experienced in the hotel industry and was associated with a couple of well-known Winnipeg hotels and managed them, and worked in the industry, et cetera; and I find that her position is somewhat difficult to comprehend. When I asked her questions in the House, one of the things that she said to me was, that again she felt that people interested in the sciences were the primary people that would be attracted, but then she said this, "They would be coming and the people that had not had for the short time that they would be having a view of this, that we didn't think it was to our advantage to be spending our needed advertising dollars on that type of promotion." I take her answer to mean, in effect, that the Eclipse was something that would happen for a few minutes on a particular day, and it wasn't worthwhile to promote it on that basis.

I say, that when you have an event, whether it's a football game that lasts an hour, or a hockey game that lasts a couple of hours or whatever, that people who come from other parts of the country or from another country don't normally come in on one day, see the event and then leave. We're usually talking for an event of this type — at least three days, one day to arrive and the next day the event, and then possibly a departure the following day — so I believe, first of all, you're talking basically three days; secondly, I don't think that in any event you give people an examination as to the sincerity of their interest in an event. When you buy tickets for a football game, nobody asks you whether or not you are, in fact, a sincere football fan or if you're a hockey fan, whether you have been following the game, know the players, know their records and so on and so on. You simply buy a ticket from the promotional viewpoint, I think that is all that is required.

I believe that the government could have spent several thousand dollars — I don't know what

figure we're talking about, I don't know if it's 10 or 20 thousand or \$100 thousand on an event of this type — but I believe that the government, first of all, could have helped ensure the sell-out of every single hotel and motel room in Manitoba, in effect, from Winnipeg southwest — that's one point. Secondly, I believe that the government could have interested people, citizens in renting out their homes. This is not an unusual type of procedure.

During the Pan-American Games, people were encouraged to take boarders, if you like. In other major sporting events, this happens all over the world. For some major sporting events people are staying 20, 30, 40, 50 miles away from the actual base of operation, and then take trains or buses into it, or in the case of if Winnipeg wasn't the ideal viewing point, and I think it was more than a adequate for most of our purposes, people could have been booked into Winnipeg and then bussed number of miles to some other so-called suitable location. But none of this was done, and I believe that the government really, in effect, committed one of the faux pas of the century, and it happened to fall under the Department of Tourism in the last 6 to 12 months, part of the time when the present minister was in office and then when her predecessor was in office. So I ask the minister if she has any comment there?

MRS. PRICE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't think with reference to people coming in to attend a ballgame, if they checked with it and there weren't any seats available at the game I don't think they would be making any reservations to come into the city. And, as I mentioned before, the hotel accommodation was at a premium.

I would also like to say to the member that our advertising dollars are very precious dollars and we feel that we have to put them in the areas that will bring the best rate of return. We have staff that have laboured long and hard and with great diligence and have come up with a very sophisticated and very, I think, thorough advertising program. We felt that it was in our best interests to spend the taxpayer's dollar where we will get the best return, and this is how we have done our rationalizing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I simply say that with proper promotion and an expenditure a lot higher, in thousands of dollars and tens of thousands of dollars, I believe that the government could have made, for the hotel or the hospitality industry, a great deal of money. One estimate of how much money they did make was given in the Free Press on March 7th, through the Winnipeg Convention and Visitors' Bureau. They estimated that visitors stayed an average of 3-½ days a piece, which bears out my point, and spent an average of \$50 a day. They mentioned that rent-a-car firms were completely booked up. They say that in the city, hotels were operating at a 90 percent occupancy. Now, that's good, but I say it should have been 100 percent and there should have been homes that were utilized and maybe many other forms of residency. I know that if this opportunity came in Minneapolis or in other American centres, I think it would have been a magnet for people from all over North America, that they would have had ads and attractions and it would have been made a very interesting and exciting thing, and people would have come from far and wide. And whatever the amount of money spent, whatever the amount of money spent it would have been paid for in large dividends.

So I simply say that, given the promotional opportunities and given the response of the department, I think that the department blew an opportunity in the most shocking and stark terms.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just a few comments and a couple of questions in general about the Minister's department before we get down to the specifics and our line-by-line consideration of the Estimates.

My first question to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, relates to my concern about the splitting up of the department from as it was formerly structured — Tourism, Recreation, Cultural Affairs and Parks being within one portfolio — to what it is now and divided up amongst three departments: Tourism and Cultural Affairs being one, Parks in another and Recreation in a third. And the reason for my concern, Mr. Chairman, is the fear that there may be a lack of liaison and co-ordinated activity amongst the three departments because there is a relationship amongst those four branches, a relationship in terms of tourist promotion and the like.

So therefore it would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that this dividing up of the department as formerly structured may result in one of two things. In some areas it may lead to some duplication of effort and in other vital areas it may either result in certain programs, certain matters, falling

between two stools, as it were, because one department might assume that the other department or that another department is dealing with that particular matter or, in fact, we may find instances where departments — and I'm not blaming them because that's the nature of the beast — may be working at cross purposes with each other. And I emphasize this point, Mr. Chairman, I'm not faulting any Minister or department for taking a different philosophic approach toward his particular department but looking at, for example, Parks and Tourism. The Parks Department, the Parks management type, he is a different breed of cat entirely. His prime concern, I suppose — and so it should be — the preservation of our parks, the protection of our natural environment, and the like. The Tourism Department, on the other hand, is more concerned about utilizing those parks to attract the tourist industry.

Now, as the department was formerly structured, through the organizational structure of it, I believe that it was possible to bring a co-ordination of those two, or a meeting of minds of those two philosophic approaches and provide a proper balance between the two, and thus use our parks, our natural attractions to serve both purposes: One from the point of view of the naturalists, the environmentalists and from the point of view of those involved in the tourism industry and relying on the tourism industry for a livelihood.

To give you two examples, Mr. Chairman, two that come to mind and they are probably the major ones — perhaps not, there may be others — Birds Hill Park may be one example, in the utilization of which I feel that the Tourism Department, that your department, Madame Minister, and Parks, would be equally interested in and involved because there were a number of cultural functions of a tourist attraction type being organized and conducted in Birds Hill Park.

So now I am a bit concerned about whether the parks, our parks, will still be open and accessible to this Minister for the organization and conduct of similar functions or perhaps . . . Now, I am not wedded to those particular functions because people's tastes change with the times and we may find that in a year or two there might be some other function that would bear greater appeal to the public, and a function of a type that would lend itself to being conducted in a park. So now Parks being in one department and Tourism in another, and Cultural Affairs, that is one of my concerns, whether there will still be that liaison, that co-ordinated effort to use a people's natural resource to meet those two needs.

Another example I could give the Minister may be Hecla Island, and Hecla Island, I suppose, is rather unique in that respect from a point of view that located on it we do have a tourist facility, a tourist attraction.

At the moment, I'm not quite sure who runs the hotel, Gull Harbour Lodge, whether it's this minister or another, and whichever way it is. If it's another minister, then that may present a problem too and if it's this minister, then she is the operator of a hotel on a property over which she really has no control or over a good portion of which she has no control, because it falls within the jurisdiction of another department.

Another concern that I have, Madam Minister, about the restructuring of the departments as they now are, is the effect that it would have on the research and planning function. And there too, I am wondering whether this may not lead to duplication of some areas and perhaps working at cross purposes, or other matters being neglected, because of the reason that I have indicated earlier that one department may be assuming that that particular matter is the responsibility of another.

I am also concerned, Mr. Chairman, and you know, speaking of philosophic thrust, I believe if I understood your opening remarks correctly, Madam Minister, that you did indicate that our cultural activity in the province is a major tourist attraction. Now, I don't have Hansard from last year, but if I were to take a few minutes time, I think that I could find the speeches made by your predecessor and I believe that your predecessor attached more importance at the horse racing in Manitoba, and in his opinion, he said that it was the race track that was the major tourist attraction and not our cultural affairs and our cultural activities. —(Interjection) — Your colleague from Pembina; he feels that there's another attraction that's the major one. Well, that I don't know, and if . . . —(Interjection)— That was not what I heard him say, however, I will ignore his comments.

Then, I am wondering, Madam Minister, from what appropriation the grant to the Voice of the Private Sector is paid; you know, the organization that describes itself as "The Voice of the Private Sector", the Travel and Convention Association, whether it comes out of here, or later on? But wherever it comes from, Madam Minister, I want to point this out to you, and I suppose you might say and perhaps I could be faulted for it, it may be that this organization which was funded by our government in the days when we were government, that it may have described its official monthly publication in the same manner, but that doesn't necessarily make it right. I cannot recall whether it used that slogan then or not, and I could tell you this, that if I had been aware of that organization using that slogan to describe itself, then I certainly would have brought it to their attention.

But I raised that point, Madam Minister, because of all the entrepreneurs in the private sector, those in the hospitality industry who constitute the bulk of the membership of the Travel Convention Association, of all the entrepreneurs, they are most dependent upon expenditures out of the public purse for their survival, for their existence.

It was interesting to note, in the same pamphlet which we had received a few weeks ago, there was one page listing all the functions which will be staged in Manitoba over the next few months, that hotelkeepers, restaurant owners, and other members of their association ought to be aware of, because those are going to be functions attracting tourist dollars. And without exception, every single function listed therein, receives to a greater or lesser degree, some assistance from the public purse from one level of government or another, be it from the federal government, or the provincial government, or from the local town or city council, or the surrounding rural municipalities, or whatever; be it a fair, a cultural function of some kind, but each and every one is to some degree, dependent upon assistance from the public purse. So really, Madam Minister, that is the last organization which can lay claim to being able to properly describe itself as the "Voice of the Private Sector", when it is so heavily and largely dependent upon public sector activity for the survival of their members.

Then getting down more specifically, to departmental administration, and in fact, the general administration division that we're dealing with now' And you will note, Madam Minister, that there is a very drastic reduction in the expenditures in this particular branch. If you look at the total, that's true that the total is up by less than a couple of thousand dollars, it's only up by \$1,200, but maintaining that level is only brought about by increasing the grant assessments and we'll come to that at a later time.

But zeroing in on Departmental Administration, 1.(b), and that is the item that I believe that we are specifically on at this time, I think, Madam Minister ought to explain to the committee the 40 percent plus reduction in Salaries for Departmental Administration.

Now, the Honourable Member for Wolseley applauds, and perhaps he has reason to applaud, I don't know. At this point in time, I don't know whether there is any reason to applaud or not and I'll make that decision after we hear the minister's explanation and rationale for the reduction, and then we will know whether we ought to applaud or not.

Now, I am concerned about this, because this, I would like to think, is in fact, a nerve centre of the very department, and a reduction of 40 percent is quite a substantial one. And then, on the other hand, and this I find somewhat inconsistent, is that Other Expenditures as a rule, bears some relationship to Salaries, because Other Expenditures take care of the other expenditures incurred by staff paid for and employed under that particular appropriation. So where salaries have reduced by over 40 percent, or in the order of 40 percent, Other Expenditures, on the other hand, have increased by something between 12 and 15 percent, so if the minister would be good enough to explain that.

But with those comments and the few questions which I have put to the minister, Mr. Chairman, I will pause at this time and give the minister an opportunity to respond.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: First of all, I'd like to put the Member for Burrows' mind at rest. With the reallocation of our department, the reorganization of it, we still have the three that you are referring to. The parks, the recreation and tourism, are still all sharing the offices in the Archives Building, so they are still in a close working relationship, so I don't think you'll have to worry, they are still all sharing the same space. I think my predecessor was correct when he mentioned that horse racing was one of the largest; it is one of the largest tourist revenues that we have. I don't think I said in my speech that tourism was the largest, but he was . . . — (Interjection) — I don't think I said it was the largest, I probably said it was the most important as far as the well-being of the people in our community. The reason for the reduction in the staff: with the re-organization of the department there was an elimination of six positions because of the re-organization of it; there was one employee that resigned and one employee that at present we're looking for redeployment for, and six became redundant because of the re-organization of the department; they were vacant positions before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes. Of the approved staff man years which the Minister has for the current fiscal year, could the Minister indicate the number of approved SMYs that she has for the current fiscal year and the number of vacancies under general administration? Let's deal with them.

MRS. PRICE: Well, we have 10.26 staff man years under departmental administration, yes 1.(b).

MR. HANUSCHAK: That's under departmental administration?

MRS. PRICE: Yes. Yes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Thank you. 10.26.

MRS. PRICE: 10.26, yes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Approved SMYs?

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: And how many filled?

MRS. PRICE: They're all filled, Sir.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Perhaps it may assist the committee, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister could take a couple of minutes to lead us through the Reconciliation Statement and then we might be able to get a better handle on the re-organized department as it now is, because you will note, Mr. Chairman, that there are some fairly substantial transfers, particularly transfer of functions to, and two that stand out are Fitness, Recreation, Sport, and well, Mines and Natural Resources and Environment. I think we've already dealt with that, so we know what that is. But if the Minister could take us through the Reconciliation Statement and explain it to us.

MRS. PRICE: I'd like to, with the Member's permission, to take that as notice and I'll get back with that information for you tomorrow.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Very well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member from St. Vital. Is the member for Burrows finished?

MR. HANUSCHAK: For the time being.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and like my colleague, I'd like to wish the Minister well in this particular portfolio, and I'm sure that with her knowledge of the hotel industry, she would feel a little more comfortable in this portfolio than she did in her last one. So we wish her well.

The first point I wanted to make with the Minister, Mr. Chairman, I maybe should have brought up as a matter of House privilege, because I understand, looking over a page or two that the Legislative Library comes under this Minister's responsibility, and that it is our practice . . .

MRS. PRICE: Excuse me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: Excuse me. I'd like to suggest that the Member for Elmwood had said that it would be tourism tonight, and I didn't bring any of my staff for the cultural.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Meer for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if you'll let me complete the point that I wanted to make. It has been the practice, and I understand there is a notice on the door of the library stating that it will be open during the session until 10:00 p.m. each evening. Point of privilege being, why is the Legislative Library now locked and closed?

MRS. PRICE: I didn't know it was, but I'll certainly look into it.

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask the Minister specifically about the Manitoba Enabling Vote. It's an entry that appears under most, if not all of the departments under the Reconciliation Statement. I notice there is none under this department. Can the Minister give the committee an explanation of this please?

MRS. PRICE: There is one on page 79, \$1,400,000.00.

MR. WALDING: Is this an expenditure, then, that will be dealt with or spent by the Tourism and Cultural Affairs this year?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, that's part of the DREE program that will be spent this coming year.

MR. WALDING: Can I ask the Minister, then, if this \$1.4 million is the Manitoba share, or does it include the Federal share too?

MRS. PRICE: No, it isn't the Manitoba share. That's the whole share. That's the whole thin \$1.4 million that's the Federal and Manitoba. Right here, for the Member for St. Vital, right underneath it, it says "Recoverable from Canada, \$840,000.00".

MR. WALDING: I thank the Minister for answering the next question that I had, Mr. Chairman.

Can the Minister inform the committee whether the Capital Carryover of \$494,000 for this year has been spent?

MRS. PRICE: I didn't hear you.

MR. WALDING: I asked the Minister, Mr. Chairman, whether the Capital Carryover Authority of \$494,000 for this year that we're in now has been spent?

MRS. PRICE: Where did you get that from, so I could see? Oh, here it is, on page 76. I'm informed that it hasn't all been spent, but I would have to get the figure of the balance for you, if you'd like it.

MR. WALDING: Does the Minister expect to expend all of that amount before the end of this year, or does she expect that there will be some left over?

MRS. PRICE: No, it won't all be spent. There will be some left over.

MR. WALDING: Can the Minister inform the committee whether there have been any special warrants issued in this department for the last year?

MRS. PRICE: I'm not aware of any. I don't believe there was.

MR. WALDING: One last question, Mr. Chairman, we've learned from other departments that there is a new classification of Civil Servant called Warm Bodies. We'd like to ask the Minister how many Warm Bodies there were on the payroll as of January, 1979, and the comparable figure for the preceding year, January, 1978, for this department? If she doesn't have it now, perhaps she could take it as notice and get it for us later.

MRS. PRICE: I'll take it as notice. I'll have to get them for you. I haven't got those figures that you would like.

MR. WALDING: One last question, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask the Minister if there have been any accounting changes within these Estimates, other than those listed in the Reconciliation Statement?

MRS. PRICE: Not to my knowledge, no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister provided us with some information to my colleague for Burrows, indicating that there were six positions eliminated, and I wonder if, in looking again in

1(b) . . . First of all, if the Minister could indicated — she sort of did cover this material — have there been any further re-organizations since the Estimates were printed?

MRS. PRICE: No, there hasn't.

MR. DOERN: Looking at 1(b)(1), there is a reduction, I guess, of 35 to 40 percent, reduction there. Is this where the six positions were eliminated?

MRS. PRICE: Well, there were eight positions, there was the six with the shuffle and the other two.

MR. DOERN: So there are eight positions eliminated. Could the Minister indicate what these positions were, I mean, for instance, are we dealing with clerk typists or directors, etc., could we have a run-through of what was eliminated?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, there is an Executive Assistant, secretary to the Deputy Minister, secretary to the Minister, Research Economist, Planning and Program Analyst, Administrative Secretary, Planning Consultant and Administrative Secretary.

MR. DOERN: Could the Minister characterize those positions in terms of how many, say, were higher level administrative and how many were lower level or . . .

MRS. PRICE: I don't know what you mean by categorize.

MR. DOERN: If you're going to break those figures into directors and supervisors and administration, as opposed to secretarial, etc., or so-called lower level and so-called higher level, is there any breakdown you could give us in that regard?

MRS. PRICE: Four were secretarial and the others were in a medium . . .

MR. DOERN: Could the Minister indicate, this year, compared to last year, what the ratio of staff to directors was, and what the ratio of staff to directors is?

MRS. PRICE: I'd have to take that as notice. We don't have that here.

MR. DOERN: I don't have my '79 Estimates book with me, but was there not a breakdown under a category of Policy and Program Development? Was there a section last year so described and has it been eliminated?

MRS. PRICE: I'm told there was, but it's part of the departmental administration now.

MR. DOERN: And are the SMYs the same?

MRS. PRICE: Other than those that were eliminated.

MR. DOERN: Could the Minister indicate how many people who were in Policy and Program Development, how many there were last year, and how many were eliminated in the past year?

MRS. PRICE: I would have to go into that with the department. When we had the re-shuffle, that's why these positions were eliminated. They were vacant positions at the time.

MR. DOERN: That's all I have at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, with reference to Policy and Planning, which branch of the Minister's department, if any, talks to the Department of Mines in liaising with it and developing the Whiteshell plan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: Any liaising is done through the Deputy, and he in turn allocates whoever it is to speak on it. You go through the normal chain of command the same as it always has been.

MR. HANUSCHAK: So that leads me to the next question, Mr. Chairman. Is the Whiteshell Plan being developed, strictly and exclusively by the Department of Mines, Natural Resources and Environment or does the Minister's department have any opportunity to provide any input into the plan?

MRS. PRICE: At the present time it's the Department of Mines. There isn't anything going on in my department although under the DaisE program there will be some lion with them.

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, I think that answers my question, that I understood the Minister to say that at this point in time there is no input from her department into the development of whatever plan if any is being developed by Mines for the Whiteshell. Thank You.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1. (b)(1)—pass; 1. (b)(2)—pass — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I had asked the Minister when I made reference to the 40 percent decrease in salaries that the converse occurs or appears in other expenditures, that salaries have been reduced for the reasons given by the Minister but other expenditures have increased by something in the order of 15 percent. Could the Minister explain the reason for the increase in other expenditures?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, \$10,000 is due to the department for the new centrex telephone system that was put in. And then there was the \$4.5 thousand as the general increase, the allowance for price increases.

MR. HANUSCHUK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that doesn't add up because 10 plus 4 is \$14 thousand plus \$47.9 thousand, that will bring us to well over \$60 thousand.

MRS. PRICE: Pardon me. I'm sorry, \$10.8 is the combination of two of them; the centrex telephone system was \$6.3 thousand.

MRS. PRICE: And the price increases was the \$4.5 thousand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Yes on the same question, Mr. Chairman, if there has been a reduction of six staff then it would seem logical that there should be a net reduction in other expenditures or at least that the other expenditures would not increase in the sense that the costs would shift to the new additional programming that has just been mentioned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: As I mentioned earlier the eight positions that were there, six of them were vacant for some time and our expenses the only rise in them is the \$10 thousand I said due to the telephone system and the price increases.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, even if the positions were not filled I would understand that they would have been budgeted for in any event and would show up in these figures. As long as these positions are not abolished there are budgeted for, as I understand.

MRS. PRICE: The reduction shows in the decrease in the employment but it doesn't show in the expenditures because the expenditures went on just the same because we didn't have those bodies physically, you know in the past year.

MR. USKIW: Can the Minister indicate to me then just when the reductions did show up as a result of not filling those positions?

MRS. PRICE: You mean the reductions in the employment?

MR. USKIW: The reductions in the other expenditures if you retire staff.

MRS. PRICE: There couldn't really be a corresponding reduction and as I say the reason there is the addition to it, because the net increase of \$10.8 thousand is because of the telephone system and the price increases but other than that the expenses are the same as they were last year when we had the staff man years which were vacant.

MR. USKIW: Well no, what I'm getting at, Mr. Chairman, is whether the \$47,900 which was the amount spent last year, whether that indeed was reduced from the year before because of the vacancies that were then present.

MRS. PRICE: I'm afraid I don't have what the year 1977-78 were, I don't have those figures. I just have 1978-79, and it would be the same except that \$10 thousand is because of the telephone and price increase.

MR. USKIW: Well I wonder if the Minister would undertake to advise us whenever she does get the information as to when there was a reduction in the other expenditures relative to the reduction in staff, where they would show up.

MRS. PRICE: You mean for 1977-78? We can get those figures for you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b)(2)—pass; 1.(c)(1)—pass, the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, there has been a reduction here in the size of the research and planning branch. I wonder if the Minister could indicate how many SMY's there were last year and how many there are now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: There's a decrease of two staff man years and that's due to the reorganization of the department.

MR. DOERN: And how many people were we talking about a year ago and how many now?

MRS. PRICE: We were talking about 8.39 last year and it's 6.39 now.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I find this a very peculiar and wrong decision because I assume that one of the most important requirements in any government department and particularly in this department is to have a research and planning capability. If you don't have that, then you are talking about rule of thumb and seat of the pants reactions. I think you're also talking about potential degeneration into political reactions and responses that when you don't have long term goals and plans, and the political pressure mounts from various pressure groups and in particular from members of the government caucus then it's too easy to cave in. I find this somewhat hard to understand because of the consistent and persistent indications on the part of the government Ministers every day, in Question Period, that they are spending vast amounts of their time and their departments are spending vast amounts of their energy on monitoring and studying and considering everything. If that is true, and I don't believe it for a moment, but if it is true that all of these things that the Opposition puts to the government are under consideration then this requires a research capability.

I think if we were to logically work out what is being said by the Minister of Health and by the other Ministers and now to a lesser extent, by the Minister of Tourism that we would have an army of researchers at work, that the buildings would be burgeoning, this would be the biggest potential growth industry under the Conservative administration. But then when we get down to the nitty gritty, we see that there isn't this increasing planning capability and there aren't more people employed but that this is simply a case of mere words and that the fact of the matter is that there are cuts everywhere in planning and research. This is taken to be the easiest place and the best place for the government to cut and I suppose the second best place is on maintenance so that our whole capital in the province that's long built up and carefully maintained is going to deteriorate in the next few years.

So here we have a department with an \$11 million budget with \$800 thousand being planned in advertising and there's been a reduction in the research and planning branch. I say to the Minister that it's important that she have an ability and a capacity within her department to develop plans, to plan carefully how those \$11 million will be spent and to actually monitor it and here we find

out that there's a reduction of 25 percent. So I wonder if she would care to comment on that?

MRS. PRICE: I would like to bring to the member's attention the fact that in the re-organization, it reduced the size of this department considerably. It certainly hasn't reduced the quality of research and planning that is taking place in the department. It's just that our department has become much smaller and the other departments had their mechanisms set up for their research and planning and that's why it necessitated reducing this by two.

MR. DOERN: I'm afraid I'm not following the Minister there. The Minister had 8.4 people last year, she now has 6.4 people. Can she explain how she will be able to turn out the same amount of work or more with the 25 percent reduction?

MRS. PRICE: As I explained to you our department is that much smaller — in the re-organization, our department is that much smaller and there wasn't the need for the two people.

MR. DOERN: So the Minister feels that proportionately she has the same number of staff and the same ability?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, I do.

MR. DOERN: The other two people have gone to the Recreation branch?

MRS. PRICE: No they haven't.

MR. DOERN: Have they been eliminated? Well then the Minister's department, Tourism and Cultural Affairs and the component that was formerly Recreation, there has been a reduction of 25 percent in that whole former area.

MRS. PRICE: Approximately that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to understand the Minister's answer with respect to who is now responsible for the development in the policies with respect to the Whiteshell. Perhaps you might begin by clarifying for me just what the department's role is with respect to the Whiteshell if any.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: As I mentioned earlier, we don't have any at this precise moment. We don't have any connection with the Whiteshell but as we get into the DREE program, there will be areas that we will be having an input into, but at the present time we don't.

MR. USKIW: Yes, would the Minister then inform us who it is that is responsible for the development of the Whiteshell from the point of view of tourism and recreation.

MRS. PRICE: Well if there is something pertaining to Tourism, it would be in my department but right now it's the Mines and Natural Resources that there is any activity in. But when we get into the DREE agreement we will be having some input because there will be Tourism promotion in the Whiteshell.

MR. USKIW: Yes, could the Minister tell us exactly what the Department of Mines is interested in, in terms of the Whiteshell, as opposed to the Department of Tourism? As I understand it, there are two separate functions and perhaps I'm not aware as to the new functions of the Department of Mines with respect to the Whiteshell.

MRS. PRICE: Well I think the Minister of Mines would have to answer the question pertaining to his own department. All I can say is that at the present we don't have anything to do with the Whiteshell at this precise moment.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know just where it is proper to debate the whole

question of recreation then and the development of recreational facilities, is it here or in the Department of Mines?

MRS. PRICE: In the recreational facilities it would be under the Minister for Recreation.

MR. USKIW: So as far as the Whiteshell is concerned then it's broken down into three components: Mines, Tourism and Recreation which is all split up among three departments as I understand it.

MRS. PRICE: The Whiteshell per se isn't split up between three departments. We haven't got anything in it at the present moment so that puts it down to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and I think if you had his input during his Estimates, that I think if there are any questions that you wanted to ask, it would have to be answered by himself.

MR. USKIW: Can the Minister advise us as to why it has been split off in this way so that Tourism really is not in the position to handle the whole question of development of our natural resources for tourism in Manitoba.

MRS. PRICE: I think the Premier in his wisdom saw fit to allocate the different departments in this respect and that is a question you could probably ask him in his Estimates.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I had asked the minister a question earlier which she did not respond to, and it may have escaped her mind. Who runs Gull Harbour Lodge? Is it this minister or some other?

MRS. PRICE: The Minister of Finance is running it at the present time.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The Minister of Finance?

MRS. PRICE: The Department of Finance, yes.

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: So then, who is responsible for the promotion, for the advertising and promotion of Gull Harbour Lodge? Is it the Department of Finance or is it Tourism?

MRS. PRICE: Gull Harbour Lodge is responsible.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Gull Harbour Lodge is responsible, so this department has absolutely nothing to do with the promotion of Gull Harbour Lodge?

MRS. PRICE: Well, we have a responsibility in the overall promotion of Manitoba, and as such, it embraces Gull Harbour Lodge, but the Department of Finance is looking after the management of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since the minister has said that we have had a reduction of two staff man years in this department, in looking at the Reconciliation Statement, doing a rough calculation, three-fifths of what was the department that we were just dealing with, about two-fifths of it now, and if the research and planning portion of the department that she said has been transferred is only two people, I just don't get the connection that 8.4 were able to do the research and planning for approximately, well, I think the figure is \$25.9 million, of which approximately 17.6 has been transferred now out of this department, so there is a very small portion of the department left. Just what is the present Research and Planning Department doing then, since we have only two people less than what was there before when the minister was responsible for approximately \$26 million?

MRS. PRICE: Well, that department looks after the development of the provincial tourism strategy and development programs; they look after the continuation of programs that are designed to the non-resident travel in Manitoba; they look after the public library services; horse racing industry; and cultural affairs.

MR. JENKINS: Does the department — for out of province travellers now — does the department do any research, or a questionnaire type like the federal Department of Tourism does for visitors when they come in at the airports? Are these things available, and points of entry from say, south of the international boundary and east or west of the provincial boundaries?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, we do, quite extensively. The visitors that are coming into the province, or leaving, or the ones that have a one-day stay here, ones that are passing through; they have quite an extensive research in all of this.

MR. JENKINS: This is one of the functions of this department then, is it, of this Research and Planning?

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. JENKINS: Okay, thank you.

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: No, I'm on No. 2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(c)(2) — the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, here again, we note in relation to Salaries, where there has been about a 25 percent decrease in Salaries, but approximately a 35 percent increase in Other Expenditures. And, in an attempt to obtain a clarification and explanation, for this inconsistency, where there is a decrease in Salaries on the one hand and an increase in Other Expenditures on the other, may I just take a moment or two to explain my question which is of a similar kind to that asked by my colleague, the Member for Lac du Bonnet, with reference to departmental administration?

Now, I would think, Mr. Chairman, that a good portion of Other Expenditures are closely related to Salaries, in other words, to every staff man year there are some other expenditures attributed to it for whatever it may be; postage, telephone, travel, a desk, a whole host of expenditures.

So in other words, if you have one staff man year, you will have a few thousand dollars of other expenditures, and so it goes. So therefore, it would seem that if there is a reduction of staff man years, then there should be a corresponding, or if not a corresponding reduction — because I believe that the minister did indicate that it is not always possible to reduce other expenditures, correspondingly, and I suppose that can be explained — but nevertheless, one would think that there should be some reduction in Other Expenditures with a reduction in Salaries. So could the minister explain the inconsistency between the two items? A very substantial reduction in Salaries on the one hand and an equally significant increase in Other Expenditures on the other.

MRS. PRICE: Yes. To the Member for Burrows, this \$20,000 increase is due for some short term specialized research assistance that was brought in under contract, just on a short term, and then the \$4,000 of general increase.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The short term contract research assistance, in terms of staff man year equivalence, what would it roughly amount to, a half a staff man year, a quarter, one staff man year, or what?

MRS. PRICE: I couldn't really tell you, but probably three-quarters.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well, that too, Mr. Chairman, I think is very interesting and should be noted for the record, that where under the regular Salary item in this branch, there is a reduction in SMYs, but that a good fraction of a staff man year is contained in Other Expenditures. I think, Mr. Chairman, that as we go through the Estimates, not only in this department, but in other departments, that matters of that kind we ought to keep note of because I think that the end result will be after we have considered the Estimates of all departments is, we will find that there really is not the SMY reduction of the magnitude that this government prides itself in having been able to bring about.

MRS. PRICE: This extra specialized research assistance, for example, is to look into research in

the United States using consultant contracts. That's what that has been used for just on a short term basis.

MR. HANUSCHAK: So, it's farming out government work to the private sector as we had seen evidence of this in the provincial Auditor's department some time ago, so here's another, at least a minor example of the same thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(c)(2)—pass; 1.(d)(1)— pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Could the minister give us the SMY comparisons last year to this?

MRS. PRICE: Last year it was 8.39 and this year it's 7.39.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask the minister, in preparation of these Estimates, could the minister indicate what form of budgeting has the department employed in preparing these Estimates? What form of budget process?

MRS. PRICE: You mean with regard to increasing, or decreasing, or what? I don't know what you mean.

MR. URUSKI: The preparation of the Estimates of the department. I wanted to know whether the department has used base review budgeting or have they used the zero base budgeting, or what process has the department utilized in preparing the budget?

MRS. PRICE: I think there was a little bit of everything, for the Member for St. George. I can't really tell you anything specific.

MR. URUSKI: I'll be very specific, Mr. Chairman. I'll ask the minister whether the department utilized zero base budgeting in preparing this year's budget?

MRS. PRICE: In some respects it was; in other respects there was other types of budgeting. There wasn't any set rule of thumb.

MR. URUSKI: Could the minister elaborate in which respects was it used and in which respects wasn't it?

MRS. PRICE: I would have to get back to you with that answer because I don't know just which one. If you are interested, I can get back.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Premier of this province went around this province about eighteen months ago, indicating that in this government's review and reorganization, one of the processes in setting budgets that this government would undertake was zero base budgeting, and the Task Force Review indicated that this was an approach that would be implemented. I want to know from you, Madam Minister, whether or not your department has begun utilizing the zero base budgeting process that the Premier heralded as the cost saving and saviour of the finances of this province?

MRS. PRICE: We have started, we're working on it. As I say, part of it was done this year, but we are working on it as a means to an end.

MR. URUSKI: The minister indicated, are you prepared to provide us with a resume of what areas within the department went through that process and which areas didn't, and give that to the committee? It doesn't have to be this evening, but I presume, by the time we start the Estimates tomorrow, you should be able to have that information.

MRS. PRICE: I'll see what I can get, but I don't know if I can get figures in that respect, for the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: I'm really not after figures. There is a process and a procedure that is normally followed in the budgeting process, and there is, I am sure, many accountants that can indicate

the process that zero base budgeting goes through, and I would like an indication from the minister what areas within her budget, what branches or what programs within her budget went through that process?

MRS. PRICE: I will come back with whatever information I can get for the Member for St. George tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(d)(1)—pass; 1.(d)(2)—pass; 1.(e)(1)—pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Could the minister indicate what staff comprises the translation services?

MRS. PRICE: There is four, to the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Could you tell us, from the director down, what their classifications are?

MRS. PRICE: Yes. I have the director, two translators, and one clerical support staff.

MR. DOERN: Are those two translators able to do all the work within the government, or is there a certain amount of money spent for translations outside of the department?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, to date they have been able to accomplish everything that was given to them. There hasn't been anything farmed out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(e) — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: A final point. Is it necessary to have a director in charge of that service in a sense of what does the director do other than allocate the work? I mean, what are the functions of the director of the Translation Services? One would assume that it might almost be handled by a couple of people who do the translation work.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: The same director has been here since this department was started. He's a very highly expert man. Apparently when there's some translations, especially government letters, etc. requires a great deal of expertise, and this man has it. He's highly regarded and very essential for the operation of the department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd just like to follow up with the Minister on the questions that I posed to her earlier. And I'd like to, maybe, try and define certain parameters that I'd like her to comment on in the direction the department, if it has implemented what experts in the field describe as zero-base budgeting, whether or not the department has moved from centralized control to a decentralized approach and a delegation of authority within the department — those are some of the parameters that are within the process of zero-base budgeting; whether the authoritarian approach has been moved to participate of management, in other words, management by team-planning rather than by individual planning; whether the communication within the department is upward in nature rather than downward, in other words, operating rather than by edict, by management review and participative management; whether the department is administratively centralized or centred and is it being changed or transformed into an area of creativity and innovation? What moves has the department undertaken in the innovative approach of management? Whether there is, in terms of the management team, an effort to explore future policies and innovations in programs rather than operating management on a day-to-day basis in dealing with the day-to-day matters.

These are some of the areas that I would like some comment on in terms of approach, as it's been outlined in zero-base budgeting, to find out whether or not the government is and has been serious in its indications or public pronouncements insofar as the budgeting process.

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned earlier to the Member for St. George, I will do my best to get the information that he has asked for.

MR. URUSKI: I've just tried to give you some indication of . . .

MRS. PRICE: I'll get it from Hansard.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This branch, it only does translation from one to the other of the two official languages. Is that not correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: Yes. I'm informed there's one of the translators that does four languages.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, firstly, the amounts shown here is that the net cost to the taxpayers of Manitoba, or is some of this recoverable from other departments? In other words, it's only sort of a paper figure, but it's really paid by someone else.

MRS. PRICE: There's \$15,000 recoverable from the Government of Canada.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Is there any recovery from other departments?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, there is. The different departments are charged rates from two to four cents respectively per word, technically. .

MR. HANUSCHAK: So, what portion of this or, let me put my question this way, Mr. Chairman. Of the \$66,000, what portion of that is spent on translation services for the Minister's department, what portion for other departments?

MRS. PRICE: It serves all governments — the municipal government, the federal, the provincial. They can all come in. All departments. Pardon me, I got twisted. It serves all departments. Although I don't know how much, all told, that it brings in.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I believe that there is some translation work which the Minister's department has to do — well, German and Japanese comes to mind — because I would suspect that there's a fair amount of tourist promotion done in the two countries. Are those two any way and there may be others. Does this appropriation cover that type of translation that has to be done?

For example, to translate an advertisement, the advertising copy from English to Japanese for insertion in the Japanese newspaper? Or German magazine, or what have you?

MRS. PRICE: I understand it's just the two official languages.

MR. HANUSCHAK: If I recall, Mr. Chairman, the Minister did indicate to us a moment ago that on the staff of this branch there is one person who is fluent in four languages. So then that talent is of no particular use or benefit to the Minister, or to the department, because there isn't translation being done into any language other than from one official language to the other.

MRS. PRICE: There's very little call for any other languages other than French and English. But, as I said, there's one member that's capable of translating in four languages. But there's very little call for it.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well perhaps I'll be able to get back to this under another appropriation. Now, one other question with relation to translation services. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that there is a certain type of translation that I suppose one who has a general fluency in both languages is quite capable of doing. I'm thinking of the arts graduate who had majored in one or both languages, honours degree, masters degree, so forth, and can do general translation. But even that type of an individual, if he doesn't have any further specialized training, may find it difficult to do translation work of a more technical nature — some legal documents, perhaps some of the type of material that Industry and Commerce might receive, that Mines might receive, highly technical engineering-oriented material. Does the Minister have staff to do proper translation of material of

that kind or does the Minister have to farm that out to some one else?

MRS. PRICE: I think that the main purpose for the Translation Department is to translate with the two major languages for the convenience of the government people in the different departments, and as such we do that with the French and English.

MR. HANUSCHAK: So, do I understand the Minister to say that this branch is properly and adequately staffed to do a first-class translation job of a legal document, of an engineering document, of a commercial document, from French to English or English to French?

MRS. PRICE: I think we do more than an adequate job in the FrenchEnglish. And they have the capabilities, and they also are able to draw on the federal bank for assistance, too.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Now, if there is translation assistance from the federal government, no doubt that costs us money. Where is that shown?

MRS. PRICE: No, it doesn't cost us any money. In fact, we have had an agreement, a three-year agreement, that has just come to an end now, whereby we have a \$15,000 recoverable from the federal government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I.(e)(2)—pass. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I did want to indicate to the Minister that I spoke to her before we began the Estimates, and I believe there's some heavier areas coming up here that it is my distinct preference to adjourn the committee at 10:00 o'clock. And I say to the Minister now, if she is agreeable to that notion, that I would prefer to adjourn at a civilized hour and resume tomorrow afternoon.

MRS. PRICE: That's fine.

MR. DOERN: So, then, I would ask, Mr. Chairman, that the committee adjourn until tomorrow.

MRS. PRICE: It's soonly five to ten. Do you want to carry on?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I seek guidance here. Was the Member for Elmwood passing I.(e)?

MR. DOERN: I think we can pass the Translation Services. But before we get into Manitoba Film Classification and all these other things, I would like to move adjournment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, before you receive the motion that the committee rise, I believe that I must agree with the Minister of Highways, that it is not a civilized hour for adjournment yet. It's three or four minutes to go. I have one short question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What item is the Member for Burrows speaking on?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Before we pass I.(e).

MR. CHAIRMAN: I already have the I.(e)—pass. The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. As my honourable colleague, the Member for Elmwood, was bringing to your attention a suitable hour for adjournment, I still had intended to speak at that time but I didn't have an opportunity because he was speaking.

The item Recoverable from Canada — \$15,000.00. Is that not, Mr. Chairman, completely unrelated to reimbursement of the province by the federal government for any translation services or whatever, but this is strictly a grant under the terms of the — I've forgotten the exact title of the agreement, but it's the agreement tied in with the bilingualism program — Bilingualism Support.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: It's just called a Special Assistance Program, and it's been ongoing for three years, so it started in your era.

MR. HANUSCHAK: If the Honourable Minister does not know, Mr. Chairman, would the Honourable Minister undertake to find out — to confirm or otherwise that this \$15,000 is part of the Federal Bilingualism Support.

MRS. PRICE: A special assistance program was started for the establishment and improvement of translation services with the federal government, with the contributions not to exceed 50 percent of the total cost, or \$30,000 a year. And this is the third year and it has just petered out, we've just come to the end of it.

MR. HANUSCHAK: If I may have an explanation of that — 50 percent of the total cost of what?

MRS. PRICE: Of the translation services. "Translating into French or English and printing provincial or municipal legislation, publications that explain or publicize such legislation or forms used in the administration."

MR. HANUSCHAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: l.(e)(2)—pass. The Member for Wolsely.

MR. WILSON: I would rather the committee continue to the end of the resolution unless there's anything really pressing about the small item of the Manitoba Film Classification Board. I'd like to ask some questions for information purposes and some observations that might require the minister to come back tomorrow with the answers, and I would prefer to go to the end of that section. So I would be opposed at this time to quitting. After listening to the Member from Burrows about translation for some time. I'm sure that I would appreciate that opportunity, unless there's some strong objection from the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I have a fair amount to say on the Classification Board and on Grant Assistance, and so on and so on, and as I say just on a general discussion with the minister, I suggested that we adjourn at 10 o'clock, I think that all these matters can be discussed tomorrow. We're not going to end this department immediately, and I would, therefore, move that Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson): I would draw the honourable members' attention to Page 48 in the main Estimates, Department of Health and Community Services, Item 3 Social Services and Community Health. We are on (g) Health Education (1) Salaries— pass; (2) —(Interjection)— The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Before we broke for the private members' hour the Minister was responding to a couple of points. I wonder if he wanted to finish his remarks or had he finished?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, no, Mr. Chairman, it's just that I would prefer not to subject the honourable members opposite on the committee to repetition. I don't know that I can add anything to what I have attempted to supply in terms of answers to questions on this particular appropriation or to what I was saying at 4:25, 4:29. I think that I have been candid, been frank and have answered everything that I can answer in this area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I sympathize with the Minister in not wishing to respond to the points that were made earlier this afternoon. In his response he said perhaps we should pray to God and I'm inclined to say "Amen", because the Minister really doesn't have an answer to some of the questions that we posed to him. And with reference to the item which was under discussion

was a program Building The Pieces Together. And in the response to the Minister he is still begging the question of what he is going to do about this sort of problem. He said he has issued instructions that this particular program was being suspended, or the support was being suspended.

I want to point out while we're discussing this particular program, that while it was funded as a matter of some expediency through the Alcoholism Foundation and some reference is given to Alcohol and Drug Abuse, nevertheless the program was and is intended to deal with the problems which are facing our society. I'm sure that the Minister is well apprized of his very capable, hardworking civil service that the social indices in this country, not the economic indices, but the social indices are increasing at alarming rate and regarding the Minister's comments earlier that he will do things differently than the former government, this is his prerogative. But, I'm not talking about painting a house red or blue, I'm talking about a house at all, that the indices of suicides among teenagers is increasing, the indices of juvenile delinquency are increasing.

And, I don't care what, of the 15 different varieties of theories or combination of theories the Minister personally subscribes to, he will find that underlying them all is one common thread that the difficulty is in dealing with one's self and the relationship to others, and that is the basic problem. But I had said earlier that this program was intended to address itself to that problem, and for the Minister to say that he is going to suspend it, I ask him — has he got any other alternative to present to this Legislature insofar as Health Education is concerned?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know how many times I can say it. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre may well have been in the other Committee, but I have said again and again and again that we are not suspending it, that we are not stopping it. As a matter of fact, that's one of the criticisms that's been levelled at me by colleagues of the Member for Winnipeg Centre. What we have suspended is promotion of the program. I don't know how many times I have to say that and I'm sure you'll bear with me, Mr. Chairman, that you'll find it stated at least a dozen times in discussion of this Item which ranges back to last week. We have not stopped the program. The Honourable Member for St. Johns says I have not gone far enough in not stopping it if this is the way I feel. What we have said is we have suspended promotion of the program pending an examination, a review, an assessment by the government and by resources and sources that the government will call on.t\$

Many of those resources and sources will be within the ranks of the government itself. We have people in our ranks just as the opposition has people in its ranks with competence in the field of teaching, with competence in the field of child instruction and guidance, with competence in the field of raising families, and we will assess it and evaluate it in the future period between now and the next school year and complete that evaluation, make the decision as to whether that is the level or the plane on which we want to pursue alcohol and drug education for children, or whether there is a different plane and a different level. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre knows far better than I that there are different schools of thought, different philosophies, some held by agencies which are struggling for existence because they did not represent the philosophical approach to alcohol and drug education that the previous government represented. I'm not holding any brief for either side of that argument. I'm simply relating a fact.

We may turn to a delivery system and to an approach that can be produced by another agency, by another source, by the revamped Alcoholism Foundation itself, by the Department of Health and Community Services through our Community Field Services. That has not been determined yet. No one is putting down or discounting the need for proper and early education to prevent alcohol and drug abuse and non-medical use of drugs by children. All we have said is that we are not convinced, as the previous government apparently was convinced, which was their right, that Building the Pieces Together is the right vehicle, the right delivery system. There will be an evaluation and an assessment that will determine whether it is that right vehicle in our view or not. We may wind up working with another agency promoting a different philosophy.

I'm not an expert in this field. That's why I'm not making the decision. I would appreciate the input of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre and others who do have some expertise in addressing the problem. No one is closing any doors on the eventual method of instruction or the style or type of the program, but because of considerable concern expressed to us as I've said before on frequent occasions in the last several days, we have stopped promotion of this program until we are satisfied that it is doing the job its designers said it would do and, at the same time, doing so in keeping with the best interest, the best developmental interest of our children.

We have reason to suspect that some parents feel that it does not serve the highest developmental interests of their children. If the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre has an opposite view, it will be taken into conscientious account.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman I said last week that I believed in the

truthfulness of statements made by the Honourable Minister of Health and when I was told earlier today that the minister had quoted me as saying that he should have done more to prevent the development of the program, I didn't believe that he had said it, but I heard him say it just now, Mr. Chairman. —(Interjection)—Ah, Mr. Chairman, that's a very important point. No, Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that I said I thought it was a good program as much as I've read about it and reviewed it, I thought it was a good and worthwhile program. I said that it's the minister who is not handling it correctly. I said then that if he believed what he was told, he didn't do enough and I really blame the Minister of Education whose responsibility it is. If he didn't believe it, he shouldn't have stopped at where he did and I want to make sure that he doesn't repeat that I said he hadn't gone far enough. Because I believe he went much too far and I don't think he had justification for it.

One other point, Mr. Chairman. I have not considered in reviewing that book that it deals only with alcohol and drug abuse and the minister — and I don't blame him because he's never seen that program — I have to tell him that it does not deal solely with alcohol and drug abuse, that indeed it deals with many ramifications of what a child should learn in school, in my opinion. So that, again, because of his lack of knowledge he's fallen into the trap of thinking that all this deals with is alcohol and drug abuse, and it's not the case. Well, he shakes his head so apparently he knows that much.

MR. SHERMAN: I don't think the Alcoholism Foundation is concerned with that subject . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the minister says. He thinks that the Alcoholism Foundation is concerned with that aspect. I think, too, that they see in this a positive way of dealing with the problems that they are concerned with, but it is much broader far-reaching program, much much broader, much more far reaching, much more progressive, but not in the sense of the term Progressive Conservative because we know that the Conservatives, as such, would not go for this kind of a program. I think the decision has been made; I think it was made on the basis of appeals by various supporters of the Conservatives and certainly, the only people I've heard of so far that have given advice to the minister are members of the Conservative Party, and I think that's okay, that's fine.

But I really rose on the basis that the minister should not be saying that I felt he had not gone far enough. He knows very well that I thought he's gone much too far, but I said that to be consistent with his own attitude if he believed what he was told and he must have to the extent that he stopped the program, if he believed what he was told, then he did not go far enough and I said the Minister of Education should have done more if he believed it. That was my point.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I did not say that and the record will show, I trust, and if it doesn't then I apologize. Let the record show now that what I believe I said, if I didn't say it, I intended to say, that the Honourable Member for St. Johns has suggested that I did not go far enough, if I felt that strongly in opposition to the program.

Let me also say that the Act under which the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba was established and operates, sets out very clearly the aims and objects of the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, and it specifies very clearly that they lie in the assistance to individuals with problems involving the abuse or misuse of alcohol. It doesn't say anything about the other subject areas that the Honourable Member for St. Johns is referring to. I do not say those other subject areas are not important. What we are dealing with here is a program that has been promoted by the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba. The honourable member and his colleagues thought it was great; that's their privilege. We don't feel that we have at this point, the demonstrable evidence and the demonstrable support of parents, who after all the persons primarily responsible for, and primarily interested in the development of their children. We don't feel that it has necessarily confidence, and that it is that great.

What burns the Member for St. Johns, Mr. Chairman, as I said last week, is that he's not on this side of the House so that he can lay down his philosophy, his approach with respect to that and all other programs. We're not sold on that philosophy and that approach. We may wind up being if the Member for St. Johns will be patient, but at this juncture we're not. And nor are a number of parents who've objected about it, and I think that those parents have more right, more God-given right, to concern themselves about the developmental process through which their children are going than the Member for St. Johns does. He has that right with his children; they have that right with theirs. If they're unhappy, we intend to look into it. And we have in that spirit suspended the promotion of the program.

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

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I usually give on to Caesar that which is Caesar's and on to God that which is God's, but the minister keeps bringing this into the argument. But I would like him — he mentioned in his earlier remarks, that the former administration did not give grants to agencies which were in philosophical disagreement with the government. When the former minister left his office, he put on his hat and coat and left. I would like the minister, when we're discussing the Alcoholism Foundation, to bring evidence into this House which would support his charge.

Now I said earlier that he has a very pleasant manner in presenting things but he keeps begging the question because this opposition — and the minister is right, I wish I was on that side and especially when we get down to things like this. Uh-huh, and we'll be back there soon enough, with the help from the Member for Thompson. Go out and speak to your constituencies.

Mr. Chairman, this particular program was developed in keeping with the purported philosophy of this government is they're going to go talk to the people in the area. This was developed with the parents, with the teachers and everyone else in the community. And I said earlier that the minister is in error and I repeat it. In my opinion, he is in error' because he has reacted to some opposition from some quarters which is bound to occur relative to any new approach.

But the Member for St. Johns keeps pressing the minister. Who is doing the evaluation? And all we get out of it is political people and some people in the community. He has not said that he's going to ask for an expression of opinion on anyone else, any other organization in the society. I believe the Leader of the Opposition read into the Record a letter of support from the Merinonite community. Is he going to send copies of this book and ask for an expression of the various theological groups in the community, what they feel about it, how they feel about it? Is he going to ask the Social Planning Council how they feel about it? To what extent this is a problem in our society, the minister with his ability at PR continually adopts this attitude, he gets up and makes a speech, but he never answers a question. He comes up with words, the semantics of which he wants to change to suit his own purpose, monitoring. If the minister will go get a dictionary or lexicon or anything else and look up the semantics of the word "monitoring", monitor means to watch and take action.

Now "suspend" that's almost with the he's talking about new words theological concept of limbo from what we found out. And two years, Mr. Minister, I'm sorry is not good enough because this is a pressing need in our society. And you had very confident capable people and I repeat, I don't know who was socialist, who was Conservative or who was Liberal in this regard because that's one area that we're very fortunate with some leaders in the Conservative Party in keeping politics out of it. But I'm sorry that the pressures on you yourself has turned that about also. Because it wasn't as the Minister of Education said off the cuff in Gimli, part of a socialist plot, I'm paraphrasing. This was an excellent program and when we get down to discussing the Alcoholism Foundation per se, we will discuss some of the politicization, I think the word is, I have difficulty with those words.

But the Minister, I repeat as a question to the Minister in light of the questions which the Minister refuses to answer, who actually is going to do evaluation on this? Is it to be continued in the milieu which he has suggested so far, that it's just going to be caucus in the Conservative Party which is going to be involved? And the Minister issued me an invitation which I had told him to some eighteen months ago that any contribution I could make in any of the fields of which I was involved, I would be glad to share my experience and perhaps share with him why some things followed a particular path. But in all fairness the Minister has been too darn busy with \$300 millions in the administrative responsibility to even look at this particular book, this particular program, how it was developed, how it arrived here on our desks, who was involved in it and why.

He has made in my judgment no serious attempt to test societal response to it except to react to some criticism which come from a small segment of the society and in checking the records he will find those criticisms and the judgment was made. I'm not saying that the Minister hasn't got the right to change and exercise his prerogative as he sees fit — that's not the question. The question is, what is this government going to do about the policy? For two years now they've been telling us they're going to monitor situations; they are going to investigate it; they're going to review; they're going to re-organize. But this is a real problem which faces society, and the results of some 3 or 4 years' work is being just scrapped. And if the minister doesn't make an honest attempt to assess the validity of this approach, then I think he is doing a disservice to the people of Manitoba of all political persuasions; that I think it's incumbent upon the minister to advise this House just exactly how he's going to review this particular program.

I repeat, is he going to send this particular program to the various agencies that represent us in our society, the different organizations, the different institutions, to get their candid opinion and expression of whether this is a valid reliable instrument to be used in alleviating the problems of society? There is some reflection of the former government and the former administration as far

as philosophy is concerned — that is true — the philosophy in the sense that some of these problems that are in my generation — and I'm being 55 as of last week — all we can do is fight fires. But here's a new approach to it that we have to start trying down underneath to find out just exactly what is making people develop the way they are in this nuclear society.

And, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister, is he seriously considering having this project reviewed by instruments of society other than the Conservative Party?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre keeps referring to two years. I would remind him that it is not two years, it is not even a year and one-half; it was in fact on this past Saturday, exactly 17 months, and one-half year is a long time in government. I would remind him of when his government came in in 1969, it is not possible to achieve everything — to turn everything around if one wishes to turn it around — to redirect things that one wishes to redirect — to reshape the direction of the province in the way that a political party elected as a government has a right and a responsibility to do in consultation with the opposition and with the public's representatives in this Chamber, in 17 months.

Now, I want to disabuse him, and I don't like to do this because I respect the work that he did, but I want to disabuse him of any illusion he had that the Alcoholism Foundation and its policies and its programs and its approaches and its philosophy and its relation to alcohol agencies and its relation to the alcohol community, was held in high esteem by any great majority of the public. He may think it was, and he's entitled to think that, but I want to tell him that that is not the impression that our government had, when in opposition; and it's not the impression we had from that community after we were elected; and it is not the impression we have had in the 17 months we've been in office, when we've been responding collectively and responsibly to the complaints, the concerns, the worries of the alcohol community and during which time we have been reshaping out of that responsibility the Alcoholism Foundation and its direction.

We're not discussing it here, and I know you are going to call me to order, Mr. Chairman. We'll discuss it under the Alcoholism Foundation, but I just want to disabuse him of the fact that the Alcoholism Foundation's programs were acceptable to the vast majority of the alcohol community. Because that is not the story we got, and that is why we have changed the AFM.

The Chairman, the Managing Director, the top administration, the members of the board suspended building the pieces together. And we'll make more changes because the alcohol community was unhappy, divided, frustrated, and completely fragmented in large part by the things that the previous directorship of the AFM were doing. The minister previously in office may have had the impression that all was well but the minister currently in office has had quite the opposite impression. And where he had his responsibility to follow through in that period, I have my responsibility to follow through in this one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I had said earlier that we will discuss that particular point that the Minister raises as a supposed response to my question. I want the record to show that I asked the Minister a question, and he responds with his presentation that he just finished. He still hasn't answered the question that I asked, and I would like the record to show that; that when we get to the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba appropriation under these particular items, I will respond to his generalizations, some of which I will support. It may come strange to the Minister that, had there not been a change in government, that some reorganization possibly would have been followed through. But nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I don't want you to call me out of order, even if the Minister was out of order. We will address ourselves to those problems when we get there. But I just want to underline once again the tactics of the government. Because they went in a political campaign in this province, and that they said that they were going to free Manitoba from this oppressive government, who was going to dictate policies from Broadway.

And I would like the Minister to go through the records and find any evidence that this program evolved out of the former Minister's office. Because, Mr. Chairman, it will not be there. Now he may question the wisdom of the former board of directors or board of governors, rather, I think is the proper terminology — of the Alcoholism Foundation, and I know these people quite well. I certainly wouldn't stand in my place and criticize even the people that he selected as board of governors because these people are appointed by Order-in-Council, and they do reflect the Minister's view of who should be on that board, and doubtless with his colleagues he gets recommendations of how they can give geographical locations, or geographical considerations, through the people who sit on such boards.

But nevertheless, Mr. Chairman . . . I almost had the temptation to say that my colleague, the Member for Inkster . . . you know the road back and forth from Toronto. I said earlier, and I mean

it, that when the government changes hands in the next election, that this individual will not use it as a means of retaliation against people from the community who served the Province of Manitoba as they see it should be served. I think the former board of governors of the Alcoholism Foundation did an admirable job in the terms of reference that they were given by the former government, which we will deal with at that time when we're discussing that particular item. And I will defend the individuals that were on that particular board as far as their competence is concerned, or as far as their public interest is concerned.

But, Mr. Chairman, I just want to underline once again that the Minister refuses to answer questions in this House; that the Conservative Government is imposing their will from above when they see something they feel is not in keeping with their political philosophy. And that's what they're elected to do. But nevertheless, I think that they should be candid about it and come out and tell the people in the Province of Manitoba this isn't how they intend to have programs developed and implemented in our society to solve problems, that the people in the community will be asked to develop these programs in co-operation with the experts and the professionals and the technicians who are available to them; and when they come up with an approach which seems to be appropriate to the situation, that it will be followed through with the support of the government in the public interest of all; that when it perhaps steps on the wrong toes, that it will be monitored, suspended, or whatever term that the Minister is using at that particular time, which really in effect from our seventeen months . . . it's a cute debating technique which shouldn't go unnoticed. There was fourteen months, fifteen months, sixteen months, seventeen months, eighteen months, that the government has been in there. It's a year and a half. It's a long time. And all of the indicators, as I mentioned earlier, are increasing exponentially. And the Minister, he hasn't got any answers to these problems.

Because there's a fundamental difference between the members on that side and the members on this side. The members on this side see governments as an extension of ourselves. The members on that side, as is engraved in stone — or, no, I'm sorry — engraved in wood in the library in the Senate of this country, that the nobles have the responsibility to protect the state against the fickleness of the people. And that really sums up the philosophy of the Conservative Government; that they don't intend to be instruments in solving problems which no one in society can solve by themselves.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would give the Minister this last opportunity, and we'll have to pass this item. Can he assure this House that he will make an honest effort to give the people in our community a chance to have some input . . . and I'm not talking about the Member for Winnipeg Centre, I'm talking about the institutions in society who have some experience in this field: The churches, the schools, the teachers, the trustees, the Alcoholism Foundation per se with the former board and the present board, or whatever, the A.A. groups, anybody else that wants to have some input. Can the Minister give us such assurance at this time, before we pass this item, that he will make an honest attempt to get a true assessment of this particular program rather than just have a gut reaction to it and put it off into limbo by monitoring and suspending, or whatever term he uses?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, the arguments of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre are generally accurate and conscientious and sincere. But I suggest to you that when he makes the suggestion that this Minister refuses to answer questions, that the record will show that that debunks and deflates whatever other argument he tries to put across, because he cannot accuse me of refusing to co-operate and to answer questions and to try to explain to the best of my ability, limited as it may be, but to the best of my ability the questions and challenges that are being put to me.

I reject his suggestion that the question has not been answered. I commend him, Mr. Chairman, to Hansard, beginning at Page 1492 which was Thursday afternoon and he will find the answers to his questions.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to mention that the Federal Parliament has been dissolved and the election is called for May the 22nd. Mr. Chairman, for the record that in going back and reviewing the pages referred to by the Minister, we will find the same non-answers on that page as we do in all pages of Hansard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (g)—pass; (h)Community Psychiatric Services for Children: (1)Salaries — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, this is a new item appearing this year in the Estimates, at least it's in a new form. It seems to have been a spin-off from — not in last year which included far more. Last year it was part of a program that included forensic services and staff support to Winnipeg Psychiatric Institute and other Psychiatric Services, so apparently this is somewhat different. This is a much narrower portion dealing with Community Psychiatric Services for Children. So I'm going to try to confine myself to this very narrow one without impinging on the others. What I'd like the Minister then to tell us is this: It's my understanding that in this area, and I think last year he indicated there was a staff of 18 — that's the Community Services to children, dealing with psychiatric matters, and there was a staff of 18. Can the Minister tell us whether the same staff is in existence, whether it's been increased, what changes, if any, have taken place and are there any vacancies? Can the Minister answer that question?

MR. SHERMAN: There's one position less, Mr. Chairman. There was a complement of 18, one of which was vacant, and my information is that it had been vacant for some years. That position has now been eliminated and the complement is 17, but there are currently three vacancies that we are attempting to fill and will fill.

MR. MILLER: All right. So I take it the vacancies are — are they of a professional level or are they secretarial? I'm curious whether, in fact, the staff that you have — and I'm assuming because this is broken out as a separate item that this reflects the Minister's concern in this area, and his desire to focus attention on it, because of the way it's been broken out — so I'm wondering if I'm right in that assumption, if the Minister reports that there's a reduction from 18 to 17 I assume the one less is a vacancy of a professional person, a psychiatrist, and now that there are three more vacancies, are they professional people, or are they clerical or administrative?

MR. SHERMAN: That eliminated position, Mr. Chairman, was a Field Counsellor's position, not a psychiatrist. The three vacancies in existence at the present time include two vacant psychiatrist positions and one Field Counsellor. There are nine psychiatric positions in total in the component. Two of them are filled on a full-time basis, five of them are filled on a half-time basis, a sessional fee, and two are vacant. Now, we're searching diligently for psychiatrists to fill them. They're not easy positions to fill, as I think the honourable member knows, but that is not a rationalization of the situation. We are attempting to fill them.

MR. MILLER: Now, I wonder too whether the Minister could indicate — I believe last year he indicated, and I believe the Annual Report somehow indicated that there was going to be greater emphasis on the preventative aspect rather than the treatment — to what extent has there been any success in that area at all? Has there been any movement? You know, the fact that there's two less psychiatrists disturbs me because there's even less people to handle a difficult job than there was a year ago, and with the deletion of the Field Counsellor position, it makes it even more difficult. So I'm wondering to what extent did his statement last year that they're going to try to move towards a greater emphasis on treatment; in other words, getting at the problems earlier, because there are, as I recall, between 7,000 and 8,000 children who would fall into the category of requiring psychiatric care. And this is an area as I say, which I believe — I have to assume the government's zeroing in on because of the manner in which they're showing it in their Estimates. So I'd like the Minister to tell us why it's been highlighted and I'm hoping to hear that it has been highlighted because some very major thrusts are being planned or have been started because it's 17 months ago, as the Minister points out to us, and last year he indicated his concern in this area.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the primary focus of the program continues to be treatment and the treatment aspects, but in the past year there has been a shift and there is an increasing emphasis on the preventive aspect of the mental care of children. The 7 counsellors who are deployed to five different regions are basically concerned with and responsible for preventive treatment, and the preventive aspect of care.

We have recently completed a contractual arrangement with a psychiatrist for northern Manitoba, who lives in The Pas, flies his own aircraft, and will service Thompson and Flin Flon and I believe Lynn Lake, as well as The Pas, and hopefully other northern communities and part of his responsibility will be in the child psychiatric service field. There are four child psychiatrists involved in this program overall, and each mental health worker has two psychiatrists as supervisors, so we're looking at a program that does recognize the increasing importance and need for emphasis on preventive action in this field, and that is a shifting focus and a developing emphasis in the service.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister is now saying what he intends to, but according to the report what has been done in the past is that the emphasis has been mostly on treatment; I think the Minister is talking about what he hopes that it will achieve, the same as we had started the year before also.

Now, am I right in saying that this is mostly dealing with children in the rural areas, and that the Child Guidance Clinic is doing that work here in the city, or could you tell us what the staff is, the field staff in the city? Excuse me, before I sit down. Now, last year it was 18. Where did we find that last year, because this is a new sub-title and I don't know where that is?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: This was covered partly in psychiatric services last year, Mr. Chairman. We have broken this out under Community Health and Social Services under the new realignment so that this program and this function is now operating under this division of the department. There is still close relation with and liaison with Dr. Tavener, the Chief Provincial Psychiatrist and the Chief Administrator on the institutional side of the department. But, rather than being listed under Psychiatric Services related to Institutional Mental Health Services, we now show it on the Community Services and Public Health side of the department.

The other question that the honourable member raised had to do with the emphasis on the rural aspect of the program. Actually, there are two co-equal components to the program. One is rural and one is urban. In the urban program the services are operated in the metropolitan area through the Child Guidance Clinic and there is no differentiation or discrimination in terms of the department's approach to the need in this area as between urban and rural. The two programs co-exist.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister explained the reason, or tried to explain — not to my satisfaction I might say — the reason why this has been highlighted but last year under Psychiatric Services the explanation was exactly the same as we'll find on Page 51 on Psychiatric Services. So, what has been taken out? Unless this is emphasis on the child care because that has nothing to do with institution. On page 51 Psychiatric Services provides support service to community based mental health system. And then you add, it's exactly the same definition as last year. And my honourable friend says that is where the staff came from.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, essentially what we're looking at here is a support service and the component we're looking at is a component that provides support to the community based services. For example, we have the seven field counselors that we're talking about earlier, break down this way: One in Norman, one in Thompson, two in Interlake, two in Central and one in Eastman. And those are direct services. Those counselors are deployed to those regions to deliver direct services. But the component that we're looking at in terms of the listing, the way the service is presented under the Estimates is really the support service for the community workers and the community field delivery. I don't know whether that answers the honourable member's question.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I understand that, but Mr. Minister if you turn to Page 51, right at the top of the page (b) Psychiatric Services, provides support services to community based mental health system. And you say it isn't there. At one time, in 1977-78 I guess it was combined, the change seemed to be the line that we're dealing with now and doesn't seem like a division of community and institution, it seems more between adults and children. And then if this is the case, you say that's where the staff were last year and this year you have 17 and under the other, the one that I'm looking at, you had 18, you go to 15, so it's a reduction of 4 altogether but I still don't know exactly what the difference is because what you explained — the explanation for (b) is exactly the same — provides support services to community, not institution, community based mental health system.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would have to concede that probably the narrative is not as clearly spelled out as it should be. There does appear to be duplication in the print narrative for those two sections but what we have here in the component we're looking at is a —(Interjection)— yes, we have children and a situation where the psychiatrists go out and work with the counselors with the field counselors who are delivering the service at that level. Nothing has changed in that respect except that that particular component for delivering those psychiatric services for children is shown in a different part of the department.

MR. DESJARDINS: It is not a division between community and institutions. I'm sorry Mr. Chairman. It seems to be a division between adult and children and this is the children. You've divided the branch. There were 36 people and there's four less but you've divided equally between the children and this is mostly in the rural area and the support for staff because in the city it's mostly the Child Guidance Clinic. All right? So, there's no new policy in this field then, except try to switch more to prevention if possible.

MR. SHERMAN: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Meer for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if the Minister could give us some idea as to what status the proposed Health Sciences Centre Psychiatric Care Unit for juveniles has now attained. Last year, in order to clarify last year, if not the year before, it was indicated that there were moneys being allocated for capital works in this respect. I can't recollect the actual number of beds. I have an idea that it was somewhere in the area of 20 to 30 bed spaces in the Health Sciences Centre facility and there was an indication, if my memory is accurate, that the work was in the final planning stage and it was expected last year that development would be forthcoming very, very shortly. I'm wondering if the Minister could advise us whether or not that has come to fruition and what extent this has been realized.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Chairman, it hasn't come to fruition. It's tied very directly to the redevelopment plan of the Health Sciences Centre in total and has not been separated out for separate initiative or action. The new psychiatric facility at St. Boniface, which is admittedly an adult psychiatric facility, is being located in a building that will provide for some space additional to that which is being used under the current new facility designed there and it's my intention to move to have that space utilized for child psychiatric services and a junior psychiatric facility, just as quickly as possible. That will not preclude the necessity for something at the Health Sciences Centre, but it will help to reduce the pressure and moderate the challenge that faces us in that field at the present time, at least, temporarily. But the child psychiatric facility, extended bed facility, projected for the Health Sciences Centre, which is very much a part of the plans that are going through the process of finalization both by the Health Sciences Centre Board and the Health Services Commission, has not been moved ahead yet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Well, I don't wish to be argumentative, Mr. Chairman, but it is my recollection — and the Honourable Minister of course will correct me if I'm wrong — it was my recollection that this was a project that was put forward by the former government. As a matter of fact I'm sure that I can remember an early spring evening some two to three years ago, wherein I sat somewhere in that area watching these Estimate proceedings as they went forward in that particular year, and I remember members of the then opposition congratulating the former Minister of Health, the Member for St. Boniface, for taking initiatives with respect to the establishment of this much needed facility as they pointed out and indicated on that evening — at the Health Sciences Centre. And I remember there was desk thumping and there were at least two congratulatory speeches, I remember them very well, and I remember the Minister was modest and humble in his mien and accepted compliments. Now tragically, Mr. Chairman, some two years later we find that the status quo has not changed, that although the moneys were at one time mandated, they have not been expended — I don't know whether they were carried over or not, but they weren't expended — and this of course leads me to believe that there is still a tragic neglect within our system, that being a neglect of children who are very sadly lacking for the type of specialized rehabilitative care that they so badly need, that's so necessary to their future welfare and their maturation and

I can only say, Mr. Chairperson, that as the Minister knows because we have corresponded and discussed these matters previously, when I had the honour of chairing the Child Welfare Treatment Panel, this was a problem that presented itself on many occasions. Within the bounds of this province, there are — I was going to try and estimate a number — there are many children who demand this sort of service; their needs have been neglected for a long time, but I must say — and I hasten to add — that they were not to my knowledge so sorely neglected by the former government as they have by the present. It's my understanding that there were — and I stand to be corrected if the Minister and through the assistance of his staff wish to correct the record — but it's my understanding in speaking to people in the field of service, people who are involved with social service agencies dealing with you, that very few children — very very few indeed — have been sent out-of-province for specialized treatment during the tenure of this government. I'm aware that towards the latter years of the second term of our government, there were restraint measures being taken, and the number of children that were being withheld this sort of treatment option did increase, in other words there were fewer going outside the province for specialized treatment. But having said that, Mr. Chairman, I would hasten to add that it's my understanding that proportionately there were still more children — even in those latter years — still more children who were being provided with appropriate access to the services that are in question under this item.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in reviewing this particular matter, one need only to harken back to a case and instance that was, I think, very graphically brought before the House by the Member for Fort Rouge last month. During the Question Period, as I'm sure members present will remember, he asked whether it was the case that a certain boy with respect to whom it had been recommended that specialized treatment at the William Roper Hall Home, in Alberta, be provided, he asked whether or not it were true that this boy was being denied access to that very special treatment format — I should say, special but necessary treatment format — because nothing like it exists within the province of Manitoba today. And that was affirmed, Mr. Chairman, it was affirmed that it was indeed true, and one must only remember, Mr. Chairman, that that boy's case was not singular, that there are dozens if not scores of cases of that nature that occur in this province every year.

And as the Minister will appreciate, and I know that he has now been occupying his particular Chair sufficiently long, and has had sufficient tenure to now appreciate many of those children find their ways to most inappropriate settings. As alternative placements, some are sent to the Selkirk Home, and many of those children are sadly neglected proper therapy in that institution simply because that sort of therapy is not within the terms of reference of that hospital; and others sadly are sent to the Agassiz Centre for Youth, an institution that would be properly described as a training school — it's what we used to call a Reform School, but today the emphasis is indeed on therapy and rehabilitation of normal youths, youths who don't manifest or demonstrate any psychiatric disabilities, or aberrations, but rather have been involved in delinquent behaviour.

Now, I've stressed that many are sent there because I have spoken to staff members at the Agassiz Centre, and they indicate to me that these children, although they are in need of treatment, are most disruptive to the program established at their institution. It is not at all a satisfactory state, Mr. Chairman to ensconce a child who has a deep-seated psychiatric problem amongst other children who could be described, I suppose, more properly as having a delinquent orientation. The two simply don't mix, soil and water, and it only makes the job of the correction and treatment staff all the more difficult, if not impossible, in that sort of treatment milieu.

So having indicated that, knowing that children are going both to the Selkirk Hospital and to the Agassiz Centre, I would indicate to the Minister that I am personally moved to express great concern that he has not taken the initiative to fulfill not only the mandate of the former government, and one that was lauded by his then Opposition, but moved in order to fulfill his own obligation and commitment. Questions were asked respecting this matter last year. At that time we were told that things were at the final definitive stages, and that was done rather categorically. We were advised that the matter was at hand, and I don't think there was any strenuous debate. There was a presumption that the responses elicited were honourable, and were candid. Now we're told that there has been more restraint, there has been a need for cutbacks, that once again, something is under review.

I don't believe that that position is tenable. I think that the situation facing those particular children and their families is such as to demand immediate redress, and I can't for the life of me believe that, in a year where we can spend as much money as we have on highway development, that we couldn't have spent a little bit of it for a very real human need. I think that it only emphasizes the necessity that this government consider humanitarian causes on an equal footing with other demands. I know from experience that this is what you might call an inarticulate user group, those children not only fail to impact our system, they don't even know it exists. They are derelict and

they're completely without roots. They're frustrated generally, they've come to the point where they've not only frustrated their parents if they have them, but they've usually frustrated all the social agencies and committed people that have worked with them. They are realistically impossible to work with outside of a specialized milieu.

I don't understand why Alberta has had the William Roper Hull Home for, I think, at least a decade. I may be incorrect, but I think that William Roper has been active in Alberta for at least that time. Why many of the American states have private and public facilities of a similar nature. I don't understand why even Saskatchewan has something that approximates the Roper Hall format, and why in the face of all that, Manitoba, who has recognized the need, mandated the money, verified the principle, can't now move forward, take the initiative to redress the very obvious inequity.

I might say that I have spoken to people at the Health Sciences Centre, people whom I've known for some time, and they were under the impression, and I tell this to the Minister quite candidly and assertively, they were under the impression that you were proceeding. They were, to a very short time ago, under the impression that you were going to build that much-needed facility. Now, I'm not suggesting that you misrepresented anything more to them than you did to us, but I'm suggesting that not only they but all of us, including the public, were under that impression. And I suggest that it short shrift for you now to disclose that you have the matter under review and you're giving consideration to an optional sort of construction at another hospital. Plans, as you well know, were finalized. There is absolutely no room for equivocation. The plans with respect to the Health Sciences Centre facility were reviewed by the board and they were finalized. Everything was in a state of readiness to go.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister if he can advise us whether or not he will reconsider reviewing his government's decision, and whether or not he will advise this House, whether it is or is not his intention to press this matter within his Cabinet, and to his colleagues on the government side. I know, as I have indicated earlier, and I don't wish to be repetitive, but I know that there is support for this project. I know it, because I was here the evening when that Opposition side rallied to the support of this particular concept and work, when the Member for St. Boniface was still the Minister.

So I would ask whether he will rise now and do what I consider to be, frankly, the appropriate, ethical thing. And indicate for the record what he feels in terms of the necessity, and he's already done that, but re-state it. Repetition in this case will not be unworthy, and neither will it be considered to be mere redundancy. Will he re-state the principles that he's enunciated and cited before? And which are shared by many of his colleagues. And will he give us some commitment to this particular project?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will assure my honourable friend from Wellington that psychiatric services and psychiatric facilities and psychiatric needs are at the top of my personal priority list. I feel that that is an area in medicine and in health that represents a — certainly a major challenge area for us in Manitoba, perhaps crisis area is too strong a term to use. And I have taken some satisfaction in the fact that we have been able to move on some psychiatric fronts, both on an emergency basis at the Health Sciences Centre and in the capital project program for '79-80 at St. Boniface.

The Honourable Member for Wellington says that, with respect to the individual case that was raised in the House earlier, that it became known or became established that the individual youth referred to was not moved to Roper Hall in Calgary because we had not made plans to do that. At least that's what I interpreted his remarks as suggesting, and I want to assure him that that's not the case. We have attempted to have that youth placed in Roper Hall, we've attempted to have him placed in Devereaux in Massachusetts, there are six facilities of the kind that the honourable member has referred to, in which we have attempted to have him placed and he's been refused, unfortunately, at every one of them. We're still attempting to get him into Roper Hall.

The general question is one that I want to assure the Member for Wellington concerns me as much as it does him; admittedly the front on which we are moving at the moment has to do with adult psychiatry and psychiatric beds and equally important are children's psychiatric facilities and beds, and they remain a top priority for me. We have been limited, as the honourable member knows, in the number of projects of a capital nature that we have found it possible to initiate up to this point in time in our administration, and in meeting perceived needs in a number of areas it has not been possible to achieve all those objectives to which he subscribes and to which I subscribe, particularly in this field of psychiatric services.

One of the roadblocks in the way of the facilities at the Health Sciences Centre, is the final

determination of the staging of Health Sciences Centre redevelopment itself. And I want to tell my honourable friend that since I became minister, I have insisted that in the priority planning for the Health Sciences Centre — and he may regard this as interference, I have attempted to do it reasonably and not oppressively — I have insisted that one of those priorities right at the top, be psychiatric services, and particularly psychiatric services for children. There has not at all times been a complete consensus among those who are engaged in a consulting capacity to develop the redevelopment plan, among those at the Health Sciences Centre themselves, among the Health Services Commission personnel and my office, as to the precise order of priority priorities. But I want to reassure him that I will continue to insist that the priorities be so arranged that that need is met as quickly as possible.

I hope that before he has to upbraid me again in this area, that I will be able to demonstrate some initiatives being taken. At the very least, I feel absolutely confident that we will be able to move very quickly once the McEwen Residence is converted for the adult psychiatric facility that has been announced to incorporate a children's facility there in an available half floor or possibly a full floor, at least a half floor that is presently not spoken for.

The subject of out of province placements is one that has exercised Ministers of Health in this province before my time, and governments in this province before our government's time. There has been a reduction in out of province placements, ranging over the past several years, a very substantial reduction of out of province placements of emotionally disturbed children. One of the reasons has been the enormous cost of placing them out of province.

Another reason has been the unfortunate concern that has developed from time to time about particular wilderness camps and other facilities for mostly disturbed children that has come about as a consequence of one or two incidents that both he and I can recall that have received considerable publicity in the media, and that have raised questions about some facilities and that have perhaps discouraged some of us from relying too much on those facilities. The result has been that we have dealt with many of our severely emotionally disturbed children here through the child caring institutions with which the honourable member is fully familiar.

That's not to suggest that enough has been done. I will, for the record, and out of respect for his question, recommit myself to what I have said in the past and repeat, is a top priority for me.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, I thank the minister for his candor, also, affirmative of would tell him that I respect his recommitment and I am willing to accept that commitment at its face value. Of course, that's the purpose of this exercise, the Estimates review, is that we either do or don't accept responses on that basis and of course in each successive year, the test is, as they say, in the pudding. We are given the opportunity to be informed as to whether or not a person has in fact fulfilled their commitment.

Since the honourable minister has evinced a similar commitment to myself in this regard, and seems to have very similar thinking with respect to the conceptual aspects of this matter, I would ask whether he is aware, and I would hope that this is the case, that the position of child psychologists on the provincial treatment panel, has for some time been vacant, and if he is aware of that, I would ask him to advise whether or not, given his concern for the needs of children with psychiatric problems, I would ask whether or not he would moved to make an appointment? As he is aware, the individual is designated by way of professional standing capacity; the person has to be qualified as a child psychologist in order to have standing to be appointed to this particular position on the panel, and as he is well aware, virtually all children who are conferenced with a view towards specialized placement, that is to say out of province placement in a sophisticated psychological treatment milieu, would have to be paneled before this particular group in order to gain access to that particular treatment resource.

Now I am advised, I am informed, Mr. Chairman, that the panel in question has been operating at a rather diminished level of expectation for some time, as a result of the previous appointee having tendered his resignation I believe, some many months ago. I believe that he hasn't been incumbent in that position since May of 1978, May or June of 1978. So I would indicate that year almost having now past, that it would seem appropriate and necessary if we are going to attend to the needs of these particular children, that a person with this specialized background be appointed to this particular panel. The panel, as I said, stands at the focal point, between the social service agencies and out of province resources, and without the skilled personnel being there to do the necessary assessments, the panels existence is vitiated, it's essentially negated, and the result is obviously frustration for people who are attempting to move through the system into a more wholesome treatment environment.

Since I am on my feet, since we're talking about the treatment panel, I would also indicate to the minister that it is my information that there are other persons, designated persons, also not

presently seated on the panel. Unless there have been very recent appointments, it's my understanding that there are several vacancies on this panel, and given the fact that there are only in total seven members, and given the fact that five are of a specialized professional nature, with only two lay persons being on the board or panel, this is a very serious situation. I can't stress too much the seriousness of this predicament. I can't understand why it has been ongoing for such a length of time unless it is a concomitant result of the provincial restraint program.

I would also note that I read in the newspaper a report in the month of January of this year, indicating that the minister had the panel under advisement, that he was having, I think it was indicated he was paraphrasing to trying to paraphrase or precis what the minister said, that he had ongoing discussions in effect, with the Attorney-General and that they were in the process of considering the advisability of maintaining the panel format. And Mr. Chairman, I would indicate, in view of the fact that this is how children with special needs gain access to treatment, I would indicate that I am gravely concerned about the possibility that this will be replaced, unless, of course, I'm advised or will be advised by the minister that some alternative and similarly appropriate and effective format will be adopted by his government. But I would suggest that such is not likely the case, I can't imagine a more comprehensive format — I think the eclectic base of the treatment panel approach assures the best interests of the child being promoted, but I would suggest that most certainly it will not be effective in its deliberations and its recommendations will not be of sufficient merit or weight, if in fact, its purview is curtailed by lack of appropriate resource representation.

So, I would ask the minister whether he can advise if the positions that perhaps were vacant have now been filled or will be filled in the near future, and whether he and perhaps, the Attorney-General or the Cabinet have made a decision respecting the future of the panel format?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Honourable Member for Wellington about the need for the Child Treatment Panel, and essentially, the situation as he recounts it is accurate, but only up to a point in time. We have made some appointments to the Child Treatment Panel within the last month, and it is functioning and working at rather high speed at the moment. It's not up to strength, there aren't seven members on it, but there are five, which gives it a quorum plus an additional member. We are looking for an educationist to appoint, to represent that component. There has been a child psychologist appointed. Dr. Harold Penner, of course, a child psychiatrist and he's acting chairman, but there has been a child psychologist appointed, Mrs. Ellen Jones, who is the executive director of the Pregnancy Distress Centre and is a qualified child psychologist.

The delay came about from the fact, in large part, that as the honourable member knows, he's a member of the Bar, there is a considerable difference of opinion between the community services field, to which I belong by virtue of appointment, and the legal field, particularly the judiciary, as to the viability and indeed, the justification for a Child Treatment Panel. I suspect, well, I don't suspect, I know that the Honourable Member for Wellington feels that a Child Treatment Panel is very necessary, and I want to tell him that I share that view with him. Thus far, my view has prevailed and the amendments that are coming in to this session of the Legislature, to the Child Welfare Act, do maintain and continue the Child Treatment Panel in place. The whole subject, however, is under study by the Juvenile Justice Committee at the present time as he also knows, and no doubt, they will be bringing considered opinions to bear on the subject. But I believe, as I know he believes, that when one considers the opportunities and avenues that are available to adults who come in conflict with the law for remission of sentences, day parole, temporary absence, leave, compassionate leave, parole and probation, that it is only fair that juveniles have the same recourse to examination, review and indeed, remission of their sentences. And in my view, the fairest way to do it is through a Child Treatment Panel, so I intend to persist in that debate and I intend to — well, it would be arrogant to say, I intend to prevail in that debate, but I certainly will not go down easily.

MR. CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, I'm almost chagrined, I was going to use the word "pleased", but I would suggest that I'm chagrined that the member shares my views. I'm pleased to hear it, but again I'm concerned that there not only be a sharing, a meeting of minds conceptually, but that we extend our shared commitment beyond that, and into the field of practical reality. The minister advises us, Mr. Chairman, that he is wholeheartedly supportive of the principle and concept embodied in the panel review process. In the same breath, he advises that there are still two appointments unmade. You can't ride, and I say this with respect, Mr. Chairman, it's impossible to ride two horses simultaneously. One can't believe in the principle embodied in the panel and at the same time have the benefit of a partially constituted panel. I know, and the minister knows,

that one of the reasons those bodies aren't there, those very necessary bodies giving opportunity and access to all the members of the panel to share in specialized expertise, one of the reasons and the main reason, if not the only reason that they are not there, is that there is still in existence a provincial restraint program. That it's certainly not for lack of educators, I can't believe that has caused the problem — I know that the lack of a child psychologist wasn't for lack of qualified personnel within our province, there rre many, we are fortunate in that regard.

I would advise the honourable minister, Mr. Chairman, that he can't for much longer have it both ways, it's only a question of time. Myself, I would invoke any lawyer coming before that particular panel, who was dissatisfied perhaps with the current state of affairs, who quite justifiably felt that the panel should be constituted as is set out in legislation and not just be carrying its bare majority necessary for a /ke, quorum. I would invo and incite for that matter, any lawyer appearing on behalf of a client, a youthful client, to proceed to the court in order to get an appropriate order requiring the appointment of those individuals. I am sure that a court of competent jurisdiction would make such an order if such an application were brought, because I believe that it is well within the law, and it is established within the law that there must be designated appointments made to that particular board; that it is not proper or appropriate within the terms of reference of that particular legislation, the Child Welfare Act, to carry only a partial complement of appointees.

It's nice to hear the solicitous responses I have received and we have commiserated together, we have not only shared our experience this evening, but we've opened our hearts and shared our truest beliefs, but it's not enough.

Justice is very simple and with respect to matters such as this, it must be done. It's not enough that it be embraced conceptually, it has to be done. There are children being conferenced as my honourable friend indicates, at a very rapid rate by this partially constituted panel, but I would remind him that they are not being constituted by an appropriately constituted panel. If somebody is before that panel, who needs some specialized resource, for instance, in the field of educational guidance counselling, that resource will not be available. That child gets short-shrift. It's simply unfair, it's unjust. I can't, for the life of me, and perhaps one day if I have the opportunity to share the experience of those who have sat on the Treasury Benches I will understand, but for the life of me at this particular point in my career, I cannot understand how it is possible that such a very basic need can be overlooked.

It seems to me that the need simply cries out and yet we are told by a wholly supportive minister, that tomorrow perhaps, we have the matter under review, but how long does something have to be under review? You had the matter under review when you came into office, and that was the month of October in 1977. We're now in the spring of 1979. —(Interjection)— Well, do you suggest that the Juvenile Justice Committee — the minister suggests for the record, Mr. Chairman, that the Juvenile Justice Committee wasn't in place then, but darn it, Mr. Chairman, it doesn't take a Juvenile Justice Committee to say that a panel under the Child Welfare Act should be properly constituted. Why do we have to have a body of 11 experts tell the minister something that he can hear from the Director of Child Welfa and should re, hear from the Director of Child Welfare, if that person is fulfilling his mandated responsibilities, in the course of three or four or five minutes, within one, two or three months after taking office? Why , after all these months are we still looking for these appointments, and it's not a question of making a big thing out of a small one — making a mountain out of molehill — it's a question, I suppose, of looking at things in perspective, and seeing the true nature of what lies before us.

The truth is, that there wasn't a child psychologist on that Treatment Panel; that children who may have needed access to that particular professional were being denied it. The truth is that there was overcrowding at the Agassiz Centre last year, and the minister and I both know that one of the major reasons for that was not only because there was a heavy demand on the system last year, but because of the lack of facilities at the Health Sciences Centre. There are children who are being inappropriately vetted into the Agassiz Centre' and who are creating problems there. And if he wants some more specific data, he can contact the staff members there. It's well known throughout the community that they were having their problems. So' there's a very obvious and demonstrable inadequacy and deficiency that could have been rectified by simply proceeding to build the psychiatric facility at the Health Sciences Centre, as was earlier indicated would be the case; by making appropriate appointments to the Treatment Panel. But these were for some reason or other best known to the minister and his government neglected.

Now, again, Mr. Chairman, I would ask if the minister would be in a position now to give us some categorical information, whether he would be in a position this evening to advise us, for the record , and this time definitively, with finality, whether or not during his term as Health and Social Service Minister —(Interjection)— My honourable friend for Seven Oaks says, "Maybe by next year." And for my part I hope that this particular minister is still responsible for this department next

year. I shudder to think if any other minister were made responsible, quite frankly. But I would ask him whether or not he can give us some commitment, some advice as to whether or not he will make a concerted effort, not only as he has already indicated to update the situation relative to the Health Sciences Centre facility, but also to round out the appointments on the Treatment Panel in order that we not have people going to the courts and having to seek their justice in that very expensive way, but rather simply can rely on the law as assured by the minister and his government. I would ask him whether he will rise and give us that assurance this evening.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I, also, am quite concerned. I'm concerned because during the debate in the Estimates of 1977, I arose in my seat and I stated that we were way behind times and I announced that we had approved construction of 12 beds at the Health Sciences Centre and that was a first priority, that it certainly should have been done before. I am sure there are very weeks that I didn't remind my Chief Psychiatrist who was Chief Medical Consultant at that time, that definitely that was a commitment, that was something that was announced in the House and something must in place or at least started while we were debating the Estimates the following year in 1978.

I know that it was quite difficult at the time, they were talking about changes at the Health Sciences Centre. They looked at the old Grace Hospital but nevertheless this was something that was one of the first if not the first priority. Now the Minister, and I give him full credit for it, talked about the facilities at St. Boniface Hospital. Now St. Boniface is a facility for adults, it is not replacing these 12 beds at the Health Sciences Centre. It is not something new. I give full credit to this administration but it was something that was prepared, the ground work was done a few years ago. We asked the St. Boniface Hospital to work with the Manitoba Health Services Commission and as I said, I give full credit to the Minister.

Now he has a dream and I know he's sincere in that, but he has a dream that something will develop out there to serve the children also. And I know he's sincere but that should not replace those beds at the Health Sciences Centre and now we're in limbo. There's nothing. This was a priority a few years ago, it was a priority and I felt that I had support from the now Minister but nothing is being done. And I have deep concern, the Minister has said that I'll make this a personal commitment that something will be done but there's no definite time limit and I might say that the first time that the Minister said, "I make this a personal commitment", I felt that well I know him and that's good enough for me. But it isn't any more. I don't want a personal commitment, I want a commitment of the government because we're having restraint and last year and this year the Minister rose in his place many times and said, "This is a commitment and the quality of service will not go down", and he's still saying that it's not going down and we know that it has. So you know what kind of an argument, how can we debate anything. The facts are there when we bring any facts or any examples, they are ridiculed most of the time and the Minister keeps saying, "I would never allow that" and there is a freeze. There is a freeze, if that is a freeze with the construction of those beds and the freeze because of the freeze that exists at the Health Sciences Centre, I think that that that should be a priority. The Minister felt that he had a move on another program that we had stated and that's the lab facilities and why isn't something done in here? There so many people — you know you emphasize this year, you want to focus attention on care for children. You've got a special item here but nothing is done. I don't doubt one minute the sincerity of the Minister when he says that this should be a priority. I know, no doubt at all, but his personal commitment is not good enough.

He's representing the government when we are debating these Estimates and we must know and now it is the same thing, the same case of cost first and then needs and in this area, Mr. Chairman, I think that we all agree it seems that this is not an ideology difference between the two sides of the House and I suggest that this should be done immediately. And if not, well let the Minister and the government get up and say, "Fine I believe in this but because of restriction it's not going to be done because we do believe that cost comes first and there's not enough money and we'll see what happens in the future". But commitments although they're done most sincerely, if it's a commitment of one person it's not good enough because I think that when he goes to Cabinet he's turned down. It seems to be the case. And they are not listening and I think we are entitled, Mr. Chairman, to know today if something will be done and when. And then we will hold the Minister responsible for that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, let me ask my honourable friend from St. Boniface, and my honourable friend from Wellington, which of these projects they would have had me drop in Cabinet in the Estimates process in order to go ahead with the children's psychiatric facility at the Health Sciences Centre. Would they have had me drop the personal care home in Winnipegosis where residents have been waiting for some time for personal care beds; would they have had me drop the replacement of the hospital at Carman which is time expired beyond imagination. I won't go through the whole list but I think they get the point. Would they have had me turn my back on the Interlake and say, "No, we're not going to put a personal care home in there." You know a government does the best it can and we are doing the best we can in concert with what we believe is a primary responsibility and I am sure honourable members opposite are tired and sick to death of hearing it, but nonetheless it is imperative, our responsibility to insure that the excellent health care system that we have in place in Manitoba is not threatened by financial ruin, by public spending that goes to the extent and the extreme that we can't maintain in the future what we've got. We have an excellent system here in Manitoba whether we Manitobans care to admit it or not. And I give my honourable friend opposite full credit for the role he played in it. I give all Manitobans credit for the role that they have played in it and the role they continue to play by supporting it through taxation and through service.

You know you go to other provinces and other states in North America and they don't believe what we've got here in Manitoba. We don't believe it's great because we live here. I grew up in Calgary; I don't see anything to rave about with respect to the Rockies because I'm so used to them that I accept them but we have here in Manitoba a system that is without, well may have peers, but it's certainly without superiors on the North American continent. We don't have to apologize to anybody, all we have to do is to make sure that our one million people, only a percentage of whom are taxpayers, are able to support it and keep it in place. We have felt that that was an imperative for the people of Manitoba through the government elected in 1977 regardless of what government it was. If the NDP had been re-elected, if the Liberals had been elected, if Social Credit had been elected, we still in our group, our party, would have said the imperative to insure that Manitobans can keep and maintain what they've got; let's not threaten it by spending ourselves in a public way to the point where we have to pull back and this structure starts to collapse.

Within that imperative, within that mission as we see it, we are doing the best we can, year by year. Next year we will produce some more projects, some more initiatives in the capital building field.

This year in the effort to meet perceived needs in various areas of the province we chose as carefully and conscientiously as we could the list that we felt that the taxpayers could live with. The children's facility at the Health Sciences Centre, which I agree is highly desirable, was not among them, in part because of the factors I've mentioned. But in part, and I don't think this should be overlooked because that final developmental plan for the Health Sciences Centre in terms of staging and priorities has not ever been brought to total consensus, I will commit myself to the honourable member for Wellington to this extent, he's asked me for a commitment to fill the child treatment panel and initiate the children's psychiatric facility at the Health Sciences Centre — I will commit myself to this extent, that I will certainly fill the child treatment panel and we are actively looking for an educationist as a representative of that particular component. It's not that easy. You know the Honourable Member for Wellington says that someday when he's on the Treasury Bench he will enjoy the challenge of wrestling with these problems and he may handle them far better than the present Minister, but I want him to know and I think that my predecessor, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface would agree with me on this, that it's not always that easy to get people to accept appointments to these particular boards that can be very very busy, particularly people in the education field. I thought we had an excellent candidate for the that appointment but because of his particular position with the school where he teaches, after seemingly being assured he could do it and a long delay in waiting, it turned out to be negative and we've had to start all over again. But I will give my honourable friend that commitment with respect to the children's psychiatric facility at the Health Sciences Centre I will give him the commitment that that will remain in an priority area and that I will endeavour to have that redevelopment plan finalized in terms of staging and priorities this year so that we can start moving ahead on it. That is the first essential step.

We recently announced, in fact I think today or perhaps it was Friday, we announced another Capital project at the Health Sciences Centre, the completion of that steam line, that service line, which will make it possible and which was an absolutely, necessit prior necessity to future development which will make it possible for future redevelopment with the Cadham lab going in there, with the Cancer Treatment Centre being expanded and with the projected development that we all hope for on that campus at hand in the near future, there has to be proper support, an infrastructure, proper support in service lines and although it doesn't have much glamour' the

of that service line, that steam line, is absolutely necessary as a foundation for the building to come. That is now approved and going ahead, the Capital borrowing authority is approved for it and it's going ahead.

A materials handling building: I know my honourable friend will say, well the day that I can announce in this House or to the press that we're going ahead with a materials handling building at the Health Sciences Centre, my honourable friend for Wellington will say, what is Sherman doing building a materials handling building, we need a childrens' psychiatric facility. Sure, we need a childrens' psychiatric facility but we are not going to be able to do any of those things there until we have a materials handling building centre. That doesn't have much glamour it just happens to be absolutely essential' as essential as a basement is. So I give my honourable friend that commitment that I will get that priority list approved and that the psychiatric facility for children will remain in the top priority group.

As for the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, I can only say to him, that I guess I had to make the choice between adult and children's psychiatric facilities. I feel that there is a considerable pressure bordering on a crisis situation but I don't think one should bandy terms like crisis around, but I can't think of a better word at the moment, in psychiatry and in mental health and we had to move to meet that problem first. That doesn't say that the children's problem is not of co-equal importance, it's simply that I had to make a choice for 1979-80.

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

MR. DESJARDENS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm very pleased, I'm glad that the Minister challenged us by saying which program should I've have lifted instead of that. I think that now it's getting closer. You know what I don't like and why sometimes I'm a little rough on the Minister is that he is two different persons. In the House he will give credit for what is done; he's not criticizing what we've done, he agrees with us. Fine, we can go along if things were in the open the way they are in this House. But as soon as the Estimates are finished he'll go in the hall or call a press conference and say that these big bad NDP, this is what they've done. And he accused us, he made statements, again I heard him on the radio, that we were throwing money away and that's the part I want to be shown. Now, what kind of question is this? "Which one should I have chosen?" You know, it's just like the law or God or somebody would come down and say, "You're going to have thirteen projects, period, nothing else" and you have that kind of a choice.

If we're going to be honest in this debate, and if you want to say that Manitoba will not support more than that, and if you're going to be stuck with that fine then I'll be stuck with the other side, I think that it can do more. Just because your government decided there should be ten or twelve projects — and I know it is a diffi— cult job, I agree with it — but there are certain things that we would announce and I would say that this is an example, that in the long run you would save money. You'll save money? You're always talking about prevention and you should start with the children in this province. I'm ready to go in an election campaign to say that I wanted not to drop any programs, but to include a few more and name them, and I would name that one. —(Interjection)— but if you want to bring in the Federal field, Mr. Chairman, I'll tell you. You're not even spending the money that you're getting from the Federal government. I've asked you time and time again ever since you took it from last year, what you received from the Federal government. And you are saying that you haven't got the money? You received an increase of 14.5, or you will receive an increase of 14.5, just on the health side, and what are you spending? You're talking about an increase of 3 percent in some instances, some places 8.2 percent and other areas 6 percent. So you're not even spending that, Mr. Chairman.

So the point is, I think that you were a little more honest today, that you said, "All right. This is all that we feel that Manitoba can go". And it's a question of priority and in effect you're repeating cost first and needs last, and that's where we differ. We put the need first. And we'll find the money. And if it needs higher taxation for people that can afford it, we will do it. And lets fight an election on that, if that's the case. Let's argue like that. And that's responsible. —(Interjection)— No, we didn't fight an election on that, because in this House during the campaign, you said, "These people waste so much money, we will save that money and we will give you, if anything, better services. We will give you better services, there won't be any reduction in service." You wanted to build more personal care homesook at your material in the last campaign. , I You bui more personal care homes, and now you're saying that you can't do it. That you're only going to do some. You're going to build more than what I had announced in 1976. And now you're talking about priorities. So don't say you fought an election on that. You did not.

A MEMBER: He said an election was fought on restraint.

MR. DESJARDINS: The seven — yes. Yes. Restraint and we already had restraint in many areas. But what kind of a restraint? Even your own member in the Federal government, I read the letter here — not the Federal government, but Federal Member, he's worried — the people at St. Boniface Hospital are worried. The people at some personal care homes — copies that we get of letters they wrote, they're all worried. And they really feel a large portion of them, feel that you have — not you personally — but that the Conservative Party has misled them because you said there would be more. Is that a fact? Or am I wrong when I say that you promised more personal care homes? Right or wrong?

MR. SHERMAN: That's right, but you're asking us to do everything in seventeen months.

MR. DESJARDINS: I never asked you to do everything in seventeen months. You did nothing in seventeen months. You froze. And now you renounce something as if you were Moses coming down from the mountain. And you're saying to us — you said to us —(Interjection)— Sure you used the deficit, because you are taking money that rightfully belongs in the field of health, money from Ottawa, and you're paying your debts with that. That's why. Yes, you know that's a fact. You know that's a fact. What's that? No, I'm talking to the backbencher, he made a point but I . . .

A MEMBER: . . . to debts, big debts.

MR. DESJARDINS: You what? I don't get it.

A MEMBER: You say we're paying the debts, so you obviously admit that there's big debts . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, he said that you're paying the debts, but you're creating debts too. I agree. I don't think that the deficit is necessarily good, but I don't think it's a first priority, that first of all before you look at the needs of your people, you say, "We've got to make sure that this is paid, and we've got to remove the succession duties, and we've got to do this and do that". That's exactly where we're debating. But the Minister said repeatedly, mostly outside of the House, that we have thrown money in this department, and I'm still waiting. Last year, I asked him, and I want to know. Because I also feel that I did my best, and I want to know where you think I went wrong. —(Interjection)— You said . . . well, I misunderstood you. Because when you started this Estimate, you said, "I'm ready to debate with the Member for St. Boniface where he threw money away". That's the way I understood.

MR. SHERMAN: No, no, where that government threw money away.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh. So it's not in the field of health then.

MR. SHERMAN: It's now in the field of health.

MR. DESJARDINS: It's what?

MR. SHERMAN: It's now in the field of Health, Community Services and Corrections, yes, but I never . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Did we throw money away or didn't we? That's what I want to know — in the Department of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Absolutely, but I never . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could the remarks from the honourable gentlemen be directed to the Chair, just so we can get it all into Hansard? The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: I don't understand the last statement of the Minister. I was told last year, I tried to find out where all these horror stories were, and we had some in every department, where all this extra staff was hiding, where all this favouritism for NDP supporters were, and I was told no, that doesn't exist. And there's not one program that was panned that we said we have to get rid of the program, somewhere, maybe not the same priorities.

This year I was told that we threw money away, that we threw money away at people and certainly

the people were led to believe that, and then we go out, fine, these are all good things, but we can't have it now because you're paying for the mistakes of the former government. And that's what I want to know, where the mistakes were.

Now, I don't mind, and I will respect the Minister if he says, "Yes, I believe in certain things," not try to involve us in something that we didn't do, and if it's an honest difference, 10 you feel that at this time Manitoba can only support thirteen programs, and then you can ask me the question and say, "Well, which one should I have replaced this with?" Fine, and then I would argue no. We could go ahead, we could have gone ahead with the five year program. That might have been stretched to six years or seven years, but an announced program, planning . . .

MR. SHERMAN: Twenty?

MR. DESJARDINS: No, it wouldn't have been done in twenty. No way. And you took a lot of credit and you cut ribbons to some of the things that we did. And that wasn't twenty years. You went out and cut some ribbons and you were pretty pleased to do it. And you're pleased to have these facilities.

MR. SHERMAN: Over 20 years it would have been half a million dollars.

MR. DESJARDINS: So, what about your prevention that you were talking about? How much is that going to cost? How much is that going to cost? You're not doing anything about prevention, except paying lip service. Because there's two or three areas that we got into in this Estimate that you would save money, and that's not your priority now. So, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that the Minister — if he thought that that was a way to put us on the spot by saying: "which project should I have cancelled?" I don't want him to cancel any of the projects. It probably costs more money now because of the delay in some of the instances. And it might be that he might build just as much as we do in five or six years, but there's no planning. It's all hit and miss and it's pressure. The Minister said himself that it was pressure. Then he tried to correct himself. It is pressure. You are listening to pressure. You will change St. Boniface Hospital, and I would say — and I hope the other hospitals are listening to me — put pressure on him and you'll get it.

The Minister said today, it's common. That doesn't mean a thing. Six percent, we asked him to give six percent. If they can't do it, well then, we'll revise that. Well, what kind of leadership is that? If they hear you say that, who's going to try to stay in six percent? Who's going to try to stay in six percent if that was just an exercise, if it didn't mean anything. And what did you base yourself on to talk about six percent, the same thing as last year on 2.2 percent? That you could have started at zero to go to 8 or 9 or 10 or whatever they wanted, and you decide 2.2. Why? Well, we decided 2.2. No, that work has to be done before. Sure, there could be some final tying up of certain programs at this time, but a few days before the fiscal year starts and the Minister said, "Well, I haven't discussed that with them yet. I'll discuss that, and it might be there is no way that this is going to be done." That's not the way the message went to the hospitals. But you know, I'm getting out of order now. I'm discussing hospitals, we were talking about the principles and I think the Minister brought that up by talking about construction of personal care homes, and we're not talking about personal care homes at all.

So I say no. There is none of those that we didn't approve. Every single one of your programs were amongst those that I had announced, except one in St. Boniface Hospital. —(Interjection)— You just finished saying that if we wanted you to do something . . . Did we not follow . . .

MR. SHERMAN: Anybody can approve anything. Anybody can approve anything, and you approved a half a billion dollars worth.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, that's not true. That's not true, and I'm going to call you the same name as I did last week if you don't change it.

MR. SHERMAN: A half a million dollars over 20 years that's what those would have cost.

MR. DESJARDINS: Of construction? Of construction?

MR. SHERMAN: Of borrowing money at a cost . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: No way. No way. And it wasn't any 20 years, it was 5 years.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, sir, you tell me what 135 million dollars adds up to in 20 years And it was

something like 100 and something million dollars. It was something like . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. To make sure that we get everything on the record, if you would direct your remarks to the Chair and the answers to the Chair, it would be greatly appreciated. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I say that we made an announcement of five years — maybe that's the difference. Maybe my understanding of government and the understanding of my honourable friend are not the same. I'm finding out today that you only announce things when you're ready to build it, there's no long-range planning at all. You're not supposed to do any long-range planning because then you might not be in office. I suggest that you certainly have the right, it can be changed if there is a change of government. It has been changed. But I think it is the proper way of doing things. You let the people know, you spread these things around with the priorities going first, and you start in different areas, and you know exactly the amount that it could be in that year's dollar. And this is what was done. Many of the things were built, we were certainly up to schedule, we weren't behind schedule. I don't know of any area where we were behind schedule. And we build that now. You froze everything when you came in; it cost you money to do that, and then you build some of them. Thank you very much. That's pretty cheap, a quarter, you should give me a buck at least.

So, Mr. Chairman, I guess we're going to cancel the highway, because I got a quarter from the Minister of Highways, and the province won't be able to afford it, so I guess we'll cancel the highway. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that I've made my point. I don't doubt the sincerity of the Minister. I want to make that very clear. But I don't want to accept a personal commitment. The Minister is speaking for the government during the debate of his Estimates and I want a commitment from the government, because I believe that he probably tries, and he said that "I'm going to try again". But then he comes back and he mouths the directive he got from Cabinet, he said: "We can't do it". But from listening to him talk, I think he believes that it could be done. But the Cabinet didn't agree with him, so I want to know where the Cabinet is going. We have no guarantee that the Minister will not be in another portfolio next year. We don't know. And we have no guarantee that this is not going to be turned down by his CABINET, SO I would like to know if we can — and I'm not trying to put words in his mouth, and I'm not going to pressure him to invent anything, but I want to know if we have any commitment in this field from the government at this time. But I want to serve notice that we will remind him of that, of a commitment and we'll expect them to keep their commitment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1—pass; 2—pass. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Yes. Since the Minister has thrown the challenge in our faces and my honourable colleague from St. Boniface has had the opportunity to respond to the gauntlet, I feel motivated to rise in order to give a short summary, a synopsis of my feelings. He asked us, for those members who didn't have the benefit of the question, he asks us which projects we on this side would cancel and he, dramatically effecting his point, suggested I think four or five or six alternatives. And it is true that with respect to all these . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. First of all, I'll apologize to the honourable members for allowing the latitude that I have had extended. —(Interjection)— I felt that for the interests of the debate, that this latitude should be allowed. —(Interjection)— I find that it has got out of reach of my control, and I would extend to the honourable members that we must stick to the subject, and the subject is community psychiatric services for children. And I would remind the honourable members that that is the clause that we are now under discussion. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for those edifying remarks, but I assure you that it was my intention to discuss the challenge in the context of community psychiatric services for children. I'm sorry if my preamble was lengthy, but it was only a minute and it was far less lengthy than the remarks by the Honourable Minister.

Mr. Chairman, my remarks are going to be drawn in the context of that challenge, and it is my intention to discuss that challenge, not in the context that my learned friend proposed it. And he talked about personal care homes, as you have correctedly brought to the Assembly's attention . . . he spoke about personal care homes and hospital facilities. He spoke about everything except the item. He waffled with respect to suggesting alternatives with respect to this particular area of concern. I will attempt to draw it into that context and sharply define the argument. I would discuss it in the context of the Health Action Centre, a service which is providing community psychiatric

services for children in the inner core of the City of Winnipeg.

There are, I am advised, services being provided by that particular centre, that apparently involve psychiatric referral services and basic counselling services. Now, the reason I bring this to the attention of the House, Mr. Chairman, is because although I agree that it is very difficult to decide which priority should go forward when one is discussing the question in a helter-skelter manner and one is dealing with a host of different proposals, scanning and spanning the entire length and width and breadth of the province — I agree, it is very difficult to establish priorities one against the other in terms of what expenditures should be made in the future. I agree. And that is why we do, within the department, constant analysis and evaluation of needs.

But, Mr. Chairman, we also can effect the system in other manners. We're not just concerned about what the priorities should be or will be, but we're also concerned about how those priorities are defined in terms of cutbacks to the existing system that my honourable friend assures us is the finest in all of Canada. He assures us that he's travelled far and wide and that he's satisfied that this is one of the best health care delivery service systems in all of the western world. Well, that may well be true, Mr. Chairman, and I assure him if that is the case, they can't take credit for it. He should remember that the responsibility in terms of the fulfillment of the existing service standards and levels that have been put in place must be shared by successive governments, including the one that now sits in opposition in this House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm not going to attempt to advise the Minister what my priorities would be for the future. What I'm going to do is I'm going to talk about his question in terms of what the priorities of one of my constituents is in the here and now. And this is one of those rare occasions, Mr. Chairman, when I really wish the Minister was listening, because I think that if he's not interested in what I have to say, he should be apprised of what this particular lady has to say, because she's, I presume, of modest means. —(Interjection)— Perhaps I've now got the ear of the Minister. As I indicated, Mr. Chairaan, it's not my intention to force him to listen to what I have to say. I would prefer that he listen to what one of the citizens of this province has to say, albeit a citizen who happens to reside in my constituency, but in order to establish my *bona fides*, Mr. Chairman, I will draw your attention and I will table the letter, the document. This lady is under the misapprehension that I am a Conservative backbencher. She writes to me care of Mr. Brian Corrin, the Conservative Caucus Room, The Legislative Building. So, one has to presume, being so unfamiliar with my politics, that she has no bone to pick; that she's not one of my supporters; that she's not one of my party members. I don't know her. I'm not familiar with her by name. And I would indicate —(Interjection)— I think the Minister is about to become assaultive. He's decided to join me on this side. Perhaps it's to gain a better vantage point to hear the contents of the letter.

Mr. Chairman, I'm motivated to say that if this were the way things were to be — I thought that one of the purposes and one of the fringe benefits of winning an election was that you got to sit on that side of the House, and the purpose of that was so that you could administer to the affairs of the province and respond to questions presented by Opposition members, as opposed to conferring with them during the process.

"Dear Mr. Corrin:" — it's simply written, by the way, Mr. Chairman, but in its own way it is very articulate and it's sensitive to the nature of the problem it presents — "Through the news media I have heard that the present Conservative government has threatened to cut back funding the Citizen's Health Action Centre. As a concerned citizen I strongly feel that the Health Action Centre provides a valuable and essential health service to residents of the inner-city area. I am writing you to support the Health Action Centre. I believe that any cutback" . . . the word is delation — I think it means deletion . . . "of services provided by this community health centre would seriously affect the quality of health care received by residents. Please note my opposition to the threatened cutbacks. I would also like to mention that this is why we fought so hard to rebuild our church in that area. Please reconsider — when it comes to human need, there are never enough places. Yours sincerely."

As I said, Mr. Chairman, simply written, but in its own way extremely articulate. And apropos and sensitive to the circumstances. It's not a question of just establishing what priorities might be in the future and what sort of system we want to build. The question before us is not only that. Unfortunately, as the Member for St. Boniface has presented this evening so dramatically, it's a question of not only what hasn't been done, but what is being done to what was formerly in place, and what the Honourable Minister described as being one of the best systems in the western world.

Now it's unfair, it's simply unfair because there are people like this lady who are dependent on that system . . . who want to have some assurance that the system will not be trifled with . . . that their concerns will be considered and that there will be no trifling with that particular area of service.

So it's not just a question of saying "what will I do?" It's more apropos for the Minister to

say to us, and this is in the context of reality in terms of what his government has done, "which project will I have to cancel". Because that is the effect of restraint. It's not a question of bold new horizons. There has been little or no striving for those horizons. It's a question of continual, constant regression, and the regression is becoming apparent on the face of the record. It's not necessary for the Opposition any longer to be strident. There's no need at all. The people that I now say that you represent . . . the people who write to me as a member of your party, who write to me care of the Conservative Caucus Room . . . are motivated by the same concerns as we are. —(Interjection)— They are sensitive to these regressions, because they are feeling them. —(Interjection)— Because they are threatened.

So it's fine to say that we'll build a child psychiatric centre at the Health Sciences Centre next year, or we'll consider that and we'll put two more people on a panel here because we haven't done that for 17 months, but the reality is that you're hurting people. They're feeling the pinch. They're starting to holler — they're starting to beg for mercy. So I would suggest to the Minister that he not throw any more gauntlets. Rather than throw gauntlets, I would suggest to him respectfully that he pick up the one that he's thrown in the face of the people of this province.

And I would suggest to him that it's not time to deal with the past record. As the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has indicated, it's not time to talk about waste and mismanagement in 1975 and 1976. It's time to talk about what you're doing and where you're going. It's obvious what people think you're doing and what they think about where you're going. They think you're hurting the system they value. And I think that the evidence now manifest on the face of your record is that they're right. That you're not doing what you said; that you've misrepresented your intentions; that you have misrepresented your own mandate when you spoke in terms of building more personal care homes. In quantitative terms you may well have built some personal care homes. There may be some on the drawing boards. Qualitatively, they may be of a similar standard — if not equivalent they may even be superior to some of the ones that we built. But the truth is, in terms of human need, restraint is still taking a priority. You're not addressing the problems that present.

And need I remind you, and I will remind you again during the Budget Address, that building a child care centre at the Health Sciences Building, or maintaining a health action centre in the inner-core of Winnipeg, is not wasteful of public money. I know this is something that has been oft repeated in this assembly, but as long as there's breath in this body it will be continuously repeated. It is not wasteful of the public purse. It is merely an investment in the future of this province.

I am sufficiently aware of what, for instance, is now transpiring in the building trades to be able to tell you — and I'm speaking, Mr. Chairman, in the context of the remarks made by my honourable friend opposite relative to the deferral of the construction of the child centre at the Health Sciences Building . . . campus — I can tell you, Mr. Chairman, that there are serious deficiencies in terms of the equilibrium of that sector of our economy.

Although my honourable friends opposite would indicate that it is incumbent on the private sector to stimulate the necessary developments that will enhance the future of that particular sector, the truth is becoming woefully obvious. That sector — and they're saying it now . . . they're saying it publicly in their trade magazines . . . it's being talked about in our newspapers . . . the statistics relative to outmigration from this province by engineers and architects — are all substantiating the very very real situation that confronts that area of our economy.

MR. SHERMAN: What's that got to do with children's psychiatric services?

MR. CORRIN: I'm sorry, I didn't hear my honourable friend. But I would indicate that he will have an opportunity to rebut my premise if its fallacious. But I would indicate that people are leaving, that that particular sector of the economy is hurting, and that that you could do —(Interjection)— That is with respect to the item. We are talking about a cutback; we're talking about a program that was mandated by your government some seventeen months ago for construction. You now come in out of the hall and you indicate to us that I should stick to the item. We've been debating this item for two hours, and the truth of the matter is, this item has been before the people of Manitoba for twenty years. So, Mr. Chairman, I would indicate it did involve a lot of governments, and the last government attempted to redress it before it went out of office. The money was in the book. It was allocated; it was appropriated for that purpose. You took it out.

I would suggest that if you don't want to proceed with this sort of construction and this sort of capital intensive work for the purpose of bettering the human condition of those in our province, do it for the sake of our friends because I honestly can say that — our friends in the private sector — do it for our sake because we are hurting. We are dependent on those contracts. We being people who work in the drafting trades, we being people who work in the legal profession, we being people who work in plumbing, we who work in the electrical trades, we who are in the cement

finishing trades; we are hurting.

The numbers of architects, and I only stress this because I think it is one of our saddest comments. The number of architects that have left this province in the past year is absolutely atrocious, and it represents a real loss, a real loss of potential with respect to this province. I suggest to my honourable friend and now I am dealing very specifically with the item, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to my honourable friend that if he doesn't build that health psychiatric service centre for children in the near future, he is going to find that doctors who are involved in specializing in that area, are going to likewise go elsewhere.

I have had discussions, and I am sure he has had discussions with people in that profession who are now eliciting those sorts of responses, evincing those sorts of feelings, and the honourable minister knows full well that those people were not necessarily supportive or always favourable to our government. But I can assure him that their expectations are being dashed by his; they are being absolutely dashed. You can't work in an environment where that sort of service is not in place. You can't expect somebody to literally provide that sort of specialized service and treatment out of his back room. It's necessary that people be employed in support personnel service, that there be specialized psychiatric nurses assisting, in order that the professional can work.

Now I know that what I am talking about is creating an environment where people in the private professions can work, where psychiatric nurses can utilize their training, where doctors and psychologists who have specialized in the care of the psychiatrically disturbed children, can ply their profession. I am talking about all those things. Where plumbers can work, where draftsmen can work, where lawyers can work; I'm talking about a productive economy, the very base of our society. And I guess ultimately, I am talking about a mixed economy. And as my honourable friend knows, I don't know what the socialist Utopia is; I have never understood that and now I am being candid with him. I don't know what it is, but I have a vision of humanity, and I think that my honourable friend shares it and in that context I suppose I can only describe myself as being what I would hope someone else would describe as being a liberal humanitarian, not with a capital "L" but a small "l".

And in that context, Mr. Chairman, I would ask, what justification there can be for this inane senseless disproportionate allocation of public funds? It's crazy; it's crazy, and I say that with respect. I am not suggest that any member is crazy, I am just saying that it is irrational for us as members of the Legislative Assembly in the late 1970s, to think that we should build, we should put priorities to the construction of highways as we have, and it disturbs me. It disturbs me that I sat in that House while the Highways Estimates were under review and, Mr. Chairman, I will draw this in the context of the item, I sat in that House and I heard the minister say that it was his aspirations as minister, to increase the spending relative to highways in this province to the proportion it had formerly enjoyed in 1968. And he indicated that that was some 13.5 or 14 percent of the total global provincial budget, and that he was disappointed that it had fallen only to 8.5 percent at the time that his government had taken over, but he was going to do his best to revitalize that situation and rebuild it back to the 13.5, 14 percent.

Well, darn it, Mr. Chairman. I wish that this minister would say the same thing, that he would fight with the Minister of Highways to maintain the status quo. But that's not happening. Slowly but surely they are eroding the former system and they are undercutting this minister's honourable intentions. I appreciate he is under pressure. I think that it's fairly apparent and obvious. I appreciate that he is standing like an island in the midst of a vast sea. I appreciate that he is probably the member opposite that's best suited to handle this portfolio, but honourably there only seems to be one alternative. Either there is a serious attempt by the minister to make good on his promises, there is either a serious attempt by the minister to fulfill his promises and commitments to this House, or the minister, I think, in all conscience, should resign. And I am not suggesting that it should be this year, but I suggest that if we come back next year and the situation is the same, I suggest that in all conscience, he should present his resignation to the Cabinet in this House, and say that the job can't be done within the context of the realities of this restraint. It's irrational within the context of restraint, and these disproportionate appropriations, where highways are being given superseence over hospitals and children's care, and the rights of all sorts of underprivileged people, the rights of this lady who writes to me this very plaintive letter. Then I suggest that it's time for him to come to face with reality, come to grips with that; take a portfolio perhaps where there is room for expansion. Highways would be very appropriate.

But let us not deceive and misrepresent and mislead all the people of Manitoba by continuing to put on this good face, in continuing to mouth all these platitudes, which of course we all accept.

A MEMBER: Get to the point.

MR. CORRIN: It's not for me to make points. I don't normally respond to that sort of remark, but I would indicate it's not for me to make points. We discussed earlier our position. We were talking about The Lord's Prayer, and I thought it was very apropos that somebody indicated that it. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I have been paying very very close attention. We have swayed from the article that we're on. If the Lord's Prayer has any significance with psychiatric services at this point, I will stand. . . —(Interjection)— I don't think it's a matter of discussion to the honourable members, I am just ruling it out of order and let's get back to the subject under discussion.

MR. CORRIN: Well, I quite agree with you, Mr. Chairman. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Lord's Prayer has its place but it's not under discussion at this point. We are under item (h).

MR. CORRIN: I quite agree with you, Mr. Chairman. I would indicate that your. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Your point is well taken, Mr. Chairman. I would indicate that I myself have prayed on many occasions, and yet none of my prayers have been fulfilled or realized. We look forward to 1981. . . —(Interjection)— So in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the hour being late, I would ask the honourable minister to, in the upcoming months, to reconsider his commitments in the context of the realities. It's not good enough to tell us what he wants to do. It's now time to find out what is realistic and to confront that and consider whether or not he can fulfill his commitments within the context of his colleagues.

If the reinstatement of priority to highways, to 13.5 or 14 percent is a priority, and if that is a priority that he shared with his members, then it's no use him coming to us throwing down the gauntlet and asking; "What would you do? What would your priorities be if you had these five projects?" I am going to tell him right now, they wouldn't be those highways. I don't care if we lose some votes; it doesn't concern me. It wouldn't be those highways from my point of view. It would be the addition to the Health Sciences Centre. So now you know and I'm on the record. I would hope that you would share that sympathy and evince it by positive affirmative action in the next year. —(Interjection)— You've got no brains; I don't know about highways having no shoulders, but you've got few brains, my friend. Don't shake your head; it rattles.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, briefly, with reference to psychiatric care for children. I realize the hour is late and I don't need twenty minutes to say what I would like to say, but I would just like to put on the record the fact that the minister is now writing a horror story. He accused us of mismanagement, and here is a case of mismanagement. Earlier today I tried to wax philosophically about the symbolism in this Chamber and while I agreed with the Chair in bringing us to order, nevertheless the minister himself earlier was praying to God, because it didn't seem that he had the answers.

But in our education system, Mr. Chairman, with reference to psychiatric care for children, we build into our educational system such stories as a youngster sticking his finger in a hole in a dike before it became large enough to inundate Holland, we build into our society, you know, cliches: "A stitch in time saves nine", and here we have but one more manifestation of the mismanagement of this government, in that they are not going to save the taxpayers of Manitoba any money at all. They are locking themselves more and more inextricably into a system which will be more expensive, more inefficient. They tell a story that comes out of India about two people who were hauling corpses out of the Ganges, and one of the fellows left and the other chap says: "Where are you going?" He says: "I am going to find out who's throwing them in".

Now we had a manifestation here of the attitude of this government earlier today with reference to building the pieces together. As crude as this system may be, and I will be the first to admit that there were problems, nevertheless, it was an attempt by the prior administration to build into the system preventative programs, to deal with those people who are increasing exponentially within our society, who for some reason or other are unable to cope with their existence and become wards of the state. And I will support the minister, that when we get down to discussing specifics, that we can't be all things to all people, and we cannot provide a system for every individual case

as the prior administration was faced with a challenging problem of what we do with certain specific individual cases within a system which we tried to build, to take care of all Manitobans. There will be anomalies which we just can't provide. It's regrettable to say that we can't, but today we cannot.

But the government is completely turning its back on a philosophy that there is money to be saved in prevention, and this is but one more manifestation of the policy of this government. I wish my colleagues would stop using that word that starts with "r", because this is not a program to save taxpayers money. It is a deliberate program to implement conservative policy in the Province of Manitoba because they spoke about it prior to 1969, their attitude towards Medicare, public health, preventative programs, and here again is a matter of the Conservative Party implementing a system, not to build the pieces together, but to tear the pieces apart.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (h)—pass; (j) Dental Services: (1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I think there has been an agreement to adjourn this House at this time, Mr. Chairman, with the Minister anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

MR. CHERNIACK: That item did not pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't have agreement. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: In the first place, you said pass, and the Member for St. Boniface rose, so I think it's agreed that that item has not passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No it's not, it is under discussion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Right. I move the Committee rise, Mr. Chairman.

MR. JORGENSEN: Committee rise. Committee is adjourned.