

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, April 5, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery, where we have ten students from e Immanuel Christian School under the direction of Mr. Hoogerdijk. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Transcona. We also have 43 students of Grade 11 standing from Churchill High School under the direction of Mr. John Hatcher. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Attorney-General. On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

Before we proceed with the orders, I should like to read to the honourable members a letter I received this morning from the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of the state of Victoria in Australia. "Dear Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank you for the courtesy and hospitality extended to me during my recent stay in Winnipeg. Would you please also convey my appreciation to your parliamentary officers for the co-operation and assistance. Sincerely, Kenneth H. Wheeler, Speaker."

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I present the first report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments:

Your Committee met on Thursday, April 5, 1979, and considered the following Bills:

No. 4 — An Act to amend The Testators Family Maintenance Act,

No. 5 — An Act to amend the The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act,

No. 8 — An Act to amend The Mental Health Act,

No. 9 — An Act to amend The Crown Lands Act and The Real Property Act,

No. 11 — An Act to amend The Provincial Judges Act,

No. 12 — An Act to amend The Corporations Act,

No. 21 — An Act to amend

And has agreed to report the same without amendment. The Real Property Act (2).

Your Committee also considered Bill:

No. 15 — An Act to amend The Garnishment Act, and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to give the First Minister an opportunity to acquaint us on his reaction to the report of the Task Force on Human Needs and Restraint

of which a formidable list of members made the report, and the specific recommendation that they made, the first one, which calls on the government to issue a policy statement showing how it intends to deal with the effects of inflation and its own restraint objectives?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the committee who produced the report, met recently with the Minister of Health, and possibly other members of the front bench. The report has been received and the report will be considered by the Treasury Bench in due course. I have no further comment on the report, not having been present at that meeting, but perhaps the Minister of Health, when he arrives, will give us further elucidation on any of the items that my honourable friend seems concerned about.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the First Minister has apparently not had an opportunity to look in detail at the recommendations, so I would ask him, and it follows from the first recommendation, whether or not the government has for itself formulated, and is prepared to make public, those economic indicators which it considers will influence a relaxation of their restraint program? In other words, what should unemployment be; what should the inflation factor be; what percentage contribution should there be from the private sector to support the government's decision to relax its restraint measures?

MR. LYON: Well, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend will be well aware that it is not the policy of this government that we can, in any way mandate in Manitoba, what the inflation factor is going to be, because that, realistically, is not within our competence, nor is it something that we have much control over in the Canadian context. —(Interjection)—

Equally, Mr. Speaker, the whole question of restraint or physical responsibility, which is being carried on for my honourable friend's edification in one form or another by all jurisdictions in Canada, including the federal government — coming into the picture far too late, by the way — is something that, according to everything that I read, all reasonable economists in this country are saying should have been done years ago. That being the case, the government of Manitoba will take into account the recommendations made by this one particular group, an interest group of course, which has a certain predictable outlook on certain policies or certain aspects of one responsibility, of the many that government has to carry on, and we'll consider them seriously.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Minister, in view of the fact that he has now opened up the door to an indication of the special interest groups of these people who have formed the Task Force, and of course they are people in the social welfare field, whom he may look down on as being social engineers.

Would he be prepared to review the question I asked and his response which did not deal with my question, which was specifically, what should the economic indicators be that will change his government's approach? I didn't say he can control inflation although he claimed that the previous government should have. I'm saying, what should the inflation factor be which will justify a relaxation of restraint, especially in the welfare fields where the poor are the ones who are being hurt? What should unemployment be in order to satisfy him that we're on the right road? These are the questions I'm asking so that we can understand what it is the government is thinking other than the blanket approach it has taken up to now, of just cutting back on all social programs.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, to correct my honourable friend from what he would have meant as an obvious misstatement, the Government of Manitoba is not cutting back on all social welfare programs at all; in fact, the Government of Manitoba in the last two years has been increasing the amounts that have been given to social programs in Manitoba. What my honourable friend is perhaps complaining about is that that increase is not as large as he would like to see it.

What my honourable friend is also conveniently overlooking is that having regard to the size of the deficit that we inherited from my honourable friend and his colleagues, having regard to the fact that the taxation level in Manitoba was totally uncompetitive when we assumed office and we had to do something about it, having regard to the fact that the economy according to the Conference Board had been in a state of recession under my honourable friend's government for the three years prior to our government coming into office; all of these major considerations impinged upon any responsible government and the program that it had to implement in the public interest, and in the interest particularly of the poor against whom inflation is the worst weapon, or the worst enemy that they can possibly have.

So while the Question Period, Mr. Speaker, is not the occasion to engage in that kind of

debate that my honourable friend would obviously like to engage in, I invite him to participate in that debate when we return, as I expect we shall this afternoon, to the Estimates of the Department of Health.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, now that I gave the Minister the recognized opportunity to repeat what he has been saying for some time, and which helped him win an election, is he prepared to tell us what are the indicators that this government is looking for to release the restraint that it has on especially, the social programs of the poor wherein the increases in budget in his last two years have not kept up with inflation itself, for which he has now dropped and sloughed off all responsibility, and is he prepared to tell us now what they intend to do to improve the lot of the poor rather than reduction of taxes on the rich, which is the policy of his government? Is he prepared to tell us and to tell the people of Manitoba, what are the indicators — social, economic, or political, if necessary — which will. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please, order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for St. Johns that his question is repetitive? The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: I do appreciate your pointing out to me that the question is repetitive. I wish you would have pointed out to the Honourable the First Minister that he has failed to answer any one of the questions. But we know he is not bound to; we know that he can take this opportunity to make his regular speech. I thought I'd give him one more opportunity to answer the question, and now I will just make it in a general way where he can give his usual general reply. Is he prepared to accept the recommendation to provide us with a comprehensive plan for restraint, which would indicate the specific criteria to be used for assessment of the value of program for people served. Now, this is the recommendation, and I'm asking him, is he prepared to give that to us and when?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend reads one recommendation from one report from one recognized interest group in Manitoba — we are going to be looking at all of those recommendations, and I dare say that if he will follow carefully, when he listens to the Budget, and to other policy statements that are made by the government, and if he has listened carefully in the past, he will have no difficulty at all in understanding what the role of the government is with respect to trying to regularize and to bring-back to a state of sanity, the economy of of Manitoba after the state of dereliction in which it was left by my honourable friends opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister responsible for Crown Corporations. Since, in August of 1977 in the General Manual of Administration for membership fees in government departments and agencies specifies that there will be no membership fees paid for any social, recreational or fraternal organization, benevolent, charitable, or political association, on the part of those departments or agencies, could the Minister indicate to the House whether or not the Manitoba Club does not fit under the category of being a social club or fraternal organization?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MPIC.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, again there is obviously something very decision disturbing to him about the action of MPIC, and the Board's to use this kind of public relations. However, Mr. Speaker, he now introduces a regulation which he alleges impacts upon the decision of the Board, certainly I'll accept his question as notice. We'll examine that, and if there is some conflict between the regulation which he quotes and the action of the MPIC Board in this manner, we will certainly examine it.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister indicate whether at any time prior to the payment of the membership fees in either the Manitoba Club or in the Carlton Club, there was any consultation or advice sought from the Provincial Auditor insofar as the payment of these fees to those organizations?

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will also accept that question as notice. I would not be able,

naturally, be able to respond immediately to the question which the Leader of the Opposition places. It relates to his earlier question; I'll accept that as notice.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, as well, could the Minister advise and accept as notice whether or not the Attorney-General or the Attorney-General's department was consulted as to whether or not the payment of such membership fees were not, by the MPIC, was in violation of the General Manual of Administration pertaining to payment of membership fees by departments and agencies? .

MR. MCGILL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the additional request of the Leader of the Opposition in respect to the department of the Attorney-General, we will accept as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. ADAM (Ste. Rose): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister of Agriculture in light of his reply yesterday to my question in regard to the closing of the Glenella Creamery. In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the last four inspection reports of the plant show the performance at good or better, and that the computer printouts show the plant performance at above the provincial and Canada averages, that is, 80.2 percent for Glenella, 78.4 for the province, 78.5 for Canada. Could the Minister explain why a license is being upheld?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, in discussing the license of the butter maker in Glenella, I have been informed that he has been operating on a temporary license for the last two to three years is not a new situation — to use a two or three-month improvement would not tell the total story. However, I think it has been indicated that licensing of the individual could be reconsidered as a helper in the making business, if the company involved were to butterengage a new butter maker- I said yesterday, I believe the creamery are still licensed as a delivery point for cream, and that if they were to either employ a new butter-maker who is fully licensed, or the individual could be reconsidered but I think at this point the department are concerned about the health standards and have acted accordingly.

MR. ADAM: A supplementary to the Minister. In view of the fact that the outstanding problems remaining at the plant, in spite of the fact it is above average in the province and Canada, the performance is above average, and in view of the fact that the few remaining problems existing at the plant have been rectified since the last inspection, would the Minister be prepared to intercede personally on behalf of this butter-maker so that creamery can continue to process butter for approximately 50 or 60 farmers in the Glenella area?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, I am very concerned about the operation of the Glenella butter creamery. I'm sure that I would like to see it operate to fulfill the needs of the farmers in the district.

I think we also have to be concerned about the health standards which are being carried out, and I'm sure that I will give it serious consideration. I don't feel that it is my responsibility to get totally involved. There are standards. It is a procedure that is being carried out, and I think that if the individual involved were to further indicate his willingness to carry on in a manner which is satisfactory to the inspectors, then it could be reconsidered.

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

MR. ADAM: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister then advise what should take place at this point in time? What should the butter -maker do, or should the plant, the local board, get in touch with the Minister, or how should this proceed from here on in?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think not only the management of the company involved, but the Board of Directors of that same company, are very much involved, and they know the procedures that have to be followed.

MR. ENNS: In the meantime, keep on churning.

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

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on the same question. Could the Minister tell the House, Mr. Speaker, on what basis the licence was denied, or cancelled, or revoked, since the creamery in question did meet the standards in the last two tests that were done, or the two investigations that were carried out, resulted in the fact that the creamery complied with the Provincial Health Regulations. On the basis of that, how can they then proceed to revoke the licence, or refuse to renew?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I again can inform the members that I, as the Minister, do not intend to get involved. I'm sure there are regulations that are in place that have to be lived up to, and if is some irregularity in the carrying out of the responsibility of the department, then I will investigate it and act accordingly.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister confirm that the last two investigations did result, in the determination of the fact that the plant was complying with the Health Regulations? The last two tests that were done were positive, in favour of the plant.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of one of them; one of the tests did indicate an increase an improvement in some of the problems that were there. However, there was a reduction in that improvement in the final test, I believe the information that I have provided to me.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Did the final test confirm that the plant was within the Health Regulations, or was the plant in the final test again in violation of those regulations?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I'm sure that the department and the people who have been involved in this have been in discussion with management, and if there are any irregularities, I will certainly check into it. I'm aware of the fact that there has been some improvement, but this has not been a short period of time that we've had problems with it, that it has been over the period of one or two years.

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

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister indicated that the secondlast test proved in favour of the plant. I asked him whether the last one also proved in favour of the plant. That's all I want to know — whether the last test was in favour of the plant continuing its operations.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I will recheck the situation that the member has brought forward and see if the last one was, in fact, above the standards that are set.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the n Minister of Health and Community Services. I wonder if the Minister could indicate that, since after a year and a half of study and planning and burning the midnight oil, his plans for a redesigned correctional institute at The Pas was rejected by Cabinet, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether his proposals to renovate another building to replace the proposed court house, whether his plans to do that have also been rejected by Cabinet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (FORT GARRY): Mr. Speaker, without accepting the primary contention contained in the honourable member's question, I would suggest he refer that question to the Acting Minister of Government Services, my colleague, the Minister responsible for Housing.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, to the Acting Minister of Government Services, I wonder if the Acting Minister could then confirm that the proposal that the Minister indicated to the Town of The Pas, and to us in the Legislature that received approval in principle, whether or not in fact this proposal has been rejected, and the Minister and the Minister of Government Services, and the Minister of Corrections are now back at Square One, and have to start over again, in preparing a plan for the construction of a new correctional facility at The Pas?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Acting Minister of Government Services.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I don't have to confirm what the Minister of Health said. He said that it's right, we have said in principle it will be built. Mr. Speaker, there is no total rejection of anything. There was not a complete approval of something; that's really what happened, and it's being looked at and when we have the answers, we will be announcing them to the House.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, since the Minister's colleague who just answered has been promising an answer at the end of last month for a year and a half now, I wonder if the Acting Minister of Government Services could indicate whether or not the plans to renovate a building for use of a court house to replace the already contracted court house, whether or not that will be proceeded with? And secondly, whether or not the Minister's other plans for new juvenile facilities, will be proceeded with or not?

MR. JOHNSTON: When all of those things are decided, Mr. Speaker, they will be announced to the House.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder, since the decision has been taken a year and a half and now has been stopped and gone back to Square One, I wonder if the Minister could give us some clue, some idea by which date this government will finally make a decision on the correctional facility at The Pas?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it's awfully hard to answer questions when somebody gets up and says it's gone back to Square One, which is strictly an assumption putting words in people's mouths. He has been told three or four occasions, he will receive an answer when the decision is made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Acting Minister of Government Services, and ask him what value there is in asking the town for a two month extension on a permit for the trailers, if it will take approximately two years from now before you design the plans and tender the contract? What value is there in that?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we have another assumption that it's two years. The members will have it when it's announced.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the government is considering splitting the court house and the jail components —Interjection)— well, this has been indicated by the Minister of Health — ince the government is considering splitting these two areas and will not then access a common core of services for heating, etc., does the government have any estimates on the cost of so doing?

MR. JOHNSTON: The member is quite right when he said, considering, and that is exactly where we are. It will be announced when we have an announcement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know whether, in view of all this activity on the part of the government, which is difficult to discern, has the department or the Minister retained a new architectural and engineering consultant, or are they discussing with the former architectural and engineering consultants, the re-design or new design of The Pas Correctional Jail and Court House?

MR. JOHNSTON: We are working on it, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would then direct a question to the Premier. Could he appoint somebody as an Acting Minister who could provide us with some information?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, from all of the time that my honourable friend was occupying the Department of Public Works, we had not even an Acting Minister; we had an incompetent

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Highways in his capacity as Minister responsible for airstrips in the north. In respect to the Norway House airstrip, which is under the jurisdiction of his department, I wonder if the Minister can confirm that it is correct that his department is considering changing the designation of that airstrip which will effectively reduce the licenced length of the airstrip, and I wonder if the Minister can also confirm that if his department goes ahead with these plans, that this will seriously reduce the quality of air service to this community?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm any of the suggestions made by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, but I am certainly prepared to take them as notice and bring the honourable member an answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Tourism. Will the Minister confirm that she is meeting with representatives of the Festival du Voyageur this afternoon?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism. **HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia):** Yes, Mr. Speaker, we had a meeting with them this afternoon before the House went into Session.

MR. HANUSCHAK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister done a cost benefit study which she could apply in devising a funding formula to assist the Festival du Voyageur and other similar organizations?

MRS. PRICE: Not at this point, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: Is the Minister in a position now to give those interested in the future of the Festival du Voyageur some glimmer of hope as to what course of action the Minister proposes to take?

MRS. PRICE: Mr. Speaker, the members that were there from the Festival du Voyageur today are sending us some figures which they didn't have available before the meeting today and at that time I will take it to my Cabinet members and it will be discussed at great length there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to address my question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Can the Minister indicate whether in his speech to the law students of the University of Manitoba, he was correctly quoted as being in favour of a low minimum wage?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, if that interpretation was put on anything I said yesterday or said today or ever said, it's absolutely incorrect. **MR. FOX:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Was the Minister correctly quoted

when he said, "if the minimum wage was lower, business could hire all kinds of students who are really doing nothing"?

MR. MacMASTER: I never made those type of remarks, Mr. Speaker. variety of questions were posed to me about why people want higher A minimum wages, why certain segments of society insist on lower, and I was in a debate trying to explain to the students there the reasoning that certain segments of society require, or wish to have higher or lower minimum wages. It just a answer-question period back and forth, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FOX: This isn't a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If you wish to call it that, you're entitled to that, but I don't call it a supplementary. In view of the fact that the Minister of Labour indicated in that discourse or debate that the minimum wage was not enough to support a family, can he inform this House what the people who are family people on a minimum wage should do in respect to their families; should they abandon them, should they go on welfare, or what should they do?

MR. MacMASTER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I remember your words well yesterday that we shouldn't be debating here and discussing it. I simply said to them that minimum wages were established in this country as a base. A base which people could not hire for less than. And I said I appreciate the fact that right across this country, regardless of what minimum wage is a base in any part of our country, it would be extremely difficult for a person with a family if that was their sole income, working at the minimum wage, to raise those particular children. I say this today and it's regardless of any minimum wage that's established in our country or neighbouring countries.

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

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister indicate what those people should be doing? That was the gist of my question. Those who are family people on minimum wage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do believe there's a supplementary to the question posed by the Member for Kildonan, that I would like to address a question to the First Minister. If in fact the minimum wage in Manitoba is not to be one which is livable, but is in fact to be one among the lowest in Canada, what policy is this government intending to undertake in order to ensure that all Manitobans working, wishing to raise families, will in fact enjoy a decent standard of living, if in fact the minimum wage is not to be a livable one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I would want to be sure that I heard my honourable friend aright, namely that he is suggesting that it has ever been the formulated policy of any government in Canada that the minimum wage was meant to be a living wage for a head of a household raising a family, is that the question that he is putting? Seriously?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Honourable First Minister knows very well that the impact now in Manitoba of our very low minimum wage is such that it is not livable. Not livable for those that are the recipients of same. I'm wanting to know what policy he, as head of his government, has in respect to ensuring that those on low minimum wage will not be forced onto the welfare rolls, that it would not be to their advantage to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend makes reference to the fact that the minimum wage in Manitoba is among the lowest, I think. If he had had benefit of listening to some remarks that were made the other evening about the comparative minimum wages in Canada, he would find that if the minimum wage in Manitoba were 5 cents higher, it would in fact be amongst the third highest in Canada. So, you know, my honourable friend can make great distinctions out of 5 cents with respect to a minimum wage which he and colleagues, Mr. Speaker, did not see fit to raise from September 1, 1976 until October of 1977. But the minimum wage, as the Minister of Labour has indicated on a number of occasions, is receiving consideration. I merely point out for my honourable friend's edification that if it were 5 cents higher, it would be, my recollection is, among the group that are the third highest in Canada, at \$3.00, where the richest province in Canada is, in Ontario.

I put to my honourable friend the question, if this government or any government were to raise the minimum wage by 5 cents and thereby raise it from the fourth lowest to the third highest, would

he be satisfied? I don't think he would, and I don't think too many other people might necessarily be too satisfied. But the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, — my recollection is Quebec, that that is the difference between the highest Saskatchewan, the second highest at \$3.25, and then the rest all in around \$3.00 and Manitoba \$2.95.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the minimum wage was adjusted each and every year 1970 right through to 1976, adjusted in order to ensure compliance with the increase in the consumer price index, and in view of the fact, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that since the last time that the minimum wage was adjusted in this province the consumer price index has increased by some 22 percent. And during most of that period of time, this government has deemed fit not to do anything but to sit on their hands, I believe it is now time, Mr. Speaker, that we receive some assurance, some assurance from the First Minister that concrete and definitive steps be undertaken in order to ensure that there is an adjustment in order to avoid and this, Mr. Speaker, is the reference to an earlier — question which was left unanswered in order to ensure that those on minimum wage are left with no alternative but to join the welfare rolls of the province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that he ask his question now? The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I think somewhere in the prologue to the monologue that we just heard, I discerned a question. I think my honourable friend was asking for an assurance. And without accepting, Mr. Speaker, without accepting in any way the — I hear a certain baying from across the way, Mr. Speaker — without accepting in any way the premises which my honourable friend, I suggest, should perhaps re-examine, because he is an intelligent person — without accepting his premises at all, I repeat the assurance that the Minister of Labour has given to the House on a number of occasions, that the question of the minimum wage in Manitoba in relation to the one item that he has mentioned, the cost of living and in relation to the minimum wage — in relation to all other provinces in Canada, in relation to the state of the economy in Manitoba is being considered, a — and when an announcement or when a decision has been made with respect to it, it will be announced.

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS (Brandon East): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister responsible for Tourism in Manitoba, and ask the Honourable Minister whether she or her department are now actively working with the new owners of the Lord Selkirk to assist in the promotion of the use of that particular tourist attraction in the forthcoming tourist season.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MRS. PRICE: I'm working with everybody that is connected with encouraging people to come into Manitoba, but they haven't come in on any specific plan that they would like us to participate in.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Yes, well a further question, then, Mr. Speaker, could the Honourable Minister advise whether the new owners have approached herself as Minister of Tourism, or the Government of Manitoba, for any interest-free loans or any financial assistance whatsoever to assist in the operation of that facility this summer?

MRS. PRICE: No, Mr. Speaker, they haven't approached us for any loans of any description.

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

MR. EVANS: Yes, I'd like to ask a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Economic Development, supplementary to the question to the Minister of Tourism, and ask the Honourable Minister of Economic Development whether he has been approached, or his department has been approached, by the owners and operators of the Lord Selkirk with respect to some financial assistance for the operation of that business in the Province of Manitoba, either under some new program that the Honourable Minister has referred to previously, or under some prior

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have not been approached by anybody from the Lord Selkirk. I'm not aware of anybody in my department that has been approached. If anybody in my department has been approached, I can say to them right now, there is nothing at the present time in our department to assist the Lord Selkirk.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour for questioning having expired, we will proceed with orders of the day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Address for papers — the Honourable Member for Churchill.

ADDRESS FOR PAPERS NO. 1 — AIR POLLUTION

MR. JAY COWAN (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Logan, that an Address for Papers do issue for return of the following information regarding Northwest Smelting and Refining Limited, 2185 Logan Avenue, Varta Batteries Limited, 1717 Wellington Avenue, ESB Canada Limited, 1800 Sargent Avenue, Canadian Bronze Company Limited, 15 Bury Street, Canadian Metal Company Limited, 1221 St. James Street:

(1) Copies of all lead and air surveys done for each plant since January 1st, 1977 under the authority of The Workplace Safety and Health Act.

(2) Copies of all work improvement orders issued for each plant since January 1st, 1977 under the authority of The Workplace Safety and Health Act, and

(3) Copies of all stop-work orders issued for each plant since January 1st, 1977 under The Workplace Safety and Health Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I know it's not exactly proper to ask a question, so I'll try and phrase my comment so the Member for Churchill can respond. I appreciate what you're trying to —(Interjection)— okay, go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns on a Point of Order.

MR. CHERNIACK: The honourable member said he would phrase his comments in a way to phrase a question — I don't think he has the right to phrase any comments. He either accepts or rejects at this stage, and if it's rejected it is laid over. However, I think it is in order to ask a question for clarification, and rather than make a speech, I think he's entitled to ask the question and no more.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: That's exactly what I was trying to do, but I guess I wasn't using the right words. Under No. (1) where it's requested copies of all lead and air surveys — the lead part is a confidential matter between what happens . . . the employees. If you could explain, or if you could understand exactly what I'm saying. I have no trouble with the entire, . . . could I . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I think I can clarify it. In rereading it, I notice that "and" was supposed to be "lead in air," — "in" instead of "and" and I think that would clarify it for the Minister. The lead in air surveys, I understand, are given not only to the company, but to the union, and to the Workplace Safety and Health Committee, and would not be confidential, so I'd just like to clarify that there is a typographical error, and it's from the original that was presented in the House, so it came from our office — if that clarifies it.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty with it, now that we understand that's what it is.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Health and Community Services and the Honourable Member for Emerson in the Chair for the Department of Agriculture.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — AGRICULTURE

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Albert Driedger: Committee come to order. I'd like to refer the members of the Committee to Page 7, Resolution 6, 1.(b)—pass — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that the minister should give us a lot of information about BIAP. We've had very scanty commentary from him over the last couple of months via news reports and answers to questions which certainly would best be described as inadequate from our point of view and perhaps this is the time when the minister can fully elaborate on what is happening with BIAP.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, as far as the Estimates that we have before us, 1.(b) in referring to the Farm Income Assurance Plan, their money that is in Estimates is to fulfil the responsibility of the government to pay to the producers for the last quarter of 1978 slaughter cattle commitment. The support price was below the — pardon me 1977 slaughter cattle year — the support price was above the average price for that quarter and that is the reason for the money that's in the Estimate. As far as any other comments on the Beef Income Assurance Program is concerned, the member who is asking the question was the engineer of that program and he should have a pretty good understanding of really the history of the past and we are now discussing the Estimates that we have here and it is \$180,000 to fulfill the government's commitment on that quarter.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the government has a greater commitment than their obligation to make pay-outs under this particular program. The minister has dealt so far in his comments only on the question of what the \$180,000 represents which is self-evident. I want to know what the status of the program is. That is really the area of policy and certainly the minister should feel that this is the time for him to indicate to us and to the contract holders just where they stand with the program.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, as I've many times, we're carrying on consistently. The program is still in place; the producers have a contract with the government; there is a responsibility to pay back to the province. The money is either between what the support price is and what is considered as a slaughter animal and they are expected to pay back the difference on that weight as it is calculated for the quarter in which they marketed their animal. They will be billed, Mr. Chairman, the billings will start after April 20th.

As far as any other comments I have to make, if an individual has the option — if they want to opt out of the contract — as was in the contract, to pay back the money plus 9 percent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman, would the Minister elaborate on his statement, that he expects the producers to pay back or that they will pay back? How can he legally expect them to do that? What is his mechanism for collection, in other words?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the people have signed the contract agreeing to the terms, and the member should know pretty much about the contract, he was the engineer of it — all three of them, two in 1975, and one in 1976 — his administration of them left a lot to be desired, and I would have to say that we're working with the producers to an acceptable approach. I'm sure

that we're also being responsible to the government in expecting the producers to pay back to the province moneys that are owed to the province.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister keeps using language that side-steps the question. I specifically would like to know what legal mechanism the Minister will employ should his expectations not be fulfilled, that is, should the producer decide, in whole or in part, that they do not intend to pay back? I want to know what the Minister's policy is, should that happen?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, as far as side-stepping language, again when I'm speaking of engineers of contracts, the Member for Lac du Bonnet is a pretty good one at side-stepping language.

As far as the contract is concerned, and their intent is to carry the contract out, and I'm sure that there are areas of authority that will enforce the contract if it's not lived up to.

MR. USKIW: Well then, Mr. Chairman, more specifically, has the Minister consulted with the Attorney-General's department in an effort to determine the method of collection on any defaults with respect to any contract or all of the contracts?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: Can the Minister then indicate to us what the interpretation of the Attorney-General's department is with respect to the Minister's right to expect paybacks?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't think as far as the Committee is concerned that is sitting, that it's the proper time to bring the opinion of the Attorney-General's department into the debate of these Estimates. I've indicated how we're proceeding, and he's assuming what could happen in the future.

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is completely responsible. Now, wherever he seeks opinion, that is his responsibility, and perhaps obligation; and that particular opinion has to be conveyed back to this Committee. If he has a legal opinion that indicates that he can collect money from these producers simply on the basis of having billed them for the difference in the amount between the market price and the guaranteed price, and I would like to know the source of that interpretation and on what clause in the Agreement that it could fall under?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, could he refer to which agreement he's talking about?

MR. USKIW: We have only one agreement as between the Minister and the producer. I would like to know under what section of that agreement that a farmer has an obligation to pay back to the Crown any amount of money?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, there are three contracts. I wonder which one the member is referring to?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, we are involved with a contract which has a duration of five years, so the Minister knows which contract we're talking about.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member well knows that he was involved in the drawing up of three contracts, and I would like to know which one he's referring to? Was it the one that he introduced for two weeks and then withdrew in the first period, or is it the one that he introduced after that for the next period of time, or was it the one he brought in in 1976? I think, Mr. Chairman, it's the total confusion that has really been carried forward from the introduction of the program, the way it's been administered. There's some of the people in the community are finally getting a feel for the direction it's going.

We've said we're taking the position that there is a responsibility to pay back to the province, and we've established an average weight in which they should pay on, a weight in fact in which they considered animals to be slaughter, and I'm sure we're proceeding in that direction and do intend the people to repay the province the moneys that are owed.

MR. USKIW: Does the Minister acknowledge that he is party to a contract with one or more farmers

in Manitoba under the Beef and Consumers Plan, to date.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, we're carrying on with the contract that was between the previous government and is now in place with the . . . no, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: No' There is no contract between the previous government . . .

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it is a contract between government and the producers.

MR. USKIW: That's right, that's better. I want the Minister, then, to tell me.

MR. DOWNEY: Which, Mr. Chairman, was a contract which was introduced, or one of three contracts that were introduced by the previous administration.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I specifically want the Minister to indicate to the committee, on the basis of his present contractual obligations and the obligations of the producers under the terms of that contract, under what section are they required to pay back any money to the Province of Manitoba. That's all I want to know.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the section in the contract, I would have to look up and get that information.

MR. USKIW: Well, would the Minister take it as Notice and come back with that information?

MR. DOWNEY: I think as far as the option to purchase clause as it has been indicated to me by the department is Clause 7.(a) and 7.(b) of the contract.

MR. USKIW: Clause 7.(a) and 7.(b), is that correct? Would the Minister elaborate what Clause 7. (a) and (b) indicate is the obligation of the government and the producer?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I don't have that information . . .

MR. USKIW: Well, I don't mean in word-by-word legal terminology — his understanding of his obligation under 7.(a) and (b)?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that it's to pay the producer a deficiency grant, when the market price is below the support price; and when the market price is above the support price, or acting as a ceiling price of which he had introduced, that the money was owed back to the province.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister uses the word "owed" back to the province. My recollection is . . .

MR. DOWNEY: Payable to the province.

MR. USKIW: . . . I don't understand, or don't recall any section where it implies that a producer owes money to the Crown under that agreement. I don't recall any section that implies that.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it refers to purchase the animal at a prescribed price from the individual.

MR. USKIW: Now we're getting on track. Yes, who is to purchase the animals, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DOWNEY: It's my understanding that the animals are to be marketed in the name of the province, or to be sold then the money is to be paid to the province.

MR. USKIW: Yes, well then, would the Minister now explain to me, under what section he has the authority and the legal position from which to issue bills for moneys allegedly owed to the Crown under that agreement?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the way in which the program is being administered, part of the contract states that if the individuals when they go to market their animals, the interpretation that we have is that when the animals are to be marketed, that the farmers act as our agents and market them for the province.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman, would the Minister indicate to me under what section of that agreement a farmer becomes an agent of the Crown in the marketing of those animals?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is an interpretation of the part that is in the agreement as far as the department is concerned.

MR. USKIW: Is this particular interpretation subject to being challenged legally?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I suppose as any part of that contract is, as far as people are concerned is quite in the area of being challenged, as was the position that the former government took if the individuals opted to go for the federal program that they were not responsible to market any animals for the province at that particular time. So, as I say, I suppose there is room to challenge the province in that part.

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is trying to skate around the question. I want to know, whether he has legal opinion from his department indicating to him that that interpretation would stand up in court? —(Interjection)— Yes, I want to know whether he has that . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: That the obligations of the producer are that they are to act as an agent on behalf of the Crown in the sale of these animals?

MR. DOWNEY: That they could, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: That they could. No, Mr. Chairman, that's not good enough, I want to know if they must, because "could" is a voluntary effort. I want to know whether they "must" act as agents of the Crown, whether they shall or whether they may; there's quite a difference, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm not prepared to comment on that.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, would the minister indicate to take that question as notice and come back with the information?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I think it would be unfair. It is in a position of being able to be challenged and it would be unfair for me to comment at this particular time.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, either the minister has very definitive instructions or advice from the Attorney-General's department as to his legal rights and obligations under that agreement or he hasn't. It's one or the other. He has indicated initially that he had an interpretation from the Department of the Attorney-General that a producer may act as an agent of the Crown in the sale of those animals, in favour of the Crown. Now, he indicates that, well, he could. Now, that doesn't tell me that he has an obligation legally, it only indicates that he may if he wishes to and therefore, we have the anomalous situation where a producer may or may not, and therefore, you will have an outrageous inequity, Mr. Chairman, as between two producers — one who may choose to do so, and the other one may choose not to do so — and therefore, the one that is co-operative and volunteers that kind of co-operation is the one that pays back the amounts of money that has been billed to him and the other one escapes pay-back whatever. Now, surely the minister isn't telling us that he is going to sort of, well I hate to use the word, but "con" the 4,000 producers into believing that they have some legal obligation which he cannot really confirm here today.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I said earlier that I do have legal opinion; that we are on solid legal ground to go ahead in the manner in which we were pursuing it.

MR. USKIW: But, Mr. Chairman, then is the minister refuting his own statements of only a moment ago, when he used the word, the producer "could" become an agent of the Crown?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has not indicated to this Committee what legal procedures will be employed to collect funds based on the billings that will be out in the mail after April 20th, to some 4,000 producers in the Beef Income Assurance Program.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, if the farmer does not wish to proceed in that manner and wishes to challenge the contract he may do so. And if he takes the other option then it will be considered a default and he will be charged for the amount of money he received, plus 9 percent, which the member well knows. He was again, the engineer of the contracts which completely confused the total agricultural community.

MR. USKIW: MR. Chairman, what option is the minister indicating to us, puts the producer in default?

MR. DOWNEY: Of paying back the money on a marketing basis for the province.

MR. USKIW: Yes.

MR. DOWNEY: Or paying back the money that he owes to the province.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, is it not correct that the minister issued a letter to all of the producers, indicating a number of options that he would consider or prefer or accept as to how moneys will be returned to the province under that agreement? Is it not correct that there was a letter that went out to all the producers giving them a number of options?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: All right. If the producer insists that he wants to not exercise any new options that the province has offered to him, but wishes to exercise his rights under the agreement and to the letter of the agreement and that is that the province, if it wishes to realize any return of funds under that agreement, must exercise the option to purchase, otherwise, it foregoes its right to collect. Is that not correct, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, if the member is referring to any change in the administration of the contract, I can go back and get all the administrative changes and list them to the Committee to see if there have been any different irregularities than have taken place all the way through the program.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, you're talking not about irregularities; we are talking about a statement of the minister, a statement indicating that he is going to send some 4,000 bills out to farmers, in the hope that they are going to pay them, and that in fact, that will keep them within the sort of moral and spirit of the contract, which is fine. But then when we pursue whether there is, in fact, a legal obligation, then we are not so sure; the minister cannot assure us that he has that legal position confirmed.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the legal opinion and I have from the Attorney-General's department is that we can pursue it in that manner.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, let me go at it again. As I understand the agreement — I don't have a copy of it with me — but as I . . . —(Interjection)—

MR. USKIW: Oh yes, oh yes, they're somewhere in the snowbank in Arborg, I think.

MR. DOWNEY: That's where they were drawn up — in a snowbank in Arborg.

MR. USKIW: Anyway, as I understand the agreement, the province may exercise its option to

those animals after the producer has given the province two weeks' notice of their intent to market those animals. Can the minister indicate to me whether the minister has required the producers to give Notice of Intent to market?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the information that I have is that that was waived by the former minister.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is the whole nub of it. That provision was waived, not in perpetuity, but waived because we were in a subsidy program at the time; the market was far below the guaranteed price and therefore, the province was not interested in exercising that option. That option was waived till further notice. Now, as I understand the agreement, the producer, unless that requirement was re-instituted, really has no obligation to the Crown unless the Crown re-instituted the requirement of notice and the option to purchase.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I stated, that option was waived by the former minister to purchase the animals and any change from that, of course, was to have the farmers market on behalf of the province and have done so with legal opinion in support of what action has been taken.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the minister is trying to tell this Committee that the farmer is obligated to amend his agreement with the Crown on the basis of a letter from the minister indicating a desire for a different approach to that contract. I don't believe that that is a legal obligation, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, again, it was the Member for Lac du Bonnet who was the Minister of the Day that changed the contract and I'd question whether he had the legal authority to do that.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the contract has never been changed. The contract is as it was.

MR. DOWNEY: Which contract?

MR. USKIW: And if there is to be a change in the contract which requires an additional obligation on the producer, that could only legally be implemented with the consent of the producer. I don't believe that you can change a legal document unilaterally; it can only be by mutual consent. Now the only changes that were made by the Crown with respect to the contract, were where it was an alleviation of responsibility on the part of the producer in other words, in favour of the producer. And therefore, yes, if the government says we will not exercise our rights under Section (a), or (c), or (d), that is our privilege to do so, and it doesn't require the consent of the producer. But if the Minister wants to change the obligation of the producer, then surely if it's a legal document, then he has to have the concurrence, the voluntary agreement of the producer to make that change to be legally binding. It cannot simply be a letter that goes out in the mail indicating that the government has a new policy, and therefore instead of exercising the option to purchase, we are going to ask the producers to send us some money. I don't believe that that can be legally done.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the member brings out the point that he did in fact make changes to the contract. . .

MR. USKIW: No, not changes to the contract at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, he did say that. Mr. Chairman, I have the floor, I believe.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege. I did not say. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point of privilege. It has to be accompanied by a motion I understand; point of order.

A MEMBER: A point of privilege.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, my point is that the Minister is misinterpreting what I said. Now either

that's a point of privilege or it isn't. I indicated that a contract cannot be modified without the consent of both parties to the contract. That's a legal position. That's all I said. I didn't say that we unilaterally were able to change a legal document. Any person knows that you can't do that.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, as far as the member's point of privilege is concerned, I don't really think he has one; I think that the point that has been made is that he did in fact introduce three contracts; he's referring to a contract. I think if we are going to discuss the irregularities or the changes, he cannot substantiate the fact that there weren't any changes when he introduced three different types of contracts to the farmers of Manitoba. He admitted that he's made changes to them; that he could do so legally when it's in the favour of the farmer. He has just said that. I think the other point I would have to take is the member advocating that all the money should be written off as he did when the producers were allowed to opt into the federal program.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, whatever changes that were made with respect to the contract would only have been made with the concurrence of each producer along with the Province of Manitoba; you cannot change a contract. You cannot change a legal contract unilaterally. That is something that would not stand up. If you have a contract between two parties, then it's binding unless they both consent to a change. That's a very simple thing, Mr. Chairman, the Minister should know that.

Now, the government of course, from day to day, could make a policy decision would could alleviate a producer from certain obligations of the contract, and indicate so by letter that while we have this provision in our agreement, you are no longer obligated to respond to those provisions, or they are waived for a short time period, or indefinitely, or a completely way. That's a prerogative of the government, yes; waiving the rights of the Crown, but you cannot change the rights of the other party to the contract. That can only be done with consent of the other party.

So all of the changes that were made in the course of the last number of years, have been changes that were beneficial or advantageous to the other side of the party, and changes which only affected the Crown, negatively, if any, and not the other party.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Member for Lac du Bonnet sits there, and I hope we don't have to spend a lot of time on this because the reason being that we have explained the \$180,000 that is in our Estimates. He sits there and says that he was not part of a change in a contract when in fact the position that he took to waive the two weeks notice as far as marketing was a total change without the concurrence of the producer. He made that move without any amendment to the agreement, without any change in the agreement, and when he was the Minister, in fact, changed the contract and is now coming out and saying that it wasn't a change.

Well, Mr. Chairman, let it go on the record that there were many changes made that weren't made in agreement with the producer. I am sure that the intent of the program was to help the producers in a time of need and not to get them into a long-term problem, which in fact, if he had other motives in introducing such a program such as to totally take over the beef industry with the Beef Marketing Board, then let him put it on the record as such. But that to me would seem would be his motives in introducing the type of program that he did. The three contracts, Mr. Chairman, plus the fact he sat here and said he was the Minister that waived the two-week marketing notice, which was a change in the contract, it was a change in the contract, Mr. Chairman. We're in a legal debate. I'm sure the way it's being administered is quite acceptable to the province; we're taking the responsibility of requiring the people to pay back moneys to the province and that in fact, if they do not want to approach it in that manner, they have the option of paying back all the moneys plus 9 percent, which was a part of the contract which we introduced.

So, Mr. Chairman, he did change the contract, and he's sitting here saying that we are doing so without any authority. We, Mr. Chairman, are going on the advice of the Attorney-General's department, and are administrating the program to the best interests of all.

MR. USKIW: I challenge the Minister to bring me a legal opinion that would indicate that when there is a discretionary alleviation of an obligation on the part of a party to a contract, that that does not change the contract in itself, or that it does, rather. I challenge him to bring me a legal opinion to back up his position, that when the Crown alleviates an obligation of another party to a contract with the Crown, that that changes the contract. I challenge him, Mr. Chairman, to bring me legal opinion to that effect, because it's a voluntary alleviation on the part of the Crown in favour of the other party. It is not a change that adversely affects the other party. It's a voluntary change that could be revoked; the contract stays firm. There were no legal documentation that went with the change, as the Minister knows. There were no new contracts drawn up outlining that

change. There were no new contracts outlining any changes that were made, and whatever changes were made to any agreements were subsequently signed by both parties and binding.

So the Minister cannot sit here and say, because the previous government waived the requirement that there should be a notice given, that that's a change in a contract. It has nothing to do with the change in a contract, Mr. Chairman. It has to do with the fact that the province did not require that notice pursuant to that agreement but didn't change the obligations of either party to the agreement. Now I challenge him to find me a legal opinion that would argue with that point of view.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, we're into a legal debate. We're carrying on with the contract, and the responsibility as government. I'm sure the member who is sitting next to him from Ste. Rose, I would be interested to know which contract he had been involved with, whether it was the 1st, 2nd or 3rd. He might want to speak to this, and put some more light on the issue.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is in a box, and he now wants to defer the debate to another member of this Committee, because he's in a position of not being able to justify his own statements, Mr. Chairman. The Minister finds himself cornered on this particular issue. He is completely dishonest with this Committee, unless he is prepared to document the interpretation that he is giving us as being a legal interpretation that he has been advised by the Attorney-General's department on.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, as far as the Member for Lac du Bonnet is concerned, he's debating the legal terms of a contract and we're here to discuss the debates of the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, we're discussing \$180,000; under a contract we will owe the producers this much money, we're asking for the approval to spend it. And again it's one of three contracts, or they are a part of three contracts that were — well, I guess they were put together by the last Minister of Agriculture, by the Attorney-General's department, and the legal opinion I have is from the Attorney-General's department, and we're proceeding consistent with the way we're administering it, and I can see no reason for him to get concerned.

The reason that I refer to the Member for Ste. Rose, my understanding was that he was involved in the contract and might have been able to shed a little light on the issue. I don't expect that the Minister was involved in it, I know he couldn't be, but that was the reason I referred to the Member for Ste. Rose.

And again, I am quite prepared to back-up any statement that I make, and I'm sure that when the total light is shed on this whole program, as far as the people of Manitoba is concerned, it will totally clarify the intent of the last government, what their objectives were. That it wasn't to totally help the farm people of Manitoba, but was to totally take control of the beef industry in Manitoba, followed up by a beef vote, which would totally take the control of the beef industry away from the people of Manitoba — the farmers.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister made some fairly wild insinuations and accusations.

MR. DOWNEY: Wild but true.

MR. USKIW: Wild but true. But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the Beef Income Assurance Plan was put together because of a very serious income problem with respect to our beef producers in Manitoba over a period of three or four years.

With respect to tying that in with a referendum, which would give the province control, you know, how does a referendum give the province control? I mean, the Minister, the author of a piece of legislation that is nothing but dictatorial in forcing people to belong to an association that —(Interjections)—

Well, Mr. Chairman, not order, the Chairman allowed the Minister to get into —(Interjections)— That's right, you're quite right, you're quite right, but where was it when the Minister was dealing with it, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would like to direct the members to address their remarks to the Chair.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister tried to suggest to this Committee that somehow there's a connection between Beef Income Assurance, and the referendum on a Beef Marketing Board, and he knows there's no connection, but he would like to leave that impression.

Secondly, he tries to leave the impression that when people vote in a new system of marketing, that that is somehow controlled by the Minister of the Crown. That's the other impression he wants to leave. And you know, it's mind boggling to say the least, in light of the fact that the Minister didn't have a referendum, in fact there was a referendum held on a measure that failed to pass by a vote of the majority of people, the same issue on which the Minister then brought in Bill 25, I believe it was, having had the knowledge that the referendum didn't carry, and put it through as a measure of government forcing every cattleman in this province to be a member of an association that they didn't want to belong to, Mr. Chairman.

So, Mr. Chairman, where is the credibility of our Honourable Minister here? I find it sadly lacking, sadly lacking, Mr. Chairman.

Now, we've had no clarification from him as to under what section of the agreement he intends to pursue the collection of funds, funds from those people who are in contract with the Crown under (b) under BIA. And I would like the Minister to tell me under what section of that agreement he is empowered to do so, and if he doesn't have the information, would he please take it as notice and provide it to us so that we can then deal with it on the basis of his information and on the basis of our ability to ascertain whether he's correct or not.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I think I've explained that. The farmers of Manitoba, I'm sure, who are involved in the contract understand it, and I've referred to the sections in the contract that I'm referring to, and the way in which we're proceeding to have the people pay the money back. Now, we've had our legal opinion, and we're proceeding in that manner. Again, they have the option of opting out and paying all the money back plus 9 percent, and if the other way in which it's been proceeded does not hold up in a court of law, then the contract will, of course, go that way. The contract, I should say the three contracts, because of the way it was introduced and the type of program that it was, I'm sure it will be around the Member's neck from Lac du Bonnet, for a long time.

MR. USKIW: I would then like to ask the Minister, that if his attempts to collect the money — the difference between the market price and the guaranteed price — fail in a court, through a court action, but in the meantime some of our farmers have voluntarily paid that difference in, is the Minister going to refund that difference to all of those farmers who have volunteered to pay it back, after he has the information that a court has decided that there was no legal obligation for them to do so? I want to know what the Minister will do in that situation?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, again, I will deal with that problem if it arises; I don't expect it to arise. He's assuming — it's a question of assumption.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, we face the probability of a court action, where the Minister's position will be challenged, and where some people by that time may have paid in sums of money voluntarily, who will then find that they may have not had a legal obligation to do so, if the court finds so; and they will be in a position of a terrible inequity, from this government, Mr. Chairman, not having cleared their legal position first, before asking people to send in sums of money under that agreement. And it seems to me —(Interjection)— I would take it to court myself, Mr. Chairman, yes, I would hope they do. —(Interjection)— Oh yes, I would hope they do. Mr. Chairman, it is not the way it was drawn up, it's the way it's being implemented.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. I would once again direct members to direct their remarks to the Chair.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, we have that situation looming, and it seems to me that the producers would be wise not to voluntarily send in a penny unless a court would determine that they have a legal obligation to do so. The way the minister is administering this program, I believe that that would be the best course of action for all of those producers in Manitoba.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, again it is a question of assumption and if the farmers in Manitoba

want to follow the advice of the Member for Lac du Bonnet, I think they've had enough of that over the eight years, but if they wish to do so, they are quite allowed to do that and that will be a question of policy when and if it arises, and Mr. Chairman, I will deal with it at that time. But at this particular point I've made it very clear how we're carrying on.

MR. USKIW: The minister has indicated that he has had legal opinion justifying his methodology of collecting funds under the BIAP program from the producers of Manitoba. I would like now, to ask him whether he has also consulted with the Provincial Auditor on this question?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the Provincial Auditor is aware of the program, and I would also like to say if the member is referring to the advice we're getting from the Attorney-General, if he is now suggesting to the farmers in Manitoba that he in fact, signed an illegal contract with them in the province of Manitoba — three contracts he's saying, that he's advising them not to pay money back on a contract — 1 of 3 in which he introduced to them, he's now advising them not to pay money back.

Well, Mr. Chairman, let it be put on the record that the Member for Lac du Bonnet is now suggesting that he entered into a contract and is now saying that it's illegal, knowingly and willingly doing so. Mr. Chairman, I think that it should be on the record that it's just another way in which he administered the total agricultural community.

Now, as far as the other question is concerned, I think that as far as the Attorney-General's department and the Auditor, they are quite aware of what is taking place and will be responding to the way in which it's being held.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, we didn't need any editorial commentary from the minister, because all of what he's said is totally incorrect. Apart from that, Mr. Chairman, I ask the minister — and he's somewhat tender about answering this one — did he in fact, consult with the Auditor's Department on the methodology that he is going to employ to collect these funds or on any other question, relative to the Beef Income Assurance Plan? Did he consult with the Provincial Auditor?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I, as the minister did not directly consult with him, but as I indicated, the Auditor is aware of what is taking place and I have not had any reports from him on it.

MR. USKIW: Well, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, since the minister is unsure of his path, this whole question of collecting funds, that it would have been logical for him to consult both the Attorney-General's department and the Provincial Auditor, so they would both give him recommendations as to his best approach on the question of recapturing certain amounts of moneys that he feels are owed to the Province of Manitoba by some 4,000 beef producers of this province.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I will put on the record that in addition to keeping in total touch with the Department of the Attorney-General also were in consultation with the Department of Finance in the administration of the program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I note that the item that we're dealing with is titled Farm Income Assurance Plan, and I know that it deals primarily, if not exclusively, insofar as this appropriation is concerned with the Beef Income Assistance Plan, but I'm sure that you will agree with me, Mr. Chairman, that this is the opportunity that we have to draw other matters to the attention of the minister that he may want to consider as part of this program.

I note, Mr. Chairman, in going through my files I came across a press clipping of about five or six, about six years of June, 1973 at which time the colleague of the minister, who now sits as the Member for Rock Lake made certain promises to the people of Manitoba, and I would presume that he was speaking with the authority of his party and that these were not personal promises or commitments that he made. So my basic question with respect to those promises — and this deals with his agricultural policy and it deals primarily with farm income insurance — I would want to ask the minister whether he had received a proposal from the Member for Rock Lake outlining the manner of operation of these programs as he envisages them, as he would want to see the minister of today administer them.

One promise that he made was to maintain the family farm. We must recognize the cost price squeeze and do something about it. So my first question is, has the Member for Rock Lake provided

the minister with an outline of a program how he could deal by way of farm income insurance to relieve the cost price squeeze as the Member for Rock Lake envisages it? —(Interjection)— Assurance or insurance and the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, if he will check any dictionary he will find that both mean essentially the same thing.

The other promise that the Member for Rock Lake made was to get our young people into farming. We are prepared to make greater assistance financially. Now, I appreciate that there will be another item in the minister's Estimates where we'll be able deal with this again, but the Member for Rock Lake . wasn't all that clear just what it was specifically that he was referring to, and it could be that what he had in mind was some form of income assistance which would, no doubt, come under this particular program.

The third promise which he made, was to design a pension plan for farmers, so that Manitoba farmers can retire and pass their farms on to their children without fear of financial hardship, and he said that plan will be voluntary. So, I asked the minister on this particular commitment that the Member for Rock Lake made. he received now a proposal from the Member for Rock Lake outlining the manner in which these programs will operate? Because as I've indicated earlier, one would think in reading this that he spoke with the blessings of the Conservative Party of Manitoba and that the then candidate for Rock Lake, now it's member, did have . . . Did the Member for Minnedosa wish to . . . —(Interjection)— he's going to give me . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. the Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I was just waiting, Mr. Chairman, for the Member for Pembina to get the wheels and gears and little cogs in his brain all sorted out and turning in the right direction. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I'm recognizing the Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and I hope that the Honourable Member for Pembina heard your advice. So, that is my question to the Minister whether he has received a proposal from the Member for Rock Lake for the implementation of these programs, and if he hasn't, whether this is Conservative Party policy which this government hopes to implement and bring on track.

MR. DONNEY: Mr. Chairman, the answer to the member are yes, no, and maybe, and he can use them in whatever order he likes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, that was exactly the answer I expected to receive from the Minister. It doesn't surprise me one bit because that is typical of the type of answers that we've been receiving from this government ever since Day One. So, "yes, no, maybe, we're studying, we're monitoring, we're examining closely, we're considering, we're . . .;" the most recent response that I had received from another Minister: "We are reviewing objectively." That was the most recent one. So therefore, I take it, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Rock Lake was not speaking on behalf of his party, that what promises he made, it is not the intention of this government to carry out, and that has become quite obvious in the light of the type of answer that the Minister has given us. You know, by either refusing or at least being reluctant to give a definite precise answer.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, in more complete answer to the member, I have discussed with the Member for Rock Lake, many agricultural policies and issues and he is a very sound representative of one of the good agricultural areas of Manitoba, and I would have to say that a lot of his recommendations are part of policy that have been put in place, and as all the rural members have a part in agriculture policy, they will continue to do so and we will give the people the proper kind of government that will encourage family farm operations and encourage the ease of ownership by young farmers in the transfer from the retiring farmers to the young people.

So I would have to say that we are in fact working with the total government caucus and Cabinet to have a strong agricultural base in the province, and the Member for Rock Lake's opinions and suggestions will be considered very seriously, and have been.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, when can we expect to attend the unveiling of the Minister's pension plan for farmers, if that is something that he is developing?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I hope that with the agricultural policies and programs that we see that as part of what has been traditional in the province, part of the fact that they were able to own and operate their farms that their retirements are part of the investment that they have in their land, not in fact having to compete with state-owned farm organizations, government competing

to take that very retirement means that they have had over the past . . . history of the province, really, taken away from them in which they've needed to build up to retire on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I wonder if I could refer all members of the committee that we're sidetracking off the basic Farm Income Assurance plan which was specifically a program set up for the assistance for the beef program.

The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the title of this appropriation is: Farm Income Assurance, and as I had indicated to you, Mr. Chairman, at the outset, that although I well appreciate that at the present time the appropriation contained within this program, is earmarked specifically for the beef income assurance program, but I am sure that you know, Mr. Chairman, that this is the opportunity for members of the House, for members of the opposition, to debate with the Minister any other related items that any member may feel either ought to be included in the program, or that may have been indicated by someone else that it should be included in the program or in some program of government, as the Member for Rock Lake had indicated.

Now, if the Minister wishes to tell us that a cost price squeeze assurance plan, and that a young farmers' farm acquisition assurance plan, and that a . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. It is my understanding that the money allocated that we are approving here is basically under the Beef Assurance Program.

The Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point of order.

MR. USKIW: My point of order, Mr. Chairman, is that the subject matter is fairly general. If you read it, it says: "Farm Income Assurance Plan." It means anything that could be insured under a farm income insurance plan. It has a broad definition and, by the way, for the benefit of members of this committee, it was so worded because it was anticipated that there may be other insurance plans added to the one that we are debating here today; this specific one. So it is a general description and I believe, well, I know, that the Member for Burrows is correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister on the same point of order.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, as it is stated here, the moneys that are being asked for are for the Beef Income Assurance Plan, and that is in fact what we are debating at this particular point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows on the same point of order.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order, I am sure that you could check Beauchesne, and you will find, and this has been the nature of debates in the House since time immemorial, that this is the opportunity for members of the Committee of Supply to deal with any items relevant to a particular item that's under discussion at a given time. Now, and it's even quite apparent that the Member for Rock Lake must have thought of a farm income assurance plan in much broader terms than this Minister, because he was the one who made these commitments.

Now, I repeat again. These are all farm income assurance related programs that I am discussing. However, if what the Minister is really saying is that he has accepted the advice of the Member for Rock Lake, and that he has made provision for the commitments that the Member for Rock Lake had made in 1973, that the Minister has made provision for them elsewhere, then all he needs to do is direct us to the appropriate appropriation and then when we come to them we will deal with those items then. But we didn't hear the Minister tell us that, so therefore, Mr. Chairman, I feel that I am in order in dealing with farm income assurance items which were promised to people of Manitoba by his colleague, the Member for Rock Lake.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify for the members of the committee, that in fact we only have one program; we only have the appropriation or the allocation of money for the one program, that being the Beef Income Assurance Plan, other than the Manitoba Crop Insurance, which in fact, we will be debating at another point in the Estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. While some of us here know that the item we are discussing, (b)\$180,000, is primarily for the Beef Assurance Program, it doesn't so indicate. It doesn't indicate farm, beef, beef farm income assurance plan, as you will note on item 2. Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation, and it identifies "crop", so we would be only dealing with crop under that item. Over here, it's general. It's put in here, and I believe for a purpose. It was put in that way; the former Minister of Agriculture has just stated that the reason why it was put in that way that it was anticipated that in the future there would be more programs coming in, such as the Member for Burrows is indicating, and I can't see why the Member for Burrows can't discuss these programs that could come under this heading.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my contention that we're dealing with specific moneys here for certain programs and it is my impression that as far as other programs that are involved, there is ample room under the Minister's Salary to bring in new programs, new suggestions.

The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Yes, I accept your interpretation, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to say that my understanding of the waiving. . .

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I want to raise a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet on a point of order.

MR. USKIW: I don't think that I want to accept that ruling, Sir, because I wanted to ask the Minister about other income assurance plans that he may be developing or may be announcing, or if he is going to, under this heading, because we don't know what he has in mind under Farm Income Assurance. We know that there is one existing plan; we don't know whether there will be two or three by next year, and therefore, it seems to me logical to raise those questions under Farm Income Assurance Plan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, at this particular time, there aren't any funds made available. . .

MR. USKIW: Well, that was a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Ste. Rose had the floor.

MR. DOWNEY: On that same point of order, Mr. Chairman, I'll clarify the problem for the member that in fact, the only money that's being asked for here is for the Beef Income Assurance Program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Gentlemen, in accordance with Rule 19(2), the hour of 4:30 having arrived, I am interrupting the proceedings of the Committee for Private Members' Hour, and will return at 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY — HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson): I would draw the honourable members' attention to Page 49 in the Main Estimates — Department of Health and Community Services. Resolution No. 64, Social Services and Community Health. We are on Item (q), Employment Services — (1) Salaries—pass. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: I've been trying to catch your eye unsuccessfully, because I wanted to raise a matter that is not connected with this particular item so I wanted to do it in a more proper way. Nevertheless, I'm sure you'll give me the opportunity to thank the Honourable Minister for copies of documents which he had promised to distribute and did distribute, relating to correspondence with the Dental Association. Apparently this has not been distributed broadly, but I have it on my desk. And what I have, Mr. Chairman, is a copy of a letter dated October 5, 1978, from the Manitoba Dental Association to the Minister, outlining what the Dental Association understands to be the framework for the delivery of the Children's Dental Program, and I would like to point out to the Honourable Minister that if that is all he furnished us with in connection with that particular program

I'm rather surprised because there is no letter from him to the Dental Association, either preceding this letter nor following it nor anything to indicate his concurrence with the program. I assumed we would get a copy of whatever — I think, we call it agreement, understanding, or exchange of letters. And I would ask him if he would be prepared to review his file in relation to this program and give us the full correspondence.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I would want to thank him for a copy of the letter from him to the President of the Manitoba Dental Association dated March 22, 1979, responding to a letter from the Dental Association to him of February 13, 1979. I would, of course, ask for a copy of that letter to him and again, ask whether there isn't any fuller correspondence or copies of agreements or letters of understanding. The reason being that in both cases it would appear as if the Dental Association told him what they thought should be done and he has complied with their request.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the Minister — and I believe I have asked for this before, but before we enter into the, I think, it's the penultimate line in his departmental Estimates — for a copy of the agreement which is proposed would set up a consultation mechanism between the Manitoba Health Services Commission and the Manitoba Medical Association. I wonder he would indicate his response to my request?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I recognize the Honourable Minister, I don't think we will be entering into any debate on these contracts or letters that are made reference to except under the Minister's Salary but I will allow the Honourable Minister to reply to the question. I just preceded what I

MR. CHERNIACK: All right. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to clarify that I am not entering into debate. The Minister complied with a request, honoured an undertaking he had made, and I understand that yesterday, at the beginning of the Estimates he interrupted — well he preceded before we entered into whatever item it was — to file them. So in the same way I ask for this and I don't intend to debate it, all I want to do is get his undertaking and then we will debate it if the occasion arises before his salary but certainly during his salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I didn't mean to infer that there was a debate going on at this point. I just suggested that it wouldn't be the proper place to enter into a debate. The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will recheck our files in compliance with the questions that the Honourable Member for St. Johns raises. I would ask him though if he doesn't mind to repeat his question to me, having to do with a letter of agreement on the Consultative Committee existing between my office and the Manitoba Health Services Commission. There is a Consultative Committee that operates between my office and the Manitoba Medical Association but I am not quite clear on what the reference to the Health Services Commission was.

MR. CHEIACK: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Honourable Minister's invitation to elaborate. I was not aware of a consultative committee which exists between him and the Manitoba Medical Association unless it is an informal one. If it is one set up in a formal way by an exchange of letters or agreements or written undertakings, I'm very anxious to see what that is because I just point out to the Minister, I'm concerned to know whether the government has given any undertakings to the Manitoba Medical Association to hold consultative meetings with them and if so I would like clarification.

What I was referring to was more specific, it was reported — I have the clipping from the Winnipeg Free Press of March 17, 1979 which deals with the proposed agreement between the Health Services Commission and the Manitoba Medical Association which includes, according to that article, a written agreement to set up a consultation mechanism between the Manitoba Health Services Commission and the Manitoba Medical Association. I did not refer to his department but once he did, I want that as well. But this one is relevant because today's paper announces that apparently the medical practitioners have agreed to accept the proposal of the government relating to their arrangements with the Health Services Commission.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, all right I'm clear on what the honourable member is asking about and it is related to the fee schedule negotiations for 1979-80 successfully completed between the Health Services Commission and MMA and part of the agreement that was reached included the acceptance of a Letter of Agreement, generally outlining the role of consultation that would be pursued by the Medical Association and the Health Services Commission. And that I can certainly make available to the honourable member.

The other item which he says he didn't know anything about, I would have to challenge him on, Mr. Chairman. Last year he asked me about the letter that established the consultative committee between my office and the Manitoba Medical Association and asked what the terms of reference of that committee were and I supplied him with that documentation. I think if he checks the record he will . . . what it is is simply a means of communication between the MMA and my office and it includes two persons nominated by the MMA, both of them obviously medical practitioners who are members of the MMA, two persons nominated by my office, one of whom happens to be my Associate Deputy Minister and one of whom happens to be the Executive Director of the Manitoba Health Services Commission. But I am quite sure that the honourable member if he checks his records and his files will see that I supplied that to him about a year ago.

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

MR. LAURENT L DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I apologize that I haven't seen the material that the Minister gave our party yesterday, I wasn't here. But I just want to make sure what we're requesting. An advisory committee is something else but now there is a contract, a contract exists, between the Dental Association and the Province of Manitoba. And this is something that has to be made public and that is the question that I asked at the time. I don't know if the Minister gave this information, I'll check it. But just to make sure, Mr. Chairman, I'd want it before we reach the Minister's Salary.

I say that there is a contract that exists, it might be a verbal contract but there is, there must be a contract that exists because the Dental Association are provided funds to deliver a certain service for the government and I think that has to be made public. Now I want to know the amount, how they are going to be paid, how they bill the government, what their responsibilities are, and the data that they should collect and make available to the Minister, when that should be done? In other words the evaluation of all the questions and that has to be done or they wouldn't get any money at all, Mr. Chairman. So this is something that I'd want I would hope before, well I would insist if I can, Mr. Chairman, before the Minister's Salary.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I think, Mr. Chairman, I stand to be corrected by my honourable friend, but I think that my honourable friend will find that those questions are answered in the material I've supplied. What the Member for St. Johns is asking me was where is the record of my response to that letter and that is the question that I now am going to pursue for him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item (q) Employment Services: (1) Salaries, the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, by your leave I'd like to get a clarification of procedural item regarding the Estimates from the Minister and I was wondering if I could do that — it doesn't relate to this item — but it is something that pertains to the Estimates and rather than asking it in Question Period I thought I could get a chance to ask it now before we get into this particular item?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not concerning Employment Services?

MR. PARASIUK: No it concerns 3.(t) and it concerns a commitment made by the Minister a week and a half ago or two weeks now that we would defer discussing 3. (t) namely Regional Personal Services until consultations between the health centres and the Manitoba Health Services Commission were finished so that we would be in a position to really get into the meat of the discussion here in the legislature rather than talking about it when there isn't a final decision or final recommendation made by the Health Services Commission to the Minister. Is that understanding going to be carried through?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I shall have to go back and check the record but that is at variance with my understanding of the commitment that I gave the Honourable Member for Transcona and I think the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and that was that no decision would be made arbitrarily on funding for community health centres until we permitted the duly elected members of this Legislature to debate the question of the role of community health centres and for that reason I had suggested I was prepared to postpone 3.(t) if necessary and we could move it to some other stage of the schedule.

But as it turns out we're going to be at 3.(t) before any kind of decision of that kind is going to be reached anyway so I think that fulfils the commitment. We will have the debate, I'll hear from the Member for Transcona and others and that will be part of the thinking process that goes into any government decision and I can assure him of that undertaking. But I thought that's what the undertaking was.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson, the undertaking was given in the context of our asking for information that the Health Services Commission and the departmental officials had pulled together concerning the Health Action Centre or the health centres. We asked the Minister if he would give us the information so that we would have the opportunity to look at the data and then be in a position to discuss health centres when the item came up, having had some opportunity to analyze the data that his department had pulled together.

It was at that stage that the Minister said he'd take under advisement the question of whether he'd provide the evaluation report and that he would be prepared to defer the discussion — I understood that that he would defer the discussion — and he also said that he wouldn't make a final decision, and that's true. He said he wouldn't make a final decision with respect to the health centres until such time as we had had the opportunity of debating it here in the Legislature. But unfortunately, Mr. Chairperson, we've not received any information at all from the Minister regarding the health centres and therefore I don't know if we're in that good a position to debate the health centres until the Minister provides us some information on them in advance which I thought he was going to do when we were on program and evaluation. That is why we let that item go through program and evaluation because we were looking for the evaluation on the health centres at that time. The Minister said he would undertake a look at whether in fact he'd release the entire report. Subsequent to that he decided not to release the entire report but I think if he has information or at least a summary of findings that have been released to the health centres perhaps he could give that to us now so that we could have some opportunity of finding out what his technical people have come up with in a technical way in evaluating the health centres, and we could have the opportunity of looking at that for a couple of days at least, I hope, before we get into the detailed debate on the health centres.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, obviously there is a legitimate difference of opinion as to what the method was going to be, in which we were going to proceed to debate the community health centres question.

I am fully prepared to defer consideration of 3.(t) to a later stage in the Estimates if that's desired by the members of the Committee. We're not there yet, of course, but we could when we got there move on to item (u) and just defer (t) until a little later on and I'll make what information I can available to the honourable member and to members opposite. But what is happening in fact is that officials of my department are meeting and consulting with the health centres discussing a wide range of subjects relative to health centres and delivery of health services, most of it is verbal, there obviously are some brief records of the discussions but they are not detailed minutes and I would assume that that would be the same kind of debate that would go on between the honourable members opposite and this side when we came to that item.

I would presume that the Honourable Member for Transcona would already have some specific opinions and prospectives on community health centres and there would be a free and open exchange; but if he feels that if we make sufficient progress today to get to 3.(t) and that that is catching him at a disadvantage then I would be prepared to defer it to a later point in the Estimates.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, I thank the Minister for that and I would like us to do that in that the Health Action Centre for example has commissioned a study by Operation Research Associates which will be completed at the end of this week which I gather the Health Services Commission said it would take a look at before making any decisions. So I think it would be fair for all of us if we could wait until the end of this week and perhaps get into this sometime next Monday or Tuesday, which I think provides sufficient time and doesn't draw out the Estimates process in any way, shape or form.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, we would like to thank the Minister for doing just that. It's not a question that we are being accommodated that we're not ready. The question is that we're looking at the Estimates and the Minister from what we understand hasn't made up? Commission, or even to that point in the Estimates, and then come back. I really think that we're

all interested in fairly and responsibly getting through the business of the House as reasonably as we can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item (q) Employment Services. (1)—Salaries. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, a follow-up to some of the questions that were asked yesterday by my colleagues. I wonder if the Minister could indicate under the Work Activities Projects — in the Annual Report on Page 24, it mentions that there were 215 people still I wonder if he could indicate how many involved in these projects — are left as of this date, or how many will be left when these reductions that appear in the Estimates Book here come into effect? I wonder if he could further divide that down, Mr. Chairman. The second part of the question is how many people were in the program at Pelican Rapids, where the program will no longer be existing, and how many people in the program at Barrows, where the program will no longer be existing?

I would also like the Minister to indicate whether or not the MLA who represents these two communities — Pelican Rapids and Barrows — the Member for Swan River, has raised with the Minister his concern about these programs, the reduction of these programs in his constituency, and what effect they'll have on those two communities that are mostly native people?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Pelican Rapids and Barrows projects, which were satellite projects to Dauphin were established with a budgeted total of 15 clients each. They are being phased out so you're looking at a budgeted total of 15 clients in each of those two satellite projects, who will no longer be budgeted for, no longer be in the program.

I want to just say on that point, because it picks up on a point that was asked of me yesterday by the Member for Seven Oaks, I think, and I wasn't able to answer it precisely, and that had to do with the argument I had raised about the threat to federal cost-sharing, because many of these projects were turning into sheltered workshops, which takes them outside the qualification limits for cost-sharing. And the Member for Seven Oaks, I think, asked me whether we were directly advised of that by the federal authorities or not, and I said I wasn't sure, but I had certainly been advised of that by my department officials. I'm advised that the answer to that question is yes, that the federal government had made it quite clear, in fact as early as July, 1976, that cost-sharing, at least for the projects such as MANWOP Projects, northern work activities' Amaranth and these ones we're discussing, was threatened by the fact that they were turning into sheltered workshops and they did not meet the criteria for federal cost-sharing.

The same kind of stricture was laid on us with respect to the Winnipeg Work Activity Project WHIP, and to Pioneer Services. So I just want to record that, because yesterday I wasn't able to give the Member for Seven Oaks a direct answer to that question, although it had always been my impression that that federal message had been received.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister three questions. I'll just repeat the other two that he didn't deal with. Is this figure, 215 in the report, how many would still remain on these projects once these cuts have come into effect? Is it just subtract 30 or . . . I assume that there's a number of other reductions, including one of the Winnipeg ones.

And the third question I asked, which is one I think only the Minister could deal with if he's listening, was the question of whether or not the member of the Legislature who represents the Swan River constituency in the communities of Pelican Rapids and Barrows has expressed any concern to the Minister about the effects that the elimination of these programs will have on those two fairly remote communities.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the Honourable Member for The Pas. The total number of clients provided for in the program as it exists up to the present moment has been 330. There are more than that that go through in a given year, because of pass-through, but the number that's budgeted for to be in there at any one time is 330. Under the reduction, that will be reduced to 197.

The question about the Honourable Member for Swan River I can only answer by saying no, Mr. Chairman. There has been no expression such as that referred to by the Member for The Pas. That should not be construed as indicating that the Member for Swan River has not received any communications of concern, but at this point in time in the discussions that we've had on the overall project and the overall program, I've received no such expressions from him.

MR. McBRIDE: Mr. Chairman, I think that this particular section of this department's Estimates is one of the very clear and simple examples of the report of the Task Force that looked at the so-called Government Restraint Program, which is in reality a shifting of priority program. Their comment was that government restraint is focussing more on restraint in those services with rehabilitative, supportive and developmental goals. It does not seem to be focussing as openly and as explicitly on services of a social control nature with mainly protective goals.

For example, services of a mainly protective nature such as child-abuse services do not seem to be visibly affected, while family supportive services, such as life-skills, summer enrichments, alcohol counselling, home advisor and community development programs, have been cut back. Now, Mr. Chairman, in this particular case of this section of the Minister's department, in the one section, the Work Activities Projects, we see the fact that 133 people will no longer have the opportunity to have employment, to receive training, and to receive the life skills input that should enable them to get other jobs or move on to further educational opportunities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's a fairly drastic reduction from 330 to 197 people. I didn't work out the percentage there, Mr. Chairman, but I think it demonstrates in terms of this government, and the fact that their so-called restraint program does not have a clear goal or a clear purpose or a clear set of objectives that the Task Force has called for. So that what it is is a haphazard hit-and-miss approach to overcome this government's problem of saying that there was fat in government services; not finding that fat there, now having to cut programs, and cutting programs on a very hit-and-miss basis. And, Mr. Chairman, I think this is what my colleague for St. Boniface talked about when he said that the Minister is always flying kites or sending up trial balloons and depending upon the reaction to those trial balloons, whether he proceeds with the cuts. And of course, Mr. Chairman, it's what we have been saying on this side and what the Task Force says, that the people who don't object are the people who are least able to fight back, the people that have the less louder voices. The people that are not able to make the squeaky wheel and not able to get the grease from this government are the ones who are the most severely affected by the so-called restraint program which shifts priorities from services to people and services to low income people who need assistance if they are going to get involved in the mainstream of society of Manitoba and shifts those priorities to the elite in our society that already are well off and don't particularly need the help of government, although they are the ones that are now getting the help of government that is being taken away from the people who need it the most.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is one fortunate aspect of this Work Activities Project, and that is that the Federal government happens to have in place an employment program called the LEAP program, and Mr. Chairman, if it were not for that LEAP program' the operations mentioned on page 24 of the Minister's departmental report, where some, in fact, spinoff has occurred. Some beneficial effect has occurred from the Work Activities Projects in that a few communities have been able to develop an on-going enterprise, but Mr. Chairman, the only reason they were able to develop that on-going enterprise and take advantage of the training that people have received and use some of the facilities has been because of the Federal government program that was available to them to help them in the initial stages of taking a training program and turning it into an Economic Development Program.

Mr. Chairman, this government and this Minister have withdrawn any type of support to allow that type of shift to take place. But fortunately, the Federal government had a program in place which these one, two, three, four communities were able to take advantage of. Mr. Chairman, of the more northern communities, and if you count these communities that are sort of mid-north, of the fifty or more communities that could benefit from that type of input, we see at least that four have been able to find developmental assistance through the Federal government and if that Federal government assistance hadn't been there, I am sure these projects would not have got off the ground, because there is no similar type of assistance any longer from this government.

Now Mr. Chairman, the two communities that the program is being completely eliminated in, that I'm familiar with, are the communities of Barrows and Pelican Rapids, and Mr. Chairman, I mentioned the community of Pelican Rapids here a number of years ago, because I was into that

community a month or so after there had been a teenage suicide, and that particular young person was a high school dropout, was unemployed and committed suicide. In order to find out about that suicide, the RCMP interviewed most of the other young people in the community. And they were shocked, and I was shocked to learn from them that a number, in fact a majority of the young people who were out of school and unemployed had responded to the RCMP, "Well, why not? There's nothing here. What's there to live for? Why not commit suicide?" And Mr. Chairman, that was the shocking response of a young population.

Mr. Chairman, we're only talking about 15 clients, 15 opportunities, and if you take the turnover, of course you're talking about more, 15 at any one time in the program, as people finish their training and are able to move on to other educational opportunities or people are able to move on to other employment in fact there are more than 15 employed in those communities over the course of a year as the Minister has already pointed out. But Mr. Chairman, for the communities we're talking about, for the community of Pelican Rapids, where there is very little in the way of economic development activity, where there is very little opportunity, one of the reasons I suppose is that this community does have road access, but it's very poor road access, and the community has been trying for a number of years to get that particular access upgraded, and we were getting close to getting some approval under the NORTHLANDS Agreement for improving that road in there at the time of the change in government.

But Mr. Chairman, there is a few more opportunities in the community of Barrows, where people in fact do drive into Saskatchewan and obtain employment in Saskatchewan and return home on the weekends to the community of Barrows. But Pelican Rapids, being much farther from the border and having a very poor road in there, the people just aren't able to take advantage of other employment opportunities that are some distance from their community. So Mr. Chairman, you're talking about leaving this community that has very few options with one less opportunity for training, one less opportunity for employment. Mr. Chairman, it is beyond me to understand why the member of the Legislature who is supposed to represent these people in those two communities has allowed this to slip by without expressing any concern on the subject at all. The member of the Legislature that represents Pelican Rapids and Barrows has not raised this with the Minister concerned, has not expressed his concern about the effect of even 15 jobs, Mr. Chairman, in these communities, 30 jobs altogether, 15 in Pelican Rapids and 15 in Barrows. I cannot understand why he is not concerned about that type of situation when the communities are so desperate for some opportunity, when many other opportunities have been eliminated by this government and the member sits silently by with this particular operation — opportunity is taken from them, is phased out by the Minister in the change in priorities approach that this government is using.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe that this Minister, our present Minister of Health and Community Services does not understand the relationship we've been talking about on this side of the House. When you eliminate the developmental programs, when you eliminate the opportunities for people to begin to take part in the mainstream of Manitoba life, when you take those opportunities away and the community and individual people in the community then go back into a state of giving up, a state of depression as evidenced by the suicide that I was told about in Pelican Rapids, that there is not an increase in fact, an increased cost to government spending. I cannot believe, Mr. Chairman, that this Minister can not see that relationship. I think he could see that relationship when he was on this side of the House, and I don't think his perspective would have changed that much when he shifted over to the other side of the House. So Mr. Chairman, assuming that the Minister believes that there is a beneficial effect of these kind of programs, and Mr. Chairman, he talked about the figure of 28 percent, which is the percentage of people placed in permanent employment from his comments, I assumed, didn't count those who went on to other educational opportunities. Mr. Chairman, the fact that some of them might have got that employment, left employment and then have gone back again to that employment, because, Mr. Chairman, we've seen that pattern in the north before, that sometimes, from the more remote communities, from the native communities, a person might go out and work for a while, then return home again and then try it again, the third or fourth or fifth time around, establishing a permanent pattern of employment outside of the community, but not establishing that pattern, not being able to make that adjustment in his or her first try at that adjustment.

So Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Minister could understand that and would see the use for this kind of developmental program and would believe the Task Force recommendation or the Task Force report that I've already read to him and which members of this side of the House have been telling the Minister for some time, and in fact the Minister's been saying that he can understand the legitimate and sincere concern of those of us on this side of the House. I'm sure that he understands the point that we are also trying to make. So Mr. Chairman, I can only assume, since I believe the Minister understands that, that the Minister is unable to get his colleagues to understand that. Mr. Chairman, I assume that he is unable to get members like the Member for Swan River

to support him in his efforts to make sure that these very limited opportunities that are still left from all those that have been cut completely, to sit back and allow this one to be cut from 330 clients at one time to 197 or eliminate 133 opportunities, which might affect 200 or 300 people over a year or more.

So Mr. Chairman, I can only assume that the Minister is not effective in getting his point of view across to his colleagues. Mr. Chairman, I was hesitant to make that assumption before, because the Minister seems effective enough in this House, that I would assume that he would be effective with his colleagues in getting worthwhile programs, that he sees as worthwhile, approved. But in the last two days, Mr. Chairman, we have seen the evidence of the Minister's inability to get what he proposes accepted. And, Mr. Chairman, that example, of course, has been the correctional facility at The Pas, where the Minister in fact told us, told the community of The Pas, "We are now ready to proceed. All I need is the decision from my colleagues on the redesign, on eliminating the courthouse portion of that correctional facility and making a couple of other modifications, then we'll be ready to proceed. I will make a decision and we'll announce that decision by March 31st," and then on March 31st that he would announce the decision this Wednesday, communicating that message to The Pas, and then having to come back to this House and say that, "Well, there's been some changes. We have to now go back and come up with a completely new design for that facility." Which, Mr. Chairman, indicates to me that the Minister is not able to get his colleagues to accept his proposals, proposals that he had been working on for a year and a half, he'd been burning the midnight oil on, was unable to get it approved by his Cabinet colleagues. I can assume that the same thing, Mr. Chairman, is happening to the Minister with programs like this.

Because, unless the Minister stands up and tells me that he doesn't believe this kind of training, this kind of employment opportunity to get people into an employment pattern, this kind of counselling service to assist them to make the adjustment from a welfare situation to an employed situation, I cannot believe that he doesn't see the worthwhileness of that. I just can't believe that he would be so naive as not to see the connections between what he says he is trying to do and this kind of program. So I can only assume that he is not able to get his colleagues to understand, or his colleagues to agree, which means that those of us on this side of the House have to start getting after his colleagues, instead of just after this particular Minister, who is not able to get this kind of program accepted. So Mr. Chairman, we see here a drastic reduction in a program to assist people to make an adjustment to move into the mainstream of society, and a program again, Mr. Chairman, which was in the core area of Winnipeg and in the more rural areas where there's a heavy native population, where this kind of fairly intensive program is necessary if people are going to make that adjustment. And yet we see the Conservative government of Manitoba deliberately cutting those programs or reducing those programs and forcing people once again back into a welfare situation. I suppose the other part of the question we could ask to the Minister is the specific welfare payouts in the communities where this program has been reduced. It is the same as we could ask for the specific increase in welfare payouts where a number of other economic development employment programs have been eliminated by this government.

But Mr. Chairman, not only the increase in welfare costs, but the increase in all the others associated social costs, the increase in court appearances, the increase in jail terms, the increase in the calls of police, because these two communities here that I'm talking about do not have a direct police service. They have to call them in from Swan River and they have to go back again, and, Mr. Chairman, the road into Pelican Rapids is so bad that the RCMP a few years ago rolled their car trying to get in to answer a call in that particular community.

And, Mr. Chairman, I can't understand why this Minister would not fight for this kind of program, and I cannot understand why his colleagues would not accept it, if he did fight for this kind of program, and leave it at the kind of funding level it has been in the past, at least to provide a limited number of people the opportunity to get out of the welfare situation and into an employment situation. them in from Swan River and they have to go back again, and, Mr. Chairman, the road into Pelican Rapids is so bad that the RCMP a few years ago rolled their car trying to get in to answer a call in that particular community.

And, Mr. Chairman, I can't understand why this Minister could not fight for this kind of program, and I cannot understand why his colleagues would not accept it, if he did fight for this kind of program, and leave it at the kind of funding level it has been in the past, at least to provide a limited number of people the opportunity to get out of the welfare situation and into an employment situation.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I am also quite concerned about this item, this reduction — it appears that there is a reduction in this item. And my main concern probably is the way the

Minister seemed to indicate that you measure success by those that can be placed on the permanent work force. I think it is much more far-reaching than that, Mr. Chairman, and without wanting to exaggerate, I think that we must realize that we're not dealing here with a bunch of Ph.D.s or people who have all kinds of degrees or are professionals, and so on. We're talking about those people that if something isn't done very soon, are the losers in society. You know, we're talking about the most difficult cases, and there's not that much difference. You know, we're talking about now as if they're either going to work or they're going to go on welfare, there's much more than that, Mr. Chairman. There's much more than that.

I think that there seems to be more kids roaming around now than ever before because there is no work, and many of them haven't got the education, and it's from one step to the next. It might be starting by sniffing glue; vandalism; mugging; and then we go from there, Mr. Chairman. You can blame these kids up to a certain point, but I think society also has a responsibility and has a role to play. You know, the Children's Society is not too interested in taking kids after, what? They're fifteen and a half or so, that's pretty old, about 16 years old, where do those kids go when they are turfed out of their own homes? Maybe drunken parents; drunken brawls, and so on; and they're turfed out on the street and they have very little education and nowhere to go; and, Mr. Chairman, no love, no discipline, nothing. Are you just going to measure that on those that aren't going to work?

I think that even if you had to create more of these jobs, if you aren't going to create what you might call, or what some Conservative Members might say "meaningful", where they can see just the dollars and cents, and you know the profit you make, I think it would still be worthwhile to create jobs just to keep them off the street, if anything. To keep them off welfare, you know, that's not a complete loss, you have to pay welfare; you have to pay so much in the jails, how much do you think it costs to keep somebody in jail? We're getting more muggings.

Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that I'm not the only that saw the program that CBC had last week, or two weeks ago, about the Mafia, and the criminal element, and one that really scared me was the one about motorcycle gangs, those young kids. Some of them are pretty old, but where do they start, they want to belong; they can't belong any other way. There's no discipline, there's no jobs, they're kicked out of their own homes, there's no agencies — how many halfway houses do we have, or a place that they can call their own? They'll meet their friends in jails, or where? You know, I don't want to exaggerate, there are some places that are an awful lot worse than Manitoba, but that's one of the things that is good about staying in Manitoba — certainly, it isn't the weather, it certainly hasn't been the weather this year. I understand that all the civil servants are petitioning the government to have northern allowances the way things are going with this weather.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this is one of the ideas. We haven't got the large cities and maybe some of the problems like in Montreal or Toronto or Vancouver, thank God, but we want to keep it like that — or in the States. You're faced with the richest country in the world, the United States of America, who are the defenders of everybody, they're fighting for freedom — you see that all the time, they're always on the side of freedom — they are helping other countries make peace, or keep peace, and you can't even take a walk at high noon in Central Park, or in New York City, or any of these places; and at 10 o'clock the guards come to the doors and they barricade the hotels like this, because you're afraid of these kind of people.

Well surely we're not going to measure success only by those who might go in and get, as I say, "meaningful jobs". I can't understand why there should be a reduction in this area at all, I think there should be an increase; I think that in the last few years there has been a sincere attempt to move in the direction of creating jobs, of having more people get off welfare; we were trying, it wasn't very popular, Mr. Chairman, with the politicians. We asked the federal government to let us retain that portion of welfare, and that we would create jobs and give some incentive — take the dollar that came from the federal government, the dollar that the provincial government put in to match the welfare people and put in an extra dollar — to have some kind of incentive and create work. I don't think that's bad at all, you know, we are going to have some people who will get up and say, okay, there's the NDP again, they created a movement and look at how much money they lost? But why in the hell do we have to measure every single thing in dollars and cents — cost. You know it doesn't matter what, but it's cost; it doesn't matter if you're right or wrong, but cost. And it doesn't matter if you're humane or not, but it's cost in a climate — what do you call it? — a healthy climate for industry, it doesn't matter if it's right or wrong. It doesn't matter what it does to the human beings.

Well, of course, I'm not naive enough to think that that is not important, but it's not the only thing, Mr. Chairman. It's not the only thing at all. You know, we're talking about the real losers in society now, and we want to measure them the same as we would anybody else; we're talking about kids who have nowhere to go; no jobs; and no education; and these kids become adults, well I'm talking about young adults and I shouldn't have said kids, I'm talking about young adults.

I visited many when I was the Minister responsible, I visited many of these projects, and it was tough. But, you know, there was so much pride there. The administrators went on about the discipline that they were teaching; about the open line, the discussions that took place; the system that they had, the self-discipline. Of course, there were some people who left there and ended up in jail, but for every one that you save from going to jail; for everyone that you save, you might be saving \$15,000, \$20,000 to the taxpayer. \$25,000 I'm told, well then inflation is so fast, I can't keep up with it.

And not only that, it's the cost. What about the cost in tears to parents and in human terms? And what about all of those that don't get caught mugging, and so, the inconvenience that poses those on the receiving end of these muggings, and vandalism. You see all kinds of these things and the first reaction you say those damn kids. And then you take the hard line — bring back capital punishment; take the whip and the paddle out — maybe that's needed, Mr. Chairman. But give them an even break, Mr. Chairman, give them an even break before you pull out the whip and the chains and death penalty, and so on, and you'll see that society will be much richer.

Now, this Minister has an advantage over me, over what I had, he's also responsible for Corrections, and he sees what the cost is. And I'm surprised that he should say, well you know the feds, and if the feds do that well they're wrong — the feds and us we're looking at it and it's not much of a success, there's only 28 percent that find jobs, permanent jobs, especially with the way it is, how difficult. And I'm not blaming the provincial government now; I didn't accept all the blame when I was in government, and I think that's a joke to think that government can stop inflation immediately, especially when you're so close to the States and can create all kinds of jobs. There's so many jobs to go around, that's true, there's certain ways that you can take to promote jobs, but there's a limit to that too, especially when at one time there was one in the family that was earning the livelihood for the family, but now the ladies want to work — and it is their right — and the kids want to work, and they have to keep going because of inflation and in some areas low wages.

So, you know, Mr. Chairman, there's no doubt, I'm not standing here and blaming the government for the mugging and for the Hell's Angels gang, and that kind of stuff, but I think we could do a little more. To think it's easy for us, you know, to say, God I'd like to string this kid up by his heels after what he's done, but do we realize what kind of life these people had, some of them. And those are exactly the type that we're working with. You know, that job is practically a home for them; those projects are a home, not just a job, and some will fail. There's no doubt that some of them will fail — look at our jails — but I think that if you just took a little bit of money instead of . . . you know, we're going down over a million dollars. We're going down, in an area where, if anything, we should increase it, and if you're waiting to say that this \$5 million or \$3 million will make you \$15 million or \$20 million, well don't hold your breath. You're talking about the losers in society.

Maybe this will happen, you'll see some changes, and you'll see some progress, and maybe next year instead of 28 percent it might 30 percent but that's only part of the story. You might keep kids out of jail, as I said, and that can go on fast; just add on 10 percent of those, or 5 percent of those, and then multiply by \$25,000 a year. And then if society could learn, if society felt that there was love and understanding, that the almighty dollar sign wasn't just our almighty God, and that's what it seems to be here.

And I'm not blaming any government. This society is going on worshipping on the alter of the almighty dollar, that's the important thing. And, Mr. Chairman, if somebody can see that society cares instead of just saying, well okay, we're going to bring back the death penalty or we're going to do this, that we look at why these people are like that, they're human beings. You know, they weren't given too much, and maybe society could show that it cares a little bit instead of alienating these adults, and I'm disturbed, Mr. Chairman, that this should be reduced even in a year of restraint, because I think that is false economy. False economy in dollars, if that is our almighty God, but false economy in the human element in the long run with the welfare of all — not only them.

I'd much sooner live in a society where you don't have to lock your doors every time and start getting guards, you know, and there's an awful lot. Look at what's going on — the vandalism is so ridiculous and so meaningless — but those are people who don't know where to strike back. The same kid who will mug an old drunkard and then kick him, because they see a mirror. They see themselves, and they are fighting back, they don't know where to go, and they'll join the Hell's Angels or somebody else, because you know, they get their jackets and their crests and they're part of the family.

Mr. Chairman, you might feel that I'm exaggerating, but I don't think I am that much. I'm not saying that all this existed here, but it will, it will if we keep on following what we think is the new way of doing things now, of just worshipping the dollar and measuring everything and measuring

success and how many dollars we're going to save, or how many dollars we're going to make. And even at that, even at that, Mr. Chairman, it is false economy because the little success that we have is going in the right direction, and that could save a lot of money that we can't see right now.

You know, I won't be able to come here next year and say to the Minister, well, I told you so. You know, there's a million dollars missing, you've got so many more people in the jail. I won't be able to tell him that. But I think that if the Minister looked, he'll have to think that, you know, maybe I'm exaggerating. He may think I'm exaggerating a lot, but there's still a little bit of that is true. Society, that's the name of the game, a job is to earn money to feed your family, to live in some kind of a lifestyle that is at least pleasant. You can have all the dollars, and all the bucks you want in your pockets, if you've got kids that are terrorizing the neighbourhood — like I say, in the United States, this great country that is telling people how to keep peace and how to make peace, and they can't even settle their own things, you can't go in Central Park. You're not safe in Central Park, and anyother place.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'm not trying to say that all the problems of society here should be on the shoulders of the Minister. Right here it is a difficult area. He's not more responsible for that than society is and the rest of us collectively. He's responsible the same as I am, but I think that this is an area now that something could be done, and certainly, certainly the Minister is saying, "You know very well we can't afford it." You know, it's the same thing. We can't afford it, but at least we will keep, we are keeping the programs. The Minister said that on the . . . the last one that I remember was on the day care centre. We've got the best in Canada, and we're going to keep it. Mind you, we're going down, there's less space, but at least he's making, or at least if he's cutting down he doesn't like to admit it because it bothers him. And there's an area that there hasn't been any effort to say, well, we're maintaining this. No, not at all. It's going down, Mr. Chairman, and I would like the Minister to either, unless he's got another program better than this, to replace this program, well then I'll buy this — I'll go along. But if he hasn't got anything better, I would plead with him not to just look at what he thinks is the result of 28 percent efficiency, and to think of what's going on with some of these kids who are the real losers in society, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Chairman, I have not had the opportunity or pleasure of following the Estimates of the Department of Health because, when we have two committees, I've taken in the committee outside this House. But sitting here, listening to the Member for The Pas, and the Member for St. Boniface, for the last half-hour, I'm not rising, Mr. Chairman, to come to the defence of the Minister, and I want to make that abundantly clear, but rather the comments that I heard this afternoon, and on this particular resolution where they're so concerned about a little over \$1,000,000 being reduced in expenditures, and for what it's meant for. We talk about the mentioned work projects in this item.

Now, I'll deal with the Member for St. Boniface first and foremost, that I couldn't help but sit here and wonder whether, in his dialogue, whether he is not speaking and sort of trying to repent, because at one time he was a free enterpriser, and now he's in the socialistic realm there with his colleagues on that side of the House, . . .

MR. BARROW: He saw the light.

MR. EINARSON: . . . and that he's having some concern as to the facts of life that he has to face in society today, and when he talks about the people that, because they don't have work to do, they may end up in jail, or they may end up doing things that are not most desirable, and so on. But, Mr. Chairman, he was part of a government for almost eight years. When he talks about providing jobs, or creating jobs — governments can do so much. I was given to understand on many many occasions where they provided a position for some one to fill and it probably served no useful purpose. They might have spent money paying individual people where there was no productivity, it wasn't an investment. There was no money forthcoming back to the Treasury for what those people did.

You know, Mr. Chairman, what I heard this afternoon is strictly philosophy that they're expounding, and I don't fault them for that. And they are trying to get response from the Minister of Health on this side of the House to respond to that kind of thing. And that's one of the reasons why I rose.

I want to convey my thinking insofar as why we have this item as you see it here this afternoon. And Mr. Chairman, I want to convey to honourable gentlemen opposite where a man who is business

up in the north country — I had a chat with him here' it's not so very long ago — that he applied for workers, ten people to work for him. He had work for ten different people, and I said to him, "How many responses did you get for those ten applications that you wanted people to work". He says, "I got one. I got one response." And the health nurse in the area happened to see his advertisement in the paper, and about a month later, she came to him and she asked him "By the way, sir, I saw your ad advertising to employ people. Something like ten people. How many did you get in response to it?" And he told her, and she was absolutely amazed, Mr. Chairman. To think, she said, because she makes a visit about once a month to the various homes where people are getting welfare, and it amazed her to know that some of those people that were getting welfare could have full well accepted those employment opportunities, but chose, Mr. Chairman, rather to stay on welfare than to accept work.

I've been listening to this, Mr. Chairman. I have not been very active in speaking in this House this session, but I want to say to honourable gentlemen opposite, that they are going on a myth — and it's strictly a myth — when they talk about all the unemployed in this Province of Manitoba. I can say this as well, that we've had in the past, well, eight years that they were in office, they were providing the kind of employment, they thought, to people, and they were not being productive. They weren't providing the service they should have been providing to the country.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, I think that we're justified, and the Minister's justified, possibly, to make a reduction in this particular item, because I fully agree that government can do so much to provide active employment for individuals. But we happen to believe on this side of the House that the private enterprise, the free entrepreneur, given the right climate, is going to do far more in providing the opportunity of employment to people in this province than government. And when this particular gentleman who was in business indicated to me that that's exactly what's happened in the past year and a half, and it's been more encouraging and it's been developing more. But he said, it's a sad day when I ask to hire on, say, ten people, and I only get one response. And, Mr. Chairman, these are the comments that I wanted to make in regards to this Resolution.

The kind of debate that I hear from that side of the House, and it's strictly a myth that both the Member for The Pas and the Member of St. Boniface are trying to convey to the people of this province, that we are responsible. That's almost the impression I gathered, Mr. Chairman. I hope maybe I'm wrong. But I gathered the impression that we are to blame, well maybe not so much from the Member for St. Boniface, but that we are to blame for the reason for the jails being filled as they are, the unemployed that we have, probably sitting at home not doing anything. But I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the ND Party have got a great deal to answer to to the people of Manitoba, and that's exactly what happened in October 11 of 1977, and that was answered to.

I want to say that I have gone around — I want to ask the honourable gentlemen, have you been out to the country?

A MEMBER: That's why they're over there, Henry, and we're over here.

MR. EINARSON: Have you actually gone and talked to business people? Have you talked to people who have given you an example of what I have just given you this afternoon?

A MEMBER: Yes, sir.

MR. EINARSON: Then I'm surprised that you would stand up and debate the way you're debating here this afternoon.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, May I ask the member a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. DESJARDINS: Does the member realize . . . no, not the Minister, the member?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, you're afraid to ask, but you won't even let him . . . You know what? I'll get you later on tonight.

MR. EINARSON: Go ahead and . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, does my honourable friend realize what this item is all about.

We're not talking about welfare. . It is just to help people . . .

A MEMBER: To train people.

MR. DESJARDINS: To train people, that are the real losers in society. And what my honourable friend is saying is absolutely right, and that is what this is trying change, for people to take jobs. This is not a welfare program. Read what your own Minister wrote about this, what this is all about, before you make the kind of speech that you made.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Chairman, I indicated when I first spoke that I had not been following, and I never heard what the Minister said. But, Mr. Chairman —(Interjection)— oh, no, but I'm responding to the tenor of the comments that were made by the Member for The Pas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. The hour being 4:30, and in accordance with Rule 19(2), I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour, and will return to the chair at 8:00 p.m. this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. We are now under Private Members' Hour. The first item is second reading of public bills.

Bill No. 29. The Honourable Member for Inkster is not . . . we'll let that stand.

RESOLUTION NO. 1 — THE RIGHT TO WORK

MR. SPEAKER: The next item is Proposed Resolutions. The Resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster, the Amendment, and the Sub-Amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, which I took under advisement.

In particular, I wanted to read the Hansard of Tuesday, April 3rd, which I have had the opportunity of doing on Page 1889 and 1890. I read very carefully the remarks of the Honourable Member for Kildonan, the remarks of the Honourable Member for St. Johns, and the remarks of the Government House Leader, and I have come to the conclusion that the implementation of the sub-amendment and the wording of that is very very similar to the original motion. And it is my humble opinion that if the amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Roblin was simply negative, that we would accomplish the same thing as the proposal in the sub-amendment.

And I refer the honourable members to the last two lines in the original Resolution: "and urges the implementation of such public and private programs as will ensure that every person in our society seeking employment will have the opportunity of obtaining same." Those were the words of the original motion, and the subamendment moved by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, and the last two lines in his subamendment, "which will ensure that those people in our society seeking employment have the opportunity of obtaining it." I believe that a vote in the negative would accomplish exactly the same purpose as the motion of the subamendment, and amendment out of order. therefore I would have to rule the sub

Are you now ready for the question on the motion of the . . .

The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, we wish to challenge your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained? All those in favour, please say Aye. All those opposed, please say Nay. In my opinion, the Ayes have it.

Are you ready for the question? It is on the resolution moved by the Honourable Member for Roblin to the resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had spoken previously in this debate when I thought we were discussing the right to productive work; the right to an opportunity to earn a living in this society through the productive use of one's abilities, whether it be the use of a working person's hands or whether it be the use of a working person's mind.

Since that time, much debate has flowed back and forth across the House on this very subject, and we seem to have gotten caught up in what I call the "Jabberwocky of right to work". Mr. Speaker, if you are familiar at all with the work of Lewis Carroll, you will know that in Alice in Wonderland, which is a work that must be well known to the members opposite, you will know

that there's a poem in that book that comes to mind every once in a while when we caught up in a debate on something like the Right to Work, because the right to work has many meanings to many different people.

The poem starts out, and I have to preface it by saying that one of the reasons that I particularly enjoy this poem is, that if I mix a word or two or if I confuse the syntax, nobody really knows. It starts out, "Twas brillied in the slivy toes, did dire and damble in the wob." Jabberwocky in the way the Member for St. Vital corrects me and now I'm hesitant to use this poem in the future. The Jabberwocky, according to any analysis of the book of Lewis Carroll is a heated discussion or discourse, and the poem goes on to talk about this Jabberwocky, fortunately for us, the Jabberwocky is slain during the poem, but as the poem is over Alice, the main character in the story, who had been reading the poem said, "Oh, it sounds very pretty, but I don't quite understand what it means."

And that's what it is when we start to talk about Right to Work, Mr. Speaker. The right to work, I talked about when I first entered this debate, did sound very pretty to me. It sounded like a good idea, the right to provide people with economic opportunity, to do productive work. But the members opposite and it started with the backbenchers and sort of qent around and the members opposite have perverted that right to work to mean what they want it to mean. They have played the game of the Jabberwocky, Mr. Speaker, and so now we are caught up with an amendment that sounds very pretty, but like Alice, in Alice in Wonderland, we have to question what it means.

So what I'm going to speak about this time, Mr. Speaker, is the unreal right to work. I remember one of the members opposite, from the government backbenches talkng about hhe real right to work, meaning the right to productive livelihood which left the inference in my mind that the other right to work which we have heard mentioned so often inside and outside this House must be the unreal right to work. And that is a sort of anti-union, union-busting, anti-working person diatribe that has been coming from the Progressive Conservative party and their friends ad infinitum for centuriss now or I guess, that's too far back, let us say for a decades now. —(Interjection)— For centuries? I stand corrected once again in this debate, for centuries —(Interjection)— for generations. Again the Member for St. Vital brings me to my senses.

But let's talk about that Right to Work, let's talk about what they want to throw out as a topic of debate, the anti-union, union- busting smrt of legislation that would bave the tremendously negative impact on the industrial climate in the province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, the Right to Work originally came out of a, I believe it was an advertising agency of which Mr. Taft, one of the authors of the Taft-Hartley Bill had an interest in the 1940s. They coined the phrase "Right to Work." They coined it because it sounded pretty and it was somewhat confusing, and that is why you will that proponentsoof the Right to Work will every once in a while throw out a survey that shows that union members are solidly and substantially supportive of the Right to Work and that people in general are solidly in support of the Right to Work, but in reality, what they are talking about, is the unreal. They are talking about the real right to work, the right to a productive livelihood, because that's how they perceived the phrase.

But what we're talking about now, since the introduction of the amendment by the Member for Roblin is the unreal right to work. And let's see what happens in the United States because we have classic examples of the impact that this sort of legislation has on the working people. Let's see what happens to those people when Right to Work amendments are initiated in their states. Alabama passed a Right to Work law in 1953, Mr. Speaker. At that time, Alabama — it was \$680 below the national average in per capita income, \$680 below in 1953. Mr. Speaker, by 1977 it \$1,397 below — a total loss of \$717 per capita for that state. So the Right to Work in that state, in the state of Alabama has had that sort of impact on the per capita incomes of the people who have to live there. Arizona, Mr. Speaker, passed the same legislation in 1947; it has fallen \$510 below the national average or loss of \$354 since 1947. I'll just give you the figures of the losses, rather than go through the detailed statistics. Arkansas, a loss of \$924 since 1948 when it passed its Right to Work legislation. Florida, a loss of \$85 since 1944 when it passed its Right to Work legislation. Georgia, a loss of \$543 since 1948. Iowa, a loss of \$301 since 1948. Kansas, Kansas gained, Mr. Speaker, it gained \$115.00. In 1958 when it passed its Right to Work law, it was \$30 below the national average and by 1977 it was \$115 above. Louisiana, a loss of 40; Mississippi, a loss of \$1,112; Nebraska, a loss of \$378; Nevada, a gain of \$372; North (sic) Carolina, a loss of \$627; North Dakota, a loss of \$800; North (sic) Carolina, a loss of \$725; South Dakota, a loss \$1,129; Tennessee, a loss of \$748 and I think it's important that I go through the full list, Mr. Speaker. Texas, a gain of \$15 since 1948; Utah, a loss of \$845; Wyoming, a gain of \$512; and Virginia, a loss \$146.00. So we see states that have had Right to Work laws since the early 1940s and the 1950s have by and large, suffered a loss in the per capita income.

Mr. Speaker, the average weekly wages for 1977 for the United States as a total was \$226.89. In the Right to Work states, Mr. Speaker, it was \$203.03 and in the non Right to Work states it

was \$237.00. So we see that the Right to Work states not only suffer a loss in per capita income. Mr. Speaker, these facts are irrefutable. We see that they also suffer a loss in the average weekly wages that the workers are paid in those states, Mr. Speaker. And I might add that the bottom of the states are the Right to Work states.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. DAVID BLAKE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would table the document that he's quoting from that we might have the benefit of those statistics.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Member will have the benefit of those statistics when the Hansard is published and I'd like to continue.

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

MR. BLAKE: Yes, I wonder then if he might indicate to us the author of the document or what document he's quoting from.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm quoting from my notes. I can give him the source of my notes if that's what he cares to . . . the source of the notes is the U. S. Department of Labour, Employment and Earnings, May, 1978. —(Interjection)— Yes, the government House Leader seems a bit shocked that I'm quoting from a U. S. Department of Labour statistics. Well, the reason I'm quoting from that, Mr. Speaker, is the United States gives the most recent example of the economic and socioeconomic impact of Right to Work laws, seeing as how we don't have any provinces in Canada yet, that have Right to Work laws, we only have a couple — we only have a couple that are contemplating them right now. Manitoba is one of those I understand.

Mr. Speaker, the statistics, and I can go on and on with them if the members opposite wish and I would be perfectly happy to, so that they may see the folly of the course that the backbenchers are trying to chart for the government opposite, because in every instance, in every instance the implementation of Right to Work laws in individual states within the United States have resulted in a lowered socioeconomic status for the workers within that province. They have worked directly against the working population of those states.

You know, a federal Progressive Conservative who is also a backbencher I might add, is also trying to chart the course of the federal Conservative Party. One from Manitoba, the Progressive Conservative Member for Selkirk introduced him to the parliament, a Private Member's Bill for the Right to Work. And you know what happened, Mr. Speaker? Well, the same thing happened to him as happened to another backbencher many years previously who had tried to chart the same course. Their own caucus representative, their own Labour critic within the Conservative opposition in the parliament said, "We cannot support this Bill." And it's interesting that this Member for Selkirk just recently has had to withdraw the Bill, and you know the reason he gave for withdrawing the Bill, he didn't quite understand the impact of Right to Work, he didn't quite understand what it was he was suggesting.

I think that can apply just as well to the backbenchers on this side who haven't taken the opportunity or haven't taken the time to fully examine the impact that any sort of anti-labour legislation has, because when you direct an attack of that magnitude and an attack of that nature against the working people of this province, who make up the bulk of this province, you are attacking the province itself, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, almost every rational group outside of the Progressive Conservative caucus and backbenchers, and I should say, well almost every rational group, because I'm not going to include those in that group, have come out in opposition to the Right to Work laws because they know not only are they attacking the working people but they are attacking the provincial economy as a whole. The Civil Liberties Association has come out against the Right to Work laws, the Police Association here in Manitoba has come out against the Right to Work laws, numerous columnists have taken the time to survey the problem have come out against the Right to Work laws. Mr. Speaker, this type of legislation and this type of attitude and what we're talking about now is an attitude. It's interesting that we started out on the resolution from the Member for Inkster talking about something which I consider very commendable, and that was the right to a productive livelihood, and it's interesting that in the course of the debate that the Conservative backbenchers have taken it upon themselves to change the tenor of that debate, to change the whole tone of that debate, to talk about the Jabberwocky the unreal right to work.

Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about in this, is the type of legislation that would have an impact throughout the total working force. The Manitoba Union of Municipalities I believe, came

out with a resolution asking for the government to implement the Right to Work. —(Interjection)— The Member for Ste. Rose says that they don't know what they voted for —(Interjection)— They didn't know. Perhaps they will know after debates such as this take place, and I agree that they didn't know, Mr. Speaker, because if we take their definition and I think what they're asking for, their resolution says, "No person shall be denied the right to work because of age, sex, colour, religion, union affiliation or lack of union affiliation." And they went on to say, "No person shall be denied the right to work at an available job abandoned for any reason by another." And they say, "That no legislation and no provision of any employment contract shall be interpreted so as to restrict or curtail the individual's right to work." Well, when we open Pandora's box of evils, Mr. Speaker, when we delve into what they're really asking for, we see that they're asking for some fairly comprehensive changes in the labour climate within this province. What they're really after, I believe, Mr. Speaker, and it's what the backbenchers are after, are a number of things: one is to outlaw the closed shop in the province of Manitoba, the other is to alter the Rand formula and the right to strike and the right not to handle hot goods. But that's a thin edge of the wedge; if we take the Union of Manitoba Municipalities Resolution as it stands, do you know we have to take out of the legislation most references to overtime pay, because they would deny that under their resolution. Hours and conditions of work, statutory holidays, equal pay provisions, legislation for breaks, coffee breaks and lunch breaks during the workday and any mention of the minimum wage, a topic that is dear to the hearts of the backbenchers opposite. If we followed their resolution, Mr. Speaker, to the extreme — and I admit that I'm following it to the extreme but I'm interpreting it as they stated — it would call for the reintroduction of child labor. If they have their way, it would be legal for an eight year old child to be working 12 hours a day with no breaks whatsoever for whatever wages that the employer decided to give that person.

And you know, Mr. Speaker, that's not so far fetched because those sort of conditions existed. I don't believe they've ever existed under a New Democratic Party government but they have existed under numerous Tory governments in the past. And we don't have to go very far in this world today to see that they do exist today in numerous other jurisdictions, jurisdictions that the members opposite are always complaining that they have to compete with.

Mr. Speaker, I don't really mean to paint a totally black picture of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities. As a matter of fact I don't even want to take any of my remarks to mean that. I honestly don't believe they intended at all what I have just outlined in the past few minutes. But whether they intended it or not, Mr. Speaker, their Resolution would certainly allow for those changes if it did not necessitate them.

And therein lies the problem, Mr. Speaker, a right to work legislation as Alice said before, "It seems very pretty but it's rather hard to understand. Somehow it seems to fill my head with ideas only I don't exactly know what they are." And that's what the Member for Roblin and his colleagues in the backbench and some in the front benches, I'm certain, are trying to do. They are trying to fill the public's heads with pretty ideas but they don't exactly know what they mean, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the representative of the Builders Exchange has made representations to that government in regard to Right To Work laws. Letters under his own signature have stated that he has determined that it is the job of the Builders Exchange to convince the members opposite, the government of the Province of Manitoba that the Right To Work laws are a political asset not a political liability. Those are his words, Mr. Speaker. He has made representations to them and it is obvious that part of their campaign to have Right To Work laws implemented in the Province of Manitoba was that Union of Rural Municipalities resolution. And it is just as obvious, Mr. Speaker, that part of that campaign spearheaded by the Builders Exchange that brought us one of the longest construction strikes in recent history last year, who initiated it by their trying to implement Right To Work laws at the contractual level to the collective bargaining system and they failed that. So now they are calling upon the government to do their dirty work for them. And it is obvious that they have succeeded — they have succeeded in convincing some members opposite that indeed it is a political asset and not a political liability.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me just use the last few moments I have to warn them that if they do implement or decide to implement even the most tame of Right To Work legislation they will be creating a labour climate in the Province of Manitoba that will result in devastation and will result in increased conflict of a nature that we haven't seen for many many years.

Just this last year, Mr. Speaker, under the first full year of their reign, strikes, days lost to strikes and lockouts in this province were 1,000 percent more that they were the year previous and they will continue that pattern if they start fooling around, Mr. Speaker, with this sort of very dangerous, but very pretty sounding resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, as a New Democrat, as a working person, and as a social democrat, I intend fully

to do my utmost to help turn that campaign around on them. I intend to do my utmost to help save them from their own fouling. We, and I am speaking as a working person, we must show them, show the Tories, show the voters of Manitoba that the jabberwocky, the Right to Work, that they are trying to foist upon and fool the people with is not political expediency but it is political suicide. And, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that we will do so and that we will finally have slain the jabberwocky that the Member for Roblin has thrust across the floors at us.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, when the Member for St. Matthews was speaking on the Resolution some time ago he prefaced his remarks by saying that he was going to make a speech in defense of capitalism. I was prompted at that time to respond but I was pre-empted but nevertheless I think it is necessary to put on the records some views that capitalism, whether it is state or private, really isn't in the interest of people. And when the members opposite try to paint the picture that the group on this side are state capitalists which is communism where the state has to own everything then they never substantiate the case. Because the amendment which is amended puts into place an alternative of private or public, it doesn't say either way.

The other day, Mr. Speaker, when I was speaking I went around the room and I talked about the symbolism in this room and I was prompted to remember it last night when I happened to watching a documentary on Channel 3, a cable television public television from south of the border, and it dealt with the case of the Mau Mau. And how western civilization had really done a disservice in propagandizing a particular point of view that they pointed out at the time there was about 32 white people killed and 15,000 black people killed. But really the struggle was all about trying to change the economic situation in that country.

In an earlier debate today we had an accusation from the Member for Rock Lake that we were talking philosophy relative to an item that is under consideration in Committee. And when we get down to it, Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis everything we do is relative to some philosophy. And here we have another manifestation of the, what I call, the regressive preservative philosophy because they are neither progressive nor are they conservative, at least in my understanding of the term. Their conservatism was primarily based on the systems, the institutions that have evolved since leaving the trees have some reason for being some *raison d'être* and we should look at these institutions to see why they exist. But it doesn't preclude change. There are some advantages in these institutions but we should continually review it. As I recall the evolution of the Progressive Conservative Party that was supposed to be their main thrust. In fact in the prior Conservative administration prior to 1969 they showed some progressive thought in that they changed the name of the Department of Health and Welfare to Health and Social Development and had started to implement plans to address themselves to some of the social needs of the province. But nevertheless we get it pointed out to us in no uncertain terms that this particular group of people who became elected in October of 1977 have thrown all of that philosophy out the window.

History will show that the private sector cannot by itself provide work. Now we are talking about the Right To Work and I will also confess, Mr. Speaker, that sometimes I go out but nevertheless everything in the universe is causally related and I will try and demonstrate that this amendment to an amendment which would give an alternative is not providing a Right To Work because if you don't provide work, it's a meaningless phrase. How are we going to provide work? We have suggested that it be done both in the private and the public sector.

Let me go back just a bit. In the Depression of the 1930s the admonition of Roosevelt at the time people keep voting it but the only thing people have to fear is fear itself. They really didn't get out of that way of thinking until the public sector moved in. The savings in the banks that were at an astronomical rate in relative terms but it took the state to move in and set up CCC camps and the rest of it until they could get people back into a productive way of doing things and as they wound those things up they also put in place a system of winding it down which had started to take effect just prior to the Second World War in 1939.

But, Mr. Speaker, I don't think we can avoid discussing the difference in philosophy between that side of the House and this side of the House when we are talking about the Right To Work. The Member for Rock Lake earlier today made the case that somebody in the North had ten positions available and he made it known that he had ten positions available but he had only one person apply for the job.

In another debate in the House we had talked about a very simple operation in the north where people had over two or three years developed the work habits of peeling logs and making fence posts out of them. And they started off trying to inculcate the people with the work habits that most of us in this House think that we are fortunate to have. I think I am fortunate that I was raised in a culture where we learned to get up, we learned to take care of ourselves, we learned

to produce, go to work even when we didn't feel like it and some of us sometimes were under-the-weather a little bit now and again, Mr. Speaker, but nevertheless we learned these habits. But yet how can we continually criticize those people who were ignored by our culture and I don't want to go back in history and see how stupid we were in signing treaties with the Indians in which we'd give them \$5.00 a year, gave them reservations where you couldn't grow anything and just expecting them to die off or integrate. But in North America, not just in Manitoba, we were faced with that as a reality. That is what happened.

So how do you address yourself to this problem of providing work for these people and then helping them to develop the work habits necessary. It wasn't just true in Manitoba relative to the native people, it was true south of the border relative to black people. Now I don't believe in using scare tactics but jiminny gosh, Mr. Speaker — that's why I mention symbolism — the history of the world is such that we can no longer ignore the need to help people to develop work habits. Those people that haven't got them. We have to help them develop work habits. If we have to help them to develop work habits then we have to develop places for them to utilize that habit. And you just say that the private sector is going to do this, it's just begging the question. It doesn't really make any difference to me who does something. In fact, I said in one address one of the regrettable parts is with some people in the private sector, I said if you don't the government will. So that if anyone in the private sector wants to come along and put their money into something, develop something and they make a dollar, it is no sin to make a dollar in my judgment, that's fine. But nevertheless what if they want? Are we supposed to just close our mind, leave people unemployed, let things fester? This amendment destroys the idea as presented by the original motion that we as a society have to muster all of our resources to provide places for people to work.

I said earlier in this House and it's a way out, you know everybody in Manitoba or in isolation thinks that nothing can happen here. The situation in Iran as I said developed out of economic deprivation, the system in Northern Ireland is economic deprivation, the system in Israel is economic deprivation relative to the Palestinians, all over the world you are talking about economic deprivation. And a couple of the newer members, you know, if there's anybody is adding to the class struggle, it's the regressive, preservative position which is best epitomized by the First Minister of this province. Don't be silly, the Member for Pembina says. You know, I really miss the former Member for Pembina, Mr. Chairman, because he was one of the most concerned people as a human being in this House from either side. And if you needed help with something, you'd go to him and he'd be the first man to step in to give some help to anybody.

But Mr. Chairman, they close their minds, they close their minds to anything except the private sector. And this right to work thing, this right to work thing. They talk about unions. I've been on both sides of that particular fence, as an employer and as an employee, and I personally come from an old school, that I was brainwashed with the idea an honest day's work for an honest day's dollar. And if I was working for any member on the other side of the House, I'd expect to produce that, and if I didn't then they'd can me and I'd understand.

But nevertheless, we come down to the basic again, the right to work. For what? For the minimum wage that they can't even support their families on? Because if there's anything that adds to social unrest, if there's anything that adds to, as the Member for The Pas mentioned earlier today, the suicide rate, it's the lack of hope. It's the lack of an opportunity. It's fine for all us nice WASPS to run around in this country and say, "Ain't we got it good?" but I had an Indian ask me, he knows me well enough that he can ask me these questions, he says: "I understand that your ancestors were starving in the ditches in Ireland and you decided to come to this country. Well, what God gave you the right to come over here and draw little lines on my property and say it's yours?" I've also had him ask me questions, "Why are you people preoccupied with the dispute between the Israelis and the Palestinians when you haven't settled your land claims with us in the last hundred years?" We're talking about the social development of people. We're talking about giving them opportunities to enjoy what we enjoy. So that if we just rely on one sector, we lock ourselves into one sector, we're not doing our job.

And Mr. Chairman, I would implore members of this House, I don't know how the amendment came about. I don't think that this should be a far right wing or a far left wing thing. I think that the proposition which was presented, that we rely on all our instrumentalities; we rely on the private sector and we encourage the private sector, and I don't make any bones about supporting the idea as put forth by your Minister of Economic Development, that we're going to give \$30,000 to some people in the private sector to start a new business. Fine. Good. We give money to farmers to support them in industries, such as the sugar beet factory out here. When people didn't grow sugar beets we got the farmers together, we helped the farmers develop their expertise, we provided the right to work for a number of people through the instrumentality of public funds, to come down and just try to make this back in the right to work, a purported by some people as an instrument

in union busting, I think begs the whole issue. And I think the members of this House should be above that sort of thing and we should go back to the amendment should defeat this amendment and go back to the original concept, that in this day and age, I think Manitobans should demand of Progressive Conservatives, of Liberals, of New Democratic Party people, that important issues like that you bury this silly argument, left, right, left, right, left, right, which leads us nowhere, Mr. Speaker.

We've put in place, as best we can, with our limited resources in this province, the places for people to work. That will give them the right to work. And we also deal with the problem of helping people learn how to work. So I would ask members, reach out, as a challenge to members opposite, especially the backbenchers who are younger than I am and will have to deal with this problem down the road. And if we don't start now, we're going to have to pay the consequences of it later.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I was motivated to speak, mainly because I listened to the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre and was impressed, and very much impressed, with what he had to say and how he put it, clearly and succinctly and in such a way that one can really not quarrel with what he said, as far as I can see. But the fact is, I suspect that the Member for Roblin when he moved his motion of amendment, did so on behalf of the caucus of which he is part and that the Conservatives are prepared to continue to refuse to state how they feel about certain matters, what they intend to do, what is their attitude of issues that affect the people of Manitoba. That is their concern.

The amendment is a farce, and believe is intended to be a farce. The amendment emasculates any attempt to present a positive attitude to the problems of encouraging opportunities to work, and the Member for Winnipeg Centre did so clearly expose the intent of the amendment and therefore I think, conclusively, the attitude of the government of the day and of its supporters behind it. Early this afternoon I had occasion to bring to the attention of the First Minister the report of the Task Forces, social problems which was presented to the government yesterday. He hadn't read it, I don't fault him for it. But I brought to his attention the fact that they state that this government embarked on a policy of restraint without setting out its guidelines in any way. It did not enunciate its purpose. It did not enunciate the factors which would influence it to do as it did. I shouldn't have said that it did not enunciate its purpose, it did. Its purpose was to reduce government expenditure, its purpose was stated to be that and that only, but its intent, I believe, was to reduce government activity in those areas which were really designed to help people fulfill themselves in a positive way, help people adjust to a society which was a pretty tough one, and which were designed to assist them to become productive.

That I believe was the intent of the government, but its stated purpose was just to reduce the involvement of government in the programs which it inherited and which it was pledged to destroy and is now destroying. That's why I raised it. I knew very well, Mr. Speaker, that the First Minister would use the opportunity to rehash the old accusations he made, which I believe have proven to be unfounded. I gave him every opportunity to talk about the debt that was inherited, to talk about the extravagance of the program, I gave him that opportunity because I knew that for him it was playing an old record. I believe, Mr. Speaker, if all you do is prod him awake in moments when he is sleeping or dozing, that he would immediately get up and say the same things again without even knowing what he was saying, because it is so much a part of what he has been saying for the last number of years, when he decided to leave the public sector and go to work again for the public sector and be involved as an employee of the people through the public instrument of government. And he's been saying it so long, he continues to say it, but what he has refrained from saying is, how does one deal with it? He has stated openly and often that the government must become uninvolved. We have in this resolution, the resolution that's now before us, stated that we need private involvement. And the word used is program. Public and private programs that will ensure that every person in our society seeking employment will have the opportunity of obtaining same.

Mr. Speaker, I was about to say, Progressive Conservative Party, and I must admit that every time the Member for Churchill used the expression "Progressive Conservative", I was prompted to laugh, because I think that the present government is proving how foolish Mr. Bracken was when he stipulated, "If you want me as a leader, you will have to change your name to Progressive Conservative". It was amusing then, and I suppose it's embarrassing now, but I do remember when the Conservative Party was wooing Mr. Bracken to come and lead them, he having been, I guess — what was he, a farmer — Farmer's Party, and then he was the leader of the Liberals and as our party and his forerunners have often stated, they're both of the same cut and the same ilk to a large extent, except that in the past one has been in government and the other has been

out of government, and then they would reverse these roles every so often to give the people the illusion that they were indeed changing things in a dramatic way, but people like Mr. Bracken proved that his policies as a leader and premier of a farmer-Liberal government were perfectly acceptable to the Conservative Party and part of the Conservative Party's attitude was perfectly acceptable to him, except for the name. That he thought would make it all fine. When he was leaving — I guess it was the Liberal-Progressive Party at the time left it, maybe he was responsible for changing its name — but apparently he thought if you take the word "progressive" and you attach it to the word "conservative", that makes it okay.

So with great amusement those of us who remember those days look at these gentlemen who are constantly now negating the word "progressive" by the attitudes that they have and which are exemplified by this amendment we have before us, which takes out of the resolved portion of the resolution all possibility of showing that indeed it is a progressive party, a Progressive Conservative Party that is involved in the government of this province at this time. They removed it, and by removing it they are even afraid to recognize that public and private programs are necessary to ensure this kind of opportunity for employment we've talked about. They themselves have enunciated that they believe in public programs. Why they're proud of it. Was it only yesterday that the Minister for Economic Affairs talked about their grant program to stimulate employment? —(Interjection)— Well, it was a welfare program to the private enterprise, but still it was public program. Government was getting involved in saying to businesses that couldn't make it on their own, private enterprise, couldn't make it on their own, "we will subsidize you, we will give you the welfare you need to try again and again to make it on your own". That's a public program. And they obviously supported the private program by doing that very thing, stimulating private enterprise.

Why they should fear the expression of adopting the implementation of such public and private programs as will ensure that every person in our society seeking employment will have the opportunity of obtaining same, why they fear that is beyond me. It was suggested already that they don't know what they're talking about so they're afraid that what they would do is to put themselves into the awkward position of supporting something that they don't understand. But it's very clear, Mr. Speaker, who could really vote against us? Not the Member for Roblin. I just earlier today, re-read his speech on this resolution, and I realized that he didn't know what was wrong with the resolution as it stood, but he knew that he couldn't support it because it might be — and this, I'm saying — an embarrassment to him and his colleagues. So he said: "Well, let's save them embarrassment; let's emasculate this resolution so that we cannot be accused of voting for something that the NDP sponsored," so he said, "Let's just say that we approve of the principle, the right to work", and then, what did he talk about? He talked about not working. He talked about lock-outs; he talked about strikes; he talked about man days lost because of failure to arrive at agreement on negotiations; that's what he talked about. He talked real about the right not to work and, Mr. Speaker, there may well be the need to enforce the right not to work, because working as one may have to work under the kind of legislation that the Member for Churchill talked about is a real danger.

So, Mr. Speaker, to me it's laughable that they have to go through this exercise of removing what would be embarrassing to them and that is, support of an NDP statement, which they really could not deny. There is really nothing whatsoever wrong with it except — and this is important, Mr. Speaker, — except that this government has embarked on a policy which they call restraint, but which is a destruction of efforts made in previous years to assist people to acquire the ability as well as reach for the opportunity of obtaining work of a fulfilling nature.

You know, Mr. Speaker, one of the expensive programs that the NDP government was promoting — and I say it expensive advisedly in terms of the individual benefited — was the mature student program, and especially the program, the name of which escapes me, but I am sure one of my colleagues will remind me of, where we took people to Brandon; where we instituted a program through the University of Brandon, which took people —(Interjection)— the IMPACTE Program; I thank my colleague, and the BUNTEP Program, which was expensive per capita, Mr. Speaker, but made it possible for people of the intelligence and the intellectual capacity to acquire skills, to have that opportunity, even though they might be considered to be so far advanced that they were lost cases. And they took people who were in their 30's with a Grade 7 or Grade 8 education, and in their 40's, and they made it possible for them to go to professional schools in this province. That's a tremendous achievement, Mr. Speaker. In total, it was a drop in the bucket compared to the entire budget of government, but per capita, it was costly, But, Mr. Speaker, it made it possible for some people to look up and say: "The sun may also shine on me; it's possible", and that's very important, but this government, through it's — what they called restraint program, and using those already hackneyed expressions used by the First Minister — destroyed that kind of a reaching out effort which made me proud of my government.

Many things that our government did, did not make me proud. Many things that our government did was following the leader, very often a conservative provincial progressive measure. I recall several occasions where we were a little later than some of the Ontario or Alberta measures that were brought in to bring in the same kind of progressive legislation, but nevertheless, it was worthwhile, progressive, and helped people who wanted to work to learn to adjust to it.

But this government, with this practice, with this policy, is destroying those opportunities. And I regret very much, that not only are they doing that and getting away with it so far — we on this side are doing our best to expose it — but they haven't got the courage to come back to that Task Force on social problems and say: "We admit what we're doing", or "We don't admit it, but we are enunciating a policy in the following way". They are not enunciating the policy and therefore I took the risk when I asked the First Minister a question this afternoon, that he would answer me in some way that would be self-serving for him. I took that risk knowing he would do it but hoping he would have the intellectual integrity to say: "Yes, we have yet to spell out where we are going, where we want to go".

That has not been spelled out why the Minister of Health protests throughout all his Estimates, "Why, we're not damaging anything; we're not hurting anybody; we are doing those things which are possible to be done without damaging the program," and he has himself failed to enunciate any principles or policies which indicate not only what they're doing, but when they will change it, when they will try to do something that will be of help to the people of Manitoba, whenever they reach that wonderful stage when they will say: "We have achieved that which we wanted to accomplish by our restraint".

I predict, Mr. Speaker, they won't do it until just before the election, when suddenly, they will find that they have cured all the ills, they have prepared everything. Well, they are now in a position that if re-elected, they will be able to come back and bring in all those things which they have been destroying in these first couple of years. They are hoping, and they may be right, that people will forget what they have done, the drastic, ruthless, heartless way with which they've dealt with people, fired . . . the Minister of Tourism has come in here and I would like to recall to her how her Deputy Minister of Labour was fired. I want to recall to people, the ruthlessness with which they dealt with people, and they're hoping it will be forgotten, so that before the next election, they'll say: "Well, the Task Force on social problems asked us for questions. . . ." —(Interjection)— The Minister of Tourism is going to join in the debate and I will welcome that, Mr. Speaker. If I could rest assured that she will participate, I would be happy, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that she will indeed do so. With all her experience in the Department of Labour, I would think, Mr. Speaker, that she will have a great. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The hour being 5:30, I am leaving the Chair, the House will return at 8:00 o'clock. When this item next comes up, the Honourable Member for St. Johns will have three minutes left.