



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

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

28 Elizabeth II

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



VOL. XXVII No. 46A

2:30 P.M. Tuesday, April 24, 1979

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, April 24, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery where we have 15 students of Grade 9 standing from Bruce Junior High School under the direction of Mr. Head. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, the Minister of Economic Development. On behalf of all honourable meers, we welcome you here this afternoon.

Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. ABE KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, has directed me to report same and asks leave to sit again. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin, that the report of committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table a Return to an Order of the House No. 3, dated March 31, 1978, entered by the former Honourable Member for Rossmere and a Return to an Order of the House, No. 4 dated March 31, 1978, again entered by the former Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make two announcements regarding the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce the introduction of a new program of provincial assistance to non-profit housing corporation projects. The new provincial program has been necessitated by changes in the financing of such projects by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation under the terms of the revised National Housing Act. Under the CMHC's new program, non-profit organizations may qualify for full benefits of an interest write-down subsidy if they are able to provide 10 percent equity. The new provincial program provides for capital grants equal to 5 percent of the total cost of the new non-profit projects so that the organizations will only have to provide 5 percent of the equity requirements and will be better able to qualify for the full value of CMHC's interest write-down subsidy.

The second component of the new Provincial Assistance Program is a special Rental Supplement Program to provide on-going provincial subsidies to tenants of new non-profit housing projects who would not be able to afford the rent on the basis of CMHC's subsidy alone. The provincial assistance will be paid on behalf of qualified low-income tenants to bring their rent levels down to 25 percent of their income. MHRC will be providing funds for up to 300 units per year under this program. The introduction of these programs, Mr. Speaker, should be taken as an indication of our government's commitment to reviving the principle of private non-profit, community and volunteer sponsored and managed developments in place of massive direct government involvement which had come to replace that principle in recent years. I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that this program, in concert with the array of other MHRC programming, will go far to assist the shelter needs of

low-income Manitobans, particularly our senior citizens, for whom it is primarily intended to benefit. Mr. Speaker, the second one is the Mobile Home Loan Guarantee Program. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce the introduction of a new program of housing assistance to the low and moderate income families in Manitoba, the Mobile Home Loan Guarantee Program. Mr. Speaker, the mobile homes have long been recognized particularly with new, modern building standards and techniques of production to be a valid alternative for the provision of highquality shelter at reasonable cost.

However, for financing purposes they have always been treated in the context of chattel as opposed to real property mortgages. As a result, units which are good quality in themselves and priced much lower than equivalent conventional housing units have required high monthly payments on the part of their owners because financing has only been available for shorter mortgage terms, usually 15 years or less and at the consumer loan interest rate of up to 15 percent.

Under our new program, benefits will now be available to mobile home purchases which are similar to the benefits available to purchasers of conventional housing in financing those purchases. The Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation will guarantee to private lenders the repayment of mobile home purchase loans made at an interest rate and amortization terms which are comparable to the terms of conventional mortgage loans.

By way of example, Mr. Speaker, a purchaser of a mobile home will have their monthly payment reduced by as much as \$65.00 to \$70.00 per month from what they would have been under in previously existing methods of mobile home financing.

This program, Mr. Speaker, the first of its kind in Canada should further serve to demonstrate the commitment of the provisions of the affordable housing alternatives for Manitoba through the utilization of private sector resources as opposed to taxpayers' money in the most efficient and effective manner possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House welcome these announcements because so little has been done in the whole area of Housing for the last 18 months that even this bigger crumb is welcome.

We do have some problems, however, with the limited extent of these announcements with respect to housing in that they will come nowhere near to meeting the problems that exist for people with respect to the acquisition of affordable housing.

The program with respect to the non-profit housing sector is important although I caution the extent to which we are departing from the principle here in that previously many non-profit organizations were involved in sponsoring and managing non-profit housing corporations, and sponsoring and managing housing projects under the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. What we appreciated was the management input and the ongoing concern of these non-profit entities, be they religious, community oriented, or what. Now, the problem with the federal program is that it doesn't want these non-profit entities only for their management input, it wants them to put up 10 percent of the equity and it's transferring that function from itself onto the citizens at large and that's a regressive step, and I am sorry that the Minister wasn't able to fight this regressive step with the federal government because it is a step backwards.

However, reducing the equity requirement of a non-profit entity from 10 percent to 5 percent is a step in the right direction. I would have hoped however that this government would have reduced the equity requirement of a non-profit entity that is based in a community, that wants to manage a project from 10 percent to zero, because what we want is their management input and we want their overriding concern on the delivery of the service. We think that the capital facility can be provided by the public. So we think that this is a step in the right direction reducing the equity requirement from 10 percent to 5 percent. We think however that there will be still some hardship on the part of non-profit entities in pulling together that 5 percent equity to construct a capital facility. We would prefer having the non-profit entity concentrating its effort on the management and the delivery of service for housing for the people.

With respect to the Mobile Home Loan Guarantee Program, this is filling a gap that exists and again that's a welcome thing. However, I think that the Minister does not explain fully why up to now the private sector has not been trying to provide financing at more competitive rates for the purchase of mobile homes. It seems outlandish that up to 15 percent interest rates were being charged for the purchases of mobile homes and it would strike me that this program provides only a guarantee to the private sector and it lets them off the hook. Surely we could have negotiated with the private lending institutions so that they would follow the practice that is undertaken with respect to non-insured mortgages in the private sector for conventional homes and that is that the interest rate is only about 1 percent or a 1/2 percent of a point higher than the mortgage interest

rate for insured mortgages. So I am afraid that although this is meeting a gap I'm afraid that it might be too permissive with respect to the private sector and I would have hoped that the Minister would have negotiated more forcefully with the lending institutions in order to have them reduce that interest rate without having to have the Crown guarantee these loans by the private lending institutions which right now are indeed taking on no risk at all, whatsoever, when they provide loans for mobile home purchases.

These are small steps. They come nowhere near to meeting the large housing problems that exist still in Manitoba. The subsidies for 300 units per year is nowhere near enough but it is a step in the right direction and we will be pressuring the Minister and this government to ensure that there are more steps taken to meet the housing needs of all Manitobans.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I would like to distribute the advertising promotion campaign kits that we have given out to the Tourism industry yesterday and today. I thought that the members of the House would be interested in seeing what our department is planning for the coming year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines, Resources and Environment.

HON. BRIAN RANSOM (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the April 24th Flood Report prepared by the Water Resources Division of my department and, by way of elaboration if I might bring the honourable members up to date on recent events, Mr. Speaker, the information contained in the material which I have just tabled, is based on information processed as of 5 o'clock yesterday afternoon, so it does not include the over-night rainfall in the predictions and you will note from the tables that even prior to that rainfall that levels are predicted to be very close to the 1950 levels in the Red River Valley.

The decision was taken this morning to begin evacuation of hospitals and senior citizens homes in the Valley and warnings and advisories have been issued to the farmers living outside of diked areas in the Valley, advising them of the necessity to have livestock removed and to make plans for their own safety as well.

The First Minister and the Minister of Highways and Transportation, the Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Attorney-General, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, are now in the area meeting with municipal officials involved. I believe the meeting was planned to take place in Morris. They would be advising all municipal officials of the latest information and some joint decision would be taken, Mr. Speaker, on a possible requirement for evacuation from towns in the Valley.

There is no concern, Mr. Speaker, for the possibility of failure of the ring dikes on the Valley towns but there is the possibility that those dikes might be overtopped by levels of water that are now anticipated, and there is also concern for the isolation of these towns, the problems that would be faced by way of water supplies, sewage systems, supplying food to the area, etc. All those factors will have to be taken into consideration in the decisions now being made by municipal officials and members of the government.

I would also say that the Winnipeg Floodway, the capacity of the floodway is not anticipated to be strained in any way by the volumes of water that are expected now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I once again thank the Minister for keeping us up to date with regard to the developments concerning the problems that were experienced with water in the Province of Manitoba. I also indicated to the minister on the few other occasions that he made announcements, the previous two occasions that he can expect to receive where we are able to do so, co-operation from the members of this side of the House relative to any assistance that could be given, in particular I may want the minister to call on opposition members when he feels that there is something that can be done in this connection.

I do, Mr. Speaker, wish to put to the minister the following problem, and that is that the flood forecasting reports up until approximately two weeks ago, did not appear to indicate any great magnitude of flooding and I realize that those reports are always subject to the weather conditions that would prevail, but I wonder whether the minister wouldn't, when he has moments to do so, see whether there was any problem with flood forecasting this year because certainly problems, such as dykes over-topping could be dealt with if there is sufficient flood forecasting. When we are dealing about water going over the dykes, it merely is a problem of in advance having that kind of information to be able to deal with it.

The Minister of Finance says rainfall is one of the contingencies that can be taken into account in flood forecasting. And if your flood forecast is suggesting that you're going to be close to the top, then rainfall as a contingency would cause a reasonable person to prepare and have higher dyking in those areas. I'm not intending to be critical, I'm asking the minister whether he can see why the flood forecasting which we received, and I'm going by memory and if I'm wrong I wish to be corrected, but I can think about two weeks ago there was no indication of any magnitude in the Red River Valley. We are now talking about levels of 1950 and more, and I think that that is quite a difference from the prediction, despite rainfall.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might have the indulgence of the House to revert to the previous place on the Order Paper, Presenting Reports by Special Committees. Can I have that? The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. DON ORCHARD: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Committee on Economic Development.

MR. CLERK: Your Committee met on Tuesday, April 24, 1979, to consider the Financial Statement of McKenzie Steele Briggs Seeds.

Messrs. R.A. Clement, Q.C., Chairman of the Board of Directors, and Mr. William Moore, General Manager of McKenzie Steele Briggs Seeds, provided such information as was required by members of the Committee with respect to the Company.

The Financial Statement of McKenzie Steele Briggs Seeds was adopted.

MR. ORCHARD: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield that Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. DAVID BLAKE (Minnedosa) introduced Bill No. 41, An Act to amend An Act to incorporate United Health Services Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we go into Oral Questions, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my right, where we have 22 students of Grade 11 standing from the River East Collegiate. This school is in the constituency of Rossmere. On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here today.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Mines. Can the Minister indicate what effect the rainfall of last evening and this morning has upon his forecast and what effect continued rain of this magnitude will have on his flood forecast?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the precise information is not yet available in that the information had not been collected in terms of how widespread the rainfall was last night and to the extent of the amount of precipitation. Data had not been collected and put through the formula for calculating the effect that it would have on the levels, but we can say that in a very approximate way, that an inch of rain would result in another foot, perhaps, on the peaks that are there now. So the information which I distributed shows that many points in the Valley are at the 1950 level now. There is no question that the amount of rain which fell last night is going to push those predictions beyond that, but the precise figures are not yet available.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Mines would be able to confirm that the sandbags that were being brought into Manitoba from the United States were held up for some two hours at the border, and if he can so confirm that he could provide the House with the reasons

for the difficulty.

MR. RANSOM: I can't confirm that, Mr. Speaker. All I can confirm is that the sandbags that were coming in by truck have, in fact, come in and are being distributed and provisions are being made to bring in even greater supplies, some by air and some by truck.

MR. PAWLEY: Could the Minister of Mines indicate where the Ministers are at the present time that are presently involved with investigating the flood situation and meeting with municipal officials?

MR. RANSOM: The meeting, Mr. Speaker, was being held in Morris. The Ministers left here by helicopter to go to Morris and another two helicopters, I believe, were being used to bring the municipal officials from their respective areas into Morris to have a meeting there sometime between 12:00 and 1:00, I believe.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, since the Minister of Mines seems to be knowledgeable about this visit by the four members of the Treasury Bench, may I ask him to inform us whether members of the news media and possibly the absent television camera accompanied the Ministers?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I can't account for the absent television camera but I can advise the honourable members that a number of press people did accompany the group to Morris.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question. In view of the indication by this side of the Houses of us wishing to assist the government in dealing with the flood emergency, in view of the Minister of Transportation's indication yesterday I think it was, that there would be occasions when the Leader of the Opposition or other people from the Opposition would be enabled to accompany the visits to the flood areas, whether the Minister can justify having room for members of the press, a number of them, as he says, to accompany them on this emergency program and not have room for the Leader of the Opposition to accompany them?

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Honourable Minister of Transportation yesterday said that he would arrange for the Leader of the Opposition and perhaps other members from that side to have an opportunity to tour the area and to see the situation firsthand and I have advised the Leader of the Opposition that we expect to be able to arrange that tomorrow for him. The present situation, Mr. Speaker, was one where it was felt advisable that members of the government should go to Morris to meet with members of municipal councils there rather than bring the municipal people into Winnipeg as we did on Sunday morning. That is done because of the urgency of the situation that faces the municipal people and we wish to limit the amount of time that we take them away from their very important role that they are playing in fighting these floods.

The press people, of course, or the media people are simply being provided with an opportunity to see the situation firsthand and to report that firsthand to the people of the province. We will be making, as we said, the provision for the Leader of the Opposition and perhaps one or two other members opposite, as we may have some of our own members who wish to see the situation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, whilst commending the government for planning to have a meeting with the municipal officials at a location and in a manner that would take up the least amount of their time away from their tasks, is the Minister suggesting that the opportunity given to the press to see what is happening is one that they give them a priority over the Leader of the Opposition who also has a very great stake in knowing and assisting in what is going on? Is he therefore recognizing the press as having a prior right to view than does the Leader of the Opposition?

MR. RANSOM: We are simply recognizing, Mr. Speaker, that the media people have a particular role to play in reporting the circumstances. We have said to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that we will provide an opportunity for him to go and we will do that. Now it happened that yesterday, Mr. Speaker, when the First Minister and the Minister responsible for Emergency Measures Organization had planned to go and have a firsthand look at the situation, there were other priorities that were placed upon the machines at that time and the First Minister was not able to go. Mr. Speaker, we are attempting to handle this situation in an efficient manner and make the best use of the equipment that is available. We have provided the Honourable Leader of the Opposition with

the assurance that he will have the opportunity to go and observe the situation firsthand and we intend to provide that.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: And there will be a fifth, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Minister seems to indicate that there was not enough room for the Leader of the Opposition and that there will be an opportunity made. It seems then that the Minister is planning a selective tour for the Leader of the Opposition to see but that actually when the press was able to go today, there was not enough room for the Leader of the Opposition and in spite of yesterday's invitation and in spite of the statement made by the opposition house leader that we wanted to participate in dealing with the matter of the flood emergency and in dealing with making it clear to the people of Manitoba that the effort is a joint effort, that we are all concerned with it in a non-partisan way, the Minister has not yet justified to my way of thinking the refusal to take the Leader of the Opposition today to Morris to have an opportunity to see what apparently he and the government felt was important for the media to see.

The Minister of Economic Affairs seems to suggest that the media are more important for the people of Manitoba than the Leader of the Opposition. I must ask the Minister of Mines whether he accepts the priority given to media people over that of the Leader of the Opposition.?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the Minister of Economic Development seems to suggest that the media are more important than the Leader of the Opposition. I was not on my feet but the member obviously heard me. I think it is rather small of him to suggest that the people of Manitoba, all of Manitoba, haven't got the right to see what is happening in southern Manitoba by way of the media being there to show them it.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the point made by the Minister of Economic Development. I therefore ask the Minister of Mines whether he is not prepared to say that the Leader of the Opposition in the Province of Manitoba should have the equal right to be able to observe the activities in relation to the flood emergency at the same time as the media in order to be able to inform the members of his own group as to what is going on and be able to relate what he has been able to learn firsthand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, I don't expect to be able to satisfy the Honourable Member for St. Johns in any way but I can advise him that very likely the Leader of the Opposition will have at least the same opportunity to view the situation that the Minister responsible for Water Resources will have to view the situation.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I thought that I didn't have another question but the Minister of Water Resources now seems to indicate that he has not been given that opportunity and that that is something that is unfortunate. —(Interjections)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that the Question Period is to elicit information and should not be provocative or argumentative in its form.
The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Honourable the Minister of Mines, or any other Minister on the Treasury Bench who feels he has the knowledge to report on that, be able to assure us on this side of the House, that when there are occasions dealing with flood emergency, at which it is felt advisable for media to be present, that in the future there can be an assurance that the Minister of the Opposition will be rated at least equal with the media to be able to take part in the observance and reporting on the activities of the government in relation to the emergency? Can there be that assurance?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I think what's happening here is that we're rapidly deteriorating to the point where we're having a mountain built out of a mole hill. I can name you at least 3 members who have constituencies that are very directly affected, who would very much liked to have gone as well, but haven't been able to go at this point in time and will want to get there as soon as the mechanical facilities are available for them to go, and they're in exactly the same boat, but the media was laid on for it to get as widespread information as rapidly as possible out to the people generally, and that was the strategy behind it. The appropriate Ministers that were most directly involved in all the direct affairs that were involved today are there.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I did not have the answer to the question. I just wanted to know whether there could be an assurance that in the future the Leader of the Opposition will be given at least the same opportunity as is given to the press to be able to observe the flood emergency activities and damage.

MR. CRAIK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll include with that at least 3 MLAs who also have their constituencies directly affected, but this is an emergency meeting, this morning, called in a matter of a few hours notice to get down and deal directly with the municipal people. It's a direct administrative responsibility of the executive branch of government to do it and they've done that. The undertaking by the Minister of Highways, the chairman the day before yesterday will be honoured. There will be opportunity for the Leader of the Opposition and others to see the flood firsthand when the emergency and other matters are less pressing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Can he confirm that all sixteen anaesthetists at the Winnipeg Health Sciences Centre have given notice to the board and to the Manitoba Health Services Commission that they are going to opt out of Medicare as a block?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I believe the situation has moved beyond that point. There certainly has been some controversy with the anaesthetists at the Health Sciences Centre, some discussion with them in recent weeks. I believe the situation has moved beyond that point to a point of resolution now, but I will take the question as notice and provide the honourable member with further details as soon as I can.

MR. PARASIUK: Supplementary to the Minister. My understanding is that they were giving notice to opt out as of May 1st, and that's why there is urgency, and when the Minister is looking into this will he ensure that freedom of choice for doctors be maintained within Medicare so that people being taken to the Health Sciences Centre for elective surgery or an emergency won't have to pay cash on the barrel to an anaesthetist in order to be anaesthetised for an operation?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member's second question is hypothetical because the situation hasn't arisen yet. He's quite correct when he suggests that there had been an indication that they would opt out by May the 1st. That is what I mean when I say I think the situation has gone beyond that to a point of satisfactory resolution. I am not able to confirm to him happily, happily I'm not able to confirm to him that they will be opting out on May the 1st at all but I will report further to him as events unfold.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the honourable, the Minister, to whom the Manitoba Development Corporation reports. I wonder if the Minister can tell me which Minister of the Crown made a statement to the effect that Flyer Industries operating at full capacity will still lose \$3,000,000 a year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

MR. BANMAN: No, I can't, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that one Ted Stupidly continues to write in the

Free Press, that some Minister of the Crown made a statement that Flyer Industries Limited operating at full capacity will still lose \$3,000,000 a year, would the Minister give consideration to advising the official organ of the Conservative Party that such is not true?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Inkster that statements whether the accuracy of newspaper statements should not be a question to be raised in the Chamber. the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, since such a statement is not only false to the Minister's knowledge, but is slanderous of a commercial enterprise in the Province of Manitoba, would the Minister consider instructing the board of directors of Flyer Industries Limited to sue the Winnipeg Free Press for liable because they are publishing statements which go to the credibility and the bus producing capacity of a firm which is directly responsible to a board, which is responsible to the Minister?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to Honourable Member for Inkster it is highly improper to ask for a legal opinion in the Chamber. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't ask for a legal opinion, I ask whether the Minister will see to it that a news media publication which is slandering the title of a corporation which is responsible to a board, which is responsible to the Minister will be sued so that a Crown enterprise will have the same protection that a private firm would have if that kind of slanderous statement was continued to be made.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Fitness and Amateur Sport.

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I haven't read that particular article but I would suggest to the member that we're busy enough out there trying to drum up orders and trying to keep the plant rolling without starting all kinds of legal action.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister indicate exactly how many individual workers at Canadian Bronze have been taken off work this year due to lead poisoning since January 1st of this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): I can give the Member for Churchill an approximate number, Mr. Speaker, I would think in the neighbourhood of 24 or 25. I understand from a newspaper article that was just given to me a few short hours ago that a particular doctor had referred 4 more people off from a particular plant. It raises a fair amount of concern as I would think the Member for Churchill might share, where there seems to be more than a difference of opinion. It's a very serious matter when the Department of Labour and Manpower with this government, who has a high standard of quality control within its labs, and takes tests of workers in this province and it becomes determined after those tests that they are healthy, at least according to the standards in this province; and a doctor can take people off and send them to another lab and have tests come through which do not bear out the same results as the ones that we have. This is becoming very serious.

I have done some checking on it for the information of the House and I find that within the last month one worker was tested by ourselves who had .043, within a day he was directed to take a test by another doctor and he was sent to another laboratory within the city, and the reading was .086, so I further checked to find out and I think that this is possibly what is of concern to the Member for Churchill, and I find that there's 170 laboratories across North America that deal in a Proficiency Testing Program operated by the Centre for Disease Control in Atlanta, Georgia.

The standards which that lab, that testing centre sets is that they must be 75 percent accurate. Of the 170 laboratories in North America, there was only 33 percent that came high enough to qualify for the 75 percent proficiency.

I'm pleased to say, Mr. Speaker, that our particular laboratory was the highest, if not the highest in North America with a 98 percent proficiency test.

A few years ago, we had to check with this other particular laboratory and I'm not even going to name it here today; the one that apparently these people are being sent to. And we find that

our standards were quite acceptable, and in the words of our people, "the other laboratory had consistently high and erratic levels." I'm presently proceeding, Mr. Speaker, to request the people who run the other laboratory to see if we cannot have another comparable test. I think it's for the benefit of the workers in this province that we have these comparable tests taken and establish once and for all what is happening between these two sets of lead tests in the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would then ask the minister I think it's fairly important from his answer that we find out the name of the laboratory that is doing the testing of the other individuals and how many laboratories in the Province of Manitoba are testing individuals for lead, and are all the individuals that are being booked off by not only this one particular doctor but other doctors in the province being tested at this one particular laboratory?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: It is my understanding' Mr. Speaker, that there's only two laboratories in the province of Manitoba that do these types of tests and one belongs to us, the province. I'm not prepared to name the other one, but I'm prepared eventually to outline to the members opposite what the results of our comparative test take place.

In addition to this, Mr. Speaker, it has another serious connotation where our department is recommending that unless in extreme cases people are not treated with the chemical injections which take place in treatments.

It happens at OSHA in the States, the United States which my friend from Churchill refers to so often; they recommend exactly the same thing and yet this particular doctor here in Winnipeg who is going to this lab, who at one time had established erratic readings, is recommending the chemical treatment. So I think, Mr. Speaker, we have to have some good discussions with the doctor, have a good talk with the people that run this other laboratory to get to the bottom of this.

MR. COWAN: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, the minister mentions now that one of the laboratories belongs to us, the public of Manitoba. I'm wondering if he's inferring with that answer that the laboratory that is doing the testing for the private doctors in the province is a private laboratory, or if it is a provincial laboratory?

MR. MacMASTER: The laboratory that turned out the 98 percent efficiency is the one that is operated by the Department of Labour and Manpower, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COWAN: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think perhaps the minister misunderstood my question. What I was asking him is the other laboratory, the laboratory that he is not naming at this date, is that a laboratory that operates under the provincial jurisdiction or is it a private laboratory that operates on a different level?

MR. MacMASTER: It's not a private laboratory, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So I'll have to assume from the minister's answer that both laboratories are provincial laboratories operating under the provincial jurisdiction. I would ask the minister if he can confirm that the Winnipeg Labour Council representing some 40,000 unionists and their families have called upon the minister in writing to authorize the appointment of a Royal Commission to fully study the extent of lead poisoning of workers and lead pollution of workplaces in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, it appears like this is another letter that the Member for Churchill is more aware of than I am; I haven't seen such a piece of correspondence yet.

MR. COWAN: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the minister's information he can check with his office — it's a letter dated April 23rd of this year. Can the minister —(Interjection)— I must also say, Mr. Speaker, the minister came to my office through the regular mail service, so I can only assume that the union might be giving preferential treatment to their friends.

I'd also ask the minister if he can —(Interjection)— I'd also ask the minister what action he has taken in response to a reply from the employees which he should have received by now to the Department of Workplace Safety and Health in response to a reply from the employees of CEA Simon-Day for lead testing to be done at their work site in response to their concerns that they

may be suffering lead pollution and lead poisoning from Canadian Bronze which is situated directly next to them?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, the first thing we did following the question from the Member for Churchill was check the Minutes of the Safety Committee meeting which made no reference to this particular problem. We then contacted the union people and the Safety Committee Chairman and asked if one of our people could be present at their next Safety Committee meeting. We then jacked that up somewhat and had a special meeting with the Safety Committee, the company and the union employees. That particular time, a formula and a procedure was established by the Safety Committee for a random sampling of that particular plant, and that will be taking place very shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill with a fifth question.

MR. COWAN: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, informing the minister that a request had come from the Winnipeg Labour Council for a Royal Commission, I neglected to get an answer as to how the minister is going to deal with that request. Is the minister prepared in light of the most recent information that shows that there may be some serious problems with testing being done in the province, and I'm not indicating that there is, but that there is at least a differential in testing done.

Is the minister now prepared to initiate a Royal Commission so that we can, once and for all, fully study the problem and all the aspects of the problem so that we don't have to go through these moments of insecurity and moments that we don't really know how bad the problem is or what the proper treatment should be? Is the minister now prepared in light of all the information that has come out recently to institute a Royal Commission?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, there's been no recent information that would change my mind as to the implementation of a Royal Commission into lead problems of this province; I am still of the opinion that that is not necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill with a sixth question.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; one last question to the Minister of Labour. Can the minister confirm that his so-called lead control program called for the certification of the Provincial Laboratory for the testing of lead and blood results, and that the minister responsible for that committee, the Minister of Mines and Environment indicated to the House during his Estimates that that laboratory cannot be certified and is indeed not certified at the present time?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I would think seeing as the Member for Churchill has done so much reading on this particular item that he would know that there's no labs of that nature certified anywhere in this particular country.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to address a question to the Minister of Economic Development who, I believe, is responsible for transportation research and studies. Can the minister advise whether his staff have been consulted or are being consulted by the Federal Prairie Rail Action Committee respecting the abandonment of branch lines in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't say that my staff are being consulted by the actual PRAC Committee regarding prairie rail line abandonment. My staff, at the present time, has been made available to any group of municipalities along a rail line which is to be abandoned, who form a retention committee. The CTC will not accept an application for retention of a rail line in Manitoba without it coming from a retention committee.

I have informed the municipalities and the President of the Manitoba Municipalities Association and all honourable members, I believe, were made well aware that if they contact their local municipalities and towns and cities and there is a retention committee wants to be formed, and they need help, my staff is available to show them how to put the applications together and work with them in every way possible once that retention committee is formed.

MR. EVANS: I thank the Minister for that information, Mr. Speaker. I would ask him a supplementary question with respect to the Rossburn Subdivision, which runs from Neepawa to Russell. Has the government of Manitoba a particular position with respect to the Rossburn Subdivision and particularly this Neepawa-Russell line and are they, in effect, in agreement that it should be abandoned by the railways?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it isn't a question of the province being in agreement or not. The province has some very great concerns. The Minister of Highways has concerns, as many departments have concerns. If a retention committee is formed by the group that the honourable member speaks of — and I know it has, or if it's not completed it soon will be — the province will do everything possible to work with that Retention Committee to keep that line.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would ask another question of the Minister. I can advise him that an association has been formed, the Association for the Retention of the Rossburn Subdivision, and that they are fighting for its continued existence.

I would like to ask the Minister whether the government of Manitoba, while I understand it's prepared to help this association, nevertheless is the government of Manitoba prepared to take a stand against the abandonment of this particular railway subdivision? Is it prepared to take a position and make that position known, as the government of Manitoba, to the Canadian Transport Commission?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I think it's very obvious that the government is working with the Retention Committee to retain that line; we have made our position known very well.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I understand from the Honourable Minister's remarks that the government is prepared to assist these associations, which is very good, but it is not clear and I'd like to ask them this question then, for clarification. It is not clear whether lending technical assistance, providing data and providing back-up amounts to a position being taken by the government of Manitoba. So I would like to ask the Minister very specifically, Mr. Speaker, whether the government of Manitoba is on record in opposing the abandonment of the Rossburn Subdivision. We understand that it is helping the association but is the government definitely opposed to that abandonment?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I suggest that the honourable member's question is repetitive. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland. The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the question may sound repetitive but I have not received a clear answer from the Minister. I believe the people in the Rossburn area, in the Neepawa and in the Russell area — I don't know whether they have talked to their MLAs but I believe the people would like to get a clear position by this government —(Interjection)— a clear position, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to therefore pose the question to the Honourable Minister whether the government of Manitoba is prepared to categorically state that it is opposed to the abandonment of this particular subdivision and state that clearly and forthrightly to the Canadian Transportation Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Brandon East, I pointed out to him his question was repetitive, again, he has insisted on asking the question. I suggest the honourable member is out of order. —(Interjection)— The honourable member is out of order. Does the honourable member have another question?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, can the Honourable Minister advise the House as to the number of Retention Associations that have approached either his office or his department for assistance in fighting rail line abandonment?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be accurate when I give the honourable member that information. I will take it as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a sixth question.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, can the Honourable Minister advise the House exactly how the government is making its position known in opposing specific branch line abandonment, whether it's the Rossburn Subdivision or another? How is the Minister making the views of the Manitoba government known, not to the Association but to the federal government?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would get clear through his head the only way we can make our position known to the CTC is through a Retention Committee. The CTC will not accept an application from the provincial government on a line, and so I might say to the honourable member that if the MLAs are working with them and the MLAs are partly responsible for the formation of a Retention Committee, and my department and government are working very hard with the Retention Committee to retain that branch line, I don't know what more the honourable member has to know. Our position is that we are for that line, if the Retention Committee is formed, because it's the only way we have of making our position known.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a seventh question.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister really telling the Legislature that a federal government agency, the CTC, will not accept a brief or recommendation directly from the Province of Manitoba with respect to a branch line? Is that really what the Minister is telling this House?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I am telling the honourable member that when the Retention Committee Hearing is held on that line we are then able to make a brief as a province, and we have obviously made our indications very clear what our position is by helping the retention line. I'd like to tell the honourable member that in Saskatchewan the Minister has had people going around talking to people of towns and municipalities, the same as we have, to form Retention Committees so that the province will be able to make representation to the CTC, which is the only way we have of doing it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. BOSTROM: My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Northern Affairs. I wonder if the Minister, after his meeting with the Metis Federation along with the Premier of Manitoba, has any other programs to announce to deal with the very serious unemployment problem in northern Manitoba, that is other programs than the one he seems to be relying on as the only one to deal with the unemployment problem and that is the Relocation Program, which is obviously inadequate to deal with the very serious problem of the unemployed people in northern Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I recognize the Honourable Minister, he has 25 seconds to answer.

MR. MacMASTER: The Meeting with the MMF last night, I should report to the Member for Rupertsland, that further review will be taken of their proposals. They are going to redraft some of them themselves. In addition to that, I'd like to believe that the Member for Rupertsland will be somewhat pleased with some of the things that's in the Department of Northern Affairs budget for this particular year, which we will be discussing, hopefully in three or four days, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hour for Questions having expired, we proceed with Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The Acting Government House Leader.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Finance, 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. Education will be considered by the Committee in the Chamber and Development Agencies in Room 254, Mr. Speaker.

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 Education and the Honourable Member for Emerson in the Chair for Development Agencies.

Tuesday, April 24, 1979

SUPPLY — DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Albert Driedger (Emerson): Committee come to order. I'd like to refer members to Page 28, Resolution 39, Development Agencies: 1.(a)—pass — the Honourable Minister. The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: There's no line now for Manitoba Development Corporation.

MR. BANMAN: No.

MR. GREEN: So you will be dealing with the communities . . .

MR. BANMAN: The Manitoba Development Fund . . .

MR. GREEN: And then we'll be through because the MDC we'll do on the Committee Report.

MR. BANMAN: Economic Development Committee. Right.

MR. GREEN: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: Sorry.

MR. GREEN: Well, what do you wish to say, Mr. Minister. Do you have anything to say about . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, over the last year there's been a fair amount of activity with CEDF. The Board has undertaken several other responsibilities; namely, the administrating of the fund dealing with the Northern Flood Development Corporation which has been set up by the native people. They have been working closely with the special ARDA people and also with the people from Indian Affairs. Their specific details, of course, Mr. Chairman, will have to be dealt with in Committee when the Chairman of the Board comes before the Economic Development Committee who can then answer specific details. I guess in generalities or in principles if the members of the Committee want to talk to that, we can talk to it, but I have not got the Chairman of the Committee here and any specific questions as far as loans and the operations of the company would have to be directed to him when he appears before the Economic Development Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Minister can first of all advise us as to whether there is any difference in the philosophy and direction of the Committee's Economic Development Fund as against the basis upon which it was formulated some years ago, whether there has been any policy change, policy direction, with regard to this particular fund.

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, about 18 months ago there was a determination made that CEDF would deal with loans that received special ARDA funding, also deal with the ongoing loans that were being administered by them, but as such at the present time would not be looking at all kinds of other new loans that were not involving either Indian Affairs or special ARDA or another government agency.

MR. GREEN: Then, Mr. Chairman, I take it that an entrepreneur in Northern Manitoba that wished . . . to set up a grocery store in a community which had only one retail outlet, that, let us say, provided by the Hudson's Bay, could not now obtain moneys from the Communities Economic Development Fund because unless he could have his loan initiated through ARDA or the Department of Indian Affairs.

MR. BANMAN: That's right, if there is involvement by special ARDA or Indian Affairs, we would then look at the loan.

MR. GREEN: Do I also take it, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister is saying that the Fund's

offices are being used to provide an administration to deal with the Northern Flood Committee responsibilities of the provincial government.

MR. BANMAN: That's right, the Neyanun group, the board of directors that has been set up to administer the moneys in dealing with this development agency that has been set up to deal with the Northern Flood Agreement; we have several people from that particular group which we are training within our structure right now. The chairman of the board of the CEDF is an ex officio director of that particular board and the Fund is scrutinizing the different plans which the new Northern Flood Committee group is putting forward.

MR. GREEN: Can you tell me what the initials NEON stand for? I think you used the term NEON.

MR. BANMAN: Neyanun, that's the name of the corporation, N-e-y-a-n-u-n.

MR. GREEN: Is that an Indian name? Do the initials mean something, as is usually the case?

MR. BANMAN: I believe it is an Indian name.

MR. GREEN: Out of curiosity, can we know the meaning of the word Neyanun? —(Interjection)— We don't know that.

Can I be advised, Mr. Chairman, because it interests me, as to what, if any, the activities have been? We know that there are, if you will excuse the expression, bureaucrats here, bureaucrats in the Indian community, that they are all discussing what's going to happen. Can you tell me, aside from the discussion, what has happened, if anything, with regard to the creation or implementation of economic development programs under this heading?

MR. BANMAN: You are referring now to CEDF?

MR. GREEN: No, I'm talking about Neyanun and its liaison with the Northern Flood Committee. I gather what the Minister has said is that the Northern Flood Committee has a certain amount of money dedicated to it for economic development programs. I gather that the Communities Economic Development Fund is using its administration to analyze and perhaps assist in the development of these programs. Now, I would like to know, other than the people who are sitting down and analyzing an assistance, what are the programs, if any, that are being administered? What has happened?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, the only involvement of CDF is that the present Chairman is also an ex officio Director on that particular board and that we have undertaken to train several of the native people that will be involved in that corporation. Other than that, any direct programming or anything I am not aware of, and I would ask the member that he ask the chairman when he comes before committee.

MR. GREEN: So you are unable to indicate that any economic development activity other than planning and analyzing and projecting, but as to any on site or otherwise physically identifiable progress, you are unable to advise me of. I'm not criticizing you, I'm just saying that that is the situation.

MR. BANMAN: I believe, and now I'm speaking from memory, that what was intended is that because it is again a rather unique situation, and there is a certain start-up time required to get the whole thing going, they were looking for some expertise in the field of northern development, such as CEDF has had in the past, and we're hoping to draw on that particular expertise. But it's my understanding that once they're going, I think we've got a year contract for training some of these people, that they will be operating on their own.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have no more questions. I would like to make a brief comment, I hope, on the fact that there will be a vacuum in this area and I want to indicate that the Communities Economic Development Fund arose as a result of a joint recommendation unanimously agreed to by all of the members of the Task Force, on which were included members of the government party, the Conservative Party, the Liberal Party, representatives from the Manitoba Metis Federation, Representatives from the Indian Brotherhood; that there was needed in Northern Manitoba, a vehicle whereby leadership in an entrepreneurial way, could be developed at the local level and primarily

local people; that the problem that many people felt in Northern Manitoba was that all of the commercial activities was done by businessmen coming in from the north and making money in Northern Manitoba, which is not a sin or a crime, but it was felt that what was needed is some type of leadership, entrepreneurial assistance to enable the kind of service that was being given, to be conducted by northerners. And I think, Mr. Chairman, that if you'll look at the record in this program, you will see that there were certainly I would say, conservatively speaking, hundreds of entrepreneurial leaders developed in northern communities from amongst its own citizens of whatever race, creed, colour or religion to conduct those kind of activities in northern Manitoba and it was building — Mr. Chairman, I never regarded this as a doctrinaire, socialist program — it was the creation of little capitalists from amongst northerners and the people in those communities started to feel that they were somebody. It is true, Mr. Chairman, that some of the loans went sour, but none of them went as sour as the ones that we loaned to respectable businessmen in the south. None of them went quite as bad as Columbia Forest Products which was McIsaac and other giants of industry in southern Manitoba. None of them went quite as sour as CFI which was run by Morris Neaman and the other directors of the Manitoba Development Corporation.

So I regret that there has been left a vacuum in an area which was designed and succeeded in having human beings in those northern communities take on roles that had previously been done entirely by strangers when an opportunity came to make some money. The demise of this activity is something, Mr. Chairman, which is going to reflect two ways: It is going to reflect very badly on the Conservative Party, which I don't regret very much. It is also going to reflect for a certain number of years in a certain number of individuals, whose names we do not know, who we cannot identify but who would have, had the opportunity been there, turned out to realize themselves in a very meaningful way in their own communities and amongst their own people. We will never know which ones didn't materialize because of the demise of the program, but we will know that it happened and the reason that we will know is that we will look back and say over these several years these people became somebody in northern Manitoba by virtue of the fact that the public decided that they were going to have an interest in giving them an opportunity of being somebody. The fact that this program is now dealing with only ARDA loans and loans which are endorsed by Indian Affairs will certainly, Mr. Chairman, be a major impairment of the potentialities of the program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)—pass — the Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would share the views just expressed by my colleague, the Member for Inkster, re what looks to be the demise of this fund and maybe the Minister can assure us otherwise, but certainly there is a large reduction in moneys available to it and unless the Minister can explain that something else is happening to make up for this, it would seem to me that we are heading into a reduction in services of an economic development nature to the people of northern Manitoba.

There is no question that the most serious unemployment problems that this province faces is to be found in northern Manitoba. There is absolutely no question about that. The recent demonstration by Metis people in the City of Winnipeg, the concerns that they expressed, the statements that have been made about unemployment being 65 percent, 66 percent or whatever the figure figure, is enormously and incredibly high.

I think it is indicative of the fact that we do in Manitoba have a very, very serious economic problem which is leading to a very, very serious social problem. And I think it's incumbent upon any government to take this problem, not just under advisement but to be very active in doing whatever it can in whatever way, to provide opportunities for these people to help themselves.

People in Northern Manitoba have made it quite clear, not only recently but over the years, they do not want welfare and yet some of the biggest welfare bills that this province pays out is in Northern Manitoba, in these remote communities. The people are on record, they don't want welfare — they want jobs. Now, I'm not suggesting that the Communities Economic Development Fund is the answer to all the problems that they have in Northern Manitoba with respect to lack of job opportunities, to the lack of economic development opportunities. I'm not suggesting that for a moment. As a matter of fact, last night some of us around this table were urging a more active and aggressive role on the part of the Department of Co-operative Development, and I for one think that the most critical role for that department should be and will be for many years to come in the north, because this is where, I think, a lot of assistance is required. So, there are many things that can be done for the people in the north. There are many things that can be done to provide jobs, to help them help themselves to raise their standard of living — whether it be co-op development activities, whether it be direct government job programs, whether it be spending through the Department of Northern Affairs hiring Metis Indian people and other northerners,

of race or creed onto government staffs and so on.

But here is yet another agency that can help solve that problem, and as the Member for Inkster indicated, it is not a doctrinaire socialist philosophy that lies behind the Communities Economic Development Fund. In fact, it's the reverse, it is a fund to help private enterprise. It's a private enterprise fund. It's a fund to help these people get into the business world in effect. It's an opportunity to fill the gap that's left by financial institutions who simply do not wish to take the high risk that I would admit is involved in helping the people in these remote areas. It's been clearly demonstrated that the banks and other financial institutions are not prepared to take the high risks, which are admittedly there, and they're very high risks in some cases, but nevertheless risks that can be and should be taken by a fund such as this, if we are at all going to give these people an opportunity to do something for themselves. And as I said, it's a fund that not only finances small private enterprise, small private companies, but also, from my understanding of its operations in the past, it's been a fund that provides some technical assistance to help these people in their entrepreneurship activities.

So I think it's regrettable that the government sees fit to wind down this operation. It should be going in the other direction. It should be truly going in the other direction. I would say that the government has nevertheless made a decision to make northern development a very low priority, by virtue of the fact that it has reduced the funding of this agency, that it seems to be ready to cut staff possibly, and certainly seems to be ready to let it operate at a very low key in a very passive way.

At any rate, I don't know whether there's much more to be said. I would like to ask, if the minister hasn't already given this while I had to be out of the room for a few minutes, whether he is prepared to give to us this afternoon the number of projects in which the Communities Economic Development Fund is now active in, or is this something we will discuss when we get the report of the fund before the Committee on Economic Development?

MR. BANMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated before at the opening of the Committee Meeting, the specifics and the details dealing with the report will be brought forward to the Economic Development Committee, at which time the Chairman of the CEDF will then answer any questions that the members would have.

MR. EVANS: Yes. Can the minister advise at this time how many staff are with the fund today, and how many were with the fund last year?

MR. BANMAN: Again, we're getting into technical details and I haven't got the staff here for that right now, and these are questions that should be asked of the . . . No, I'm sorry, we've got 11 staff that are employed there right now. I would indicate that's about the same as last year — 9 last year — 9 now. I better not get involved in the details because I just haven't got the people here to deal with that.

MR. EVANS: Well, for clarification then, Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that when we have the chairman of the fund with us, he will be answering questions about the past year's activities. Will it be in order to ask questions about what's going on now, which is of course covered by these items here; that is, the current moneys for current operations?

MR. BANMAN: That's the problem that I haven't been able to sort out with the Department of Finance yet. It's sort of a unique situation. The daily operations and the breakdowns of all that can be given by the chairman when he appears before the committee. That was the procedure that was followed last year, and I think has been followed a number of years in a row because I just haven't got the people here to deal with that, and we'd be duplicating it.

MR. EVANS: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Really, if we can get an assurance that we can ask the Chairman of the CEDF, Communities Economic Development Fund, questions with regard to projects that are in the works right now, and not be told that we must restrain ourselves to discussing the period of time covered by that report, because if that's the case then there's no way of asking the question as to what projects are going on right now, and I appreciate the minister's problem in not having the required staff with him. I appreciate that and I don't expect him to have all that information at his fingertips, no one can. So, really what I am asking then is a clarification. Is he assuring us that we can discuss the current operations of the fund when we have the chairman before us, and not be constrained or limited to the period under review by the report itself?

MR. BANMAN: Well, as the member knows, regardless of whether it be MDC or any of the other

companies, as we had this morning, McKenzie Seeds, most of the chairmen of the different boards are willing to answer questions as to how sales are going now, what thrust the company is taking and I am sure the chairman at that time would not have any objection to answering questions of that nature.

MR. EVANS: Yes, thank you. Well, Mr. Chairman, then I will ask those questions at the appropriate time when the chairman appears before the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the minister could indicate if he's been involved with the discussions and the possibilities of economic development and employment creation with the members of the Metis Federation, or has he been left out of those discussions?

MR. BANMAN: I wasn't at that meeting yesterday, but I have been talking to the Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, since this particular program we are discussing now was one of sort of 18 thrusts put together in a package of economic development and employment creation, one that in effect assisted people to get in on an individual basis, or on a free enterprise basis as a group to create employment and provide economic development combined with a number of other thrusts including co-operatives and Band corporations and small Crown corporations, whatever way seemed to work in northern Manitoba; since this is one part of that effort and even then the effort wasn't great enough to overcome the serious problems being faced in that part of our province, I wonder if the minister could indicate whether he has been requesting a change from the very limited function of this Fund back to its more broad function that it had previously; whether there's any possibility that this Fund might be one of the vehicles if the government does decide to change its policy and start assisting in economic development again instead of eliminating employment opportunities and economic development in the north, whether this Fund will be one of the mechanisms by which they might begin again to assist in economic development of northern Manitoba?

MR. BANMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, we have over the last while, slowly made several changes in the policy. We have also tackled some of the problems that we were faced with. For instance, Channel Area Loggers which was having a serious problem is now being administrated, the cheques and that I understand are flowing through CEDF providing that little extra bit of accountability or control that was required for that, and as a result, I understand that the company is starting to turn around, which is encouraging for everybody, so we're actively involved in different aspects. I'm quoting off the top of my head, I think there was something like this year 25 loans that have been dealt with so far, which is pretty good if we're looking back at 1976-77. I don't think there were many more than that done, so there is a slow system evolving which we will be able to build on as we go along.

The CEDF, as the members have pointed out, was established on a business-type basis and the Board of Directors were granted fund marginal enterprises that maybe the traditional lending institutions didn't want to carry, but it was however based on the principle that the repayment was required. That principle, of course, will be carried forward. As we move along, we can possibly see somewhat of an expanding role but we are in the process right now of making loans to people involved with special ARDA projects, people getting government contracts, and those are the loans that we are processing at present.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I think that the minister is quite well aware that there's a couple of aspects of the Special ARDA Program, and the one we're talking about here is the commercial development part of it as opposed to the trappers' and fishermen's loans' part of that program. The administration of the Special ARDA on this Section that CEDF deals with is basically administered by the federal authorities, and I'm having some trouble from the book figuring out — since the two Special ARDAs are combined, I wonder if the minister could give us some indication whether the federal Special ARDA Program that deals with commercial ventures that the federal government puts up the majority of the funding for, whether that program is reducing or expanding or staying at the same level?

MR. BANMAN: I'm sorry you'd have to ask the Chairman of the Board that.

MR. McBRYDE: It seems pretty key in terms of the Estimates of this Section, because if that's all they're doing is assisting with Special ARDA, then not being the minister responsible, not being aware whether Special ARDA is expanding or contracting or staying the same certainly must affect his ability to get funding for this or to decide the level of funding this particular operation needs. I wonder what the reaction of the minister would be if we should have a change in federal policy, and Mr. Chairman, heaven forbid, that is a possibility, that the Conservative Party might form a federal government, and if their policies in the north are as disasterous as this provincial government's policy in northern Manitoba then, Mr. Speaker, this special ARDA Program might be one of the ones eliminated by the new government. If that were the case I wonder whether this minister would just let the total private enterprise development in remote communities fall to the ground, or whether he would continue to pick it up at the provincial level if the disaster happened that his federal colleagues were to form the federal government?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, at this point in time, that's a hypothetical question. I understand from staff that there hasn't been a major change in the special ARDA funding, that's what I'm told here. Again, the Chairman isn't here at the present time, but I'm sure that would have been drawn to our attention if there had been some major changes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)—pass; 1.(b)—pass; the Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I wasn't quite finished my questions to the minister or my comments on this particular Section. One, I would like to recommend to the minister that in discussions going on now with the Manitoba Metis Federation, that he should insist or request to be involved in those discussions as this is one of the, as I said, possible 18 instruments that could be used in that development. And although there might not be room on helicopters, there's probably room at these meetings for the minister if he wishes to take part in this particular type of function. It appears, Mr. Chairman, that some effort is needed by this minister to convince the First Minister, the Premier of this province, of the importance and necessity of these programs, and also his colleague's, the Minister of Northern Affairs. Because of the 18 thrusts the programs or approaches that put together an economic development package, this government appears to be picking out one, the relocation aspect that was under way under the previous government, and only giving some emphasis to that particular aspect. I think that the minister might be well aware that this kind of development that takes place through the Communities Economic Development Fund in some ways can be of assistance, and I just give the minister an example, when earlier on when I arrived at The Pas I went to a number of people who have successfully relocated from a remote community in Saskatchewan called Cumberland House who were fully employed at The Pas, and sort of asked them why they'd come to The Pas, what their background was, etcetera.

They indicated that they were involved in Cumberland House in the co-operative movement and were the leaders in that particular movement. When they got the co-operative organized for the fishermen and trappers in that community they felt that they needed more opportunity, a broader range of opportunities for themselves and having gained the confidence through their activities in their local community, they were then able to move into an industrial community without falling by the wayside in that new environment and take advantage of the opportunities in the industrial community. I think perhaps, maybe this Minister is one who might understand some of those connections, that one program or one policy probably isn't going to deal with the problem because heaven knows, Mr. Chairman, the 18 thrusts or programs made a dent in the problem but certainly didn't completely solve the situation of unemployment in the remote communities in northern Manitoba.

So I would like to urge the Minister not to play a passive role and only report for the Economic Development Fund, but to play an active role with his own colleagues and within this Conservative government and try and limit the damage that the policies of this new government are doing in northern Manitoba. I would ask the Minister to help his colleagues to understand the situation, help his colleagues to understand what the Communities Economic Development Fund can do, and not let this, as a number of other programs, fall by the wayside under the new government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Excuse me, did the Minister want to respond to that?

We're on 1.(a) — Administration. Could the Minister give us a breakdown of that \$324,200.00? You can't give a breakdown?

MR. BANMAN: I haven't got it.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I find that's very strange because . . .

MR. BANMAN: One second here, I've got some of it here. Salaries, \$182,500 — I'll pick out some of the bigger ones — Allowance for Doubtful Accounts, \$50,000; Rent, \$26,000; Legal and Audit, \$14,000; Director's Travel, \$9,600; Employee's Benefits, \$6,600; Printing and Stationery, \$5,500; Director's Fees, \$24,000; Telephone, \$6,000; Sundry, \$5,000; Travel, \$25,000.00.

MR. EVANS: Okay, on two items, the Salaries of \$182,500, how does that compare with the salaries for last year, the \$230,000.00? Of the \$230,000 that we saw last year, how much was for salaries, so that we could compare it with the \$182,000.00?

MR. BANMAN: \$219,000.00.

MR. EVANS: \$219,000, so there has been a drop in the staff. Well, I guess that was indicated and therefore it is reflected in the drop in salaries paid.

The \$50,000 was for doubtful accounts. The rent, where are the premises of the Economic Development Fund located?

MR. BANMAN: Mr. Chairman, I believe about half a year ago, it could be almost a year ago — no, in October — the lease on the particular property that they were involved in was up, because of some space being available at the Manitoba Development Corporation they moved in there. So there was a consolidation of space and they are operating out of that same office now in the Power Building.

MR. EVANS: In effect then, Mr. Chairman, the amount for rent would be paid by the CEDF to the MDC because the MDC is the tenant then and I guess CEDF in effect is a sub-tenant.

MR. BANMAN: Yes.

MR. EVANS: The amount for travel indicated is \$25,000.00. How does that compare with the amount for travel last year?

MR. BANMAN: There was a total of \$40,000 last year for travel.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: There are two travel amounts — there is the travel for the director, as he said, \$9,600, and Other Travel, \$25,000, so it is 35-something and that's probably the figure that he totalled for last year.

MR. BANMAN: To give you a comparative total for last year, Travel was \$43,000 — this includes director's travel and others — and this year it would be \$35,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Is that \$40,000 that was mentioned last year — I'm sorry, I didn't hear the answer — did that include the director's and the staff?

MR. BANMAN: Yes.

MR. EVANS: So, Mr. Chairman, we're comparing the \$40,000 last year with roughly \$34,000 or \$35,000 this year.

MR. BANMAN: \$43,000 last year and \$35,000 this year.

MR. EVANS: What is the basis of that estimate? Is it simply the reduction in staff or do you not expect the staff to be travelling around the remote communities as much? I imagine the cost of flying has risen because everything else seems to be costing more these days and air travel is certainly no exception, so it would seem to me that there would be less opportunity for the staff to be in and around northern Manitoba because I assume, or I am assuming that practically all of the travel funding would be for travel into the north.

MR. BANMAN: One of the differences is there were a number of receiverships that we were operating, such as the Thunderbird Lodge which has been cleaned up now, and several others which required a certain amount of travelling. The other thing is that we spent last year \$23,000 on travel so it is bringing it down to what the actual figure was. It was a budgeted figure and that's what we spent.

MR. EVANS: Well, would it be development officers that would go up and visit these communities, or some other type — how many people would be doing this travelling?

MR. BANMAN: It would include the chairman as well as the different development officers and people who are involved in assisting different companies with not only business assistance but also from auditing and inspection.

MR. EVANS: A more general question to the Minister. What does he foresee? We have these funds to be voted for this year but has he any plans for the Economic Development Fund? Could he advise the committee what plans the government has for the Fund? Are there any possibilities of innovations? Given the fact that there is a lot of unemployment in the north, does the government have any idea of using the Fund in some way that can cope with the rising unemployment situation? I see it would be very difficult if you are reducing the staff, reducing the funding available —(Interjection)— You are not reducing the staff?

MR. BANMAN: No. :

MR. EVANS: Well I understand the salaries were dropped and the staff was dropped from 11 to 9.

MR. BANMAN: Nine is the actual that has been there now for a while and what has happened is there were some vacancies created last year which weren't used.

MR. EVANS: Well, but then in the last couple of years there has been a reduction in staff and I would take it a reduction in activity, so I am wondering whether there is a possibility of a turn around now, whether the Minister has any ideas of more aggressively using the staff and the fund for assisting would be small enterprisers or entrepreneurs in helping themselves.

MR. BANMAN: We have nine people on staff right now. We have budgeted for eleven and that is the direction we are headed right now. We are going to have people in the field as well as people who are assisting enterprises that have trouble from time to time. It's a high risk nature business as we pointed out. We are looking at different applications that are being made all the time and the board in their wisdom then decides which ones they feel are good loans and which ones aren't.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, then the funding for the loans, well it's not under Administration but I gather the money that's referred to in (b) \$500,000, this is the capital expenditure money that's available for lending to business. I was going to ask a question on where to talk about or discuss or look for a figure on capital for the making of loans, is that under (b)?

MR. BANMAN: That's capital authority, that would be Schedule — that's voted when we vote capital authority for any other, like for Manitoba Housing Renewal and all that.

MR. EVANS: I'm not clear. I gather the item on Page 27, Reconciliation Statement, that must be, well yes it is related to Communities and Economic Development Fund so I gather then that there is some carryover of \$738,900 of capital authority for Acquisition Construction of Physical Assets, and now you have, I'm not clear as to where the \$500,000 fits into it. I know we can discuss this on the next item, that I can hold my question until that point, but I'm not clear how the \$500,000, if you add the \$500,000 to the \$968,000.00.

MR. BANMAN: Maybe we should wait till we get to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona. 1.(a)—pass; 1.(b). The Honourable Minister.

MR. BANMAN: In reply to the member's questions, there was \$738,000 last year which was the

Special Native Employment Program for the north and that is being administrated by CEDF. The \$500,000 is part of the carryover from that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Oh, I see the \$738,900 refers to 1978-79, I see, so now that is the comparative figure so that you're not working with that \$738 . . . I gather that money lapses. So all you have to work with is \$500,000.00. Okay. Does the Minister feel that that \$500,000 will be utilized in this year? Is there any indication that the fund will be expending that half a million dollars?

MR. BANMAN: I understand that there are requests coming in and the member will appreciate that we act on a request basis with regard to that and the board will have to then treat each request as they come in.

MR. EVANS: Has the Minister been provided with any estimates by staff regarding the number of jobs that they hope to create. Is there any plan? Is there any idea? Well look, we are hoping to be able to stimulate X number of enterprises and will create Y number of jobs. Do you have any estimate of what you hope to do with this money? I realize it's a response mechanism at work. On the other hand given the nature of society in northern Manitoba a lot of people are not familiar with the fund and what it can do and so on and to some degree depends on the staff going around to the communities and discussing the possibilities with people and to encourage them to do their own thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could I ask the intention of the members, would it be the intention to pass this department or do we reconvene tonight, the hour being 4:30, I have to call Private Members' Hour in a little while. If it only takes a couple of minutes then my watch would be a little slow. The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: We will come back and be discussing some of the specifics in the committee on economic development.

MR. BANMAN: The chairman will be before the committee, you can ask him all these questions. He has the pertinent information dealing with that and unfortunately he's out of town today.

MR. EVANS: I think we can pass this but just this one question . . .

MR. BANMAN: Let me just answer one question. I understand from the work the board has been doing over the last number of years that they figure that about 35 loans would be a good objective for the board to hit. This year we are going to hit about 22 to 25, so we're slowly getting there. It's not that the board isn't out there looking at the different loans, but I understand that in the low 30s is something that they could feel comfortable with. As the member has pointed out a lot of these loans are based on a high risk and require a lot of attention and require the development officers to spend quite a bit of time with those different firms and nurse them along but we are getting up to a level where the board feels would be acceptable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)—pass; (c)—pass; Resolution No. 39. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$824,200 for Development Agencies—pass.

Before we rise is it the understanding that the committee does not sit tonight in this room? (Agreed) Committee rise.

SUPPLY — DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe the honourable members Kovnats (Radisson): I would direct to Page 31 of the Main Estimates, Department of Education, Resolution No. 43, Clause 4. Program Development and Support Services. The first item is (a) Division Administration: (1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry; I can't see you, or you can't see me through the Clerk. Perhaps the Minister can tell us what he wants this money for, there is a reduction from \$186,600 to \$166,300.00. I'd like an explanation if I can get one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS, Minister of Education (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, just before I respond to the member's question I would like to forward some material requested by the Member for The Pas, and if it could be delivered to the Member for Winnipeg Centre, Mr. Boyce, please.

The Member for Winnipeg Centre would like an explanation for the difference in Salaries shown in the Estimate Book. The printed vote for 1978-79 placed Salaries at \$136,500.00. The adjusted vote before us for 1978-79, is \$186,600, and that is explained, Mr. Chairman, by a transfer in of an ADM from Administration at \$39,600.00. Two persons from the Student Aid Appeal Board at \$19,400 and one individual at \$7,500.00. And a transfer out, Mr. Chairman, to Curriculum Services, one individual \$8,900, resulting in an adjusted vote for 1978-79 in Salaries of \$186,600.00.

Then, moving to the sum shown for 1979-80, we have a deletion of Co-ordinator of In-service. This position has been assumed by another person within the department at \$30,600.00. We have salary increases and adjustments of \$10,300, and Operating the CPI and Workload Change \$2,300, resulting in \$166,300, Mr. Chairman, under Salaries.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that's rather complicated, but where you do have transfers in and out that type of situation does occur.

MR. BOYCE: Well, on this particular item, Mr. Chairman, this is the area that we usually look into some of the programs and what the policy of the Minister is, because if you will notice in the description of the activities of this allocation, it's rather broad including such things as Special Programs develops and administers innovative programs designed to broaden educational opportunities. And, while we don't intend to prolong the debates or repeat arguments, nevertheless there are some questions that I think some of my colleagues have. The Member for St. Johns, I believe, has some on the intent of the government, as far as fulfilling that high-sounding statement printed in the Estimates Books.

I will deal with the Minister's response to my question when I get a chance to absorb what he has just told me.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, I've been waiting for quite a while to discuss with the Minister his decisions and responsibilities in relation to the teaching tool known as "Building the Pieces Together." He indicated in the past that this would be the occasion and that he would be glad to discuss it. I don't know if he's aware of the discussions we had with the Minister of Health in relation to "Building the Pieces Together", but I'll assume that he has been briefed by his colleague and I wonder if he would indicate his position in regard to the use of this program.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I should say initially to the Member for St. Johns that the program that he refers to exists in the Department of Health. I'm sure he's well aware of that — under the Alcohol Foundation. It is the responsibility of the Department of Health. The particular program or material does not exist in the Department of Education. I have made that particular position quite clear to anyone who has inquired in that regard.

I should point out to him as well that in its usage in the schools it is treated the same as any other government publications, or government material, or in fact if you wish to expand that into programs, although programs is rather an all-encompassing word, Mr. Chairman. The material is treated in exactly the same way as the type of things I have just referred to. School Boards, of course, have their schools follow the Core Program as laid down by the Department of Education. They utilize those textbooks, materials, that have been approved by the Department of Education. They also have the jurisdiction, the right, to determine what other supplementary materials that they may utilize in their Division, in the schools of their Division, and "Building the Pieces Together" as a production or a program within another department comes into that particular category, Mr. Chairman.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know the extent to which this Minister and his department work toward the development of educational programs and assist School Boards and the teaching personnel of Manitoba to make the fullest use of educational material designed to assist in the educational responsibilities of the children in the Public School System.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, our curriculum committees, made up of representatives from different parts of the Educational System, as well as citizens at large, in drafting curriculum guides for the

total school program, consider materials from a wide range of areas.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, does this Minister consider it his responsibility to recommend to the teaching institutions of this province methods of teaching, making use of the most up-to-date means in which to carry out their responsibility in Education?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the answer to that question is obvious.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, obviously the Minister and I may have different views as to what is obvious. Would he care to answer the question, Mr. Chairman?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, there is no problem at all, of course, with — and the reason I say that it is obvious that I would expect that the Member for St. Johns would understand that we are prepared at all times to look at materials that might enhance the programs that are being offered in the schools of this province. This is the reason that I say that the answer to his question is obvious.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I don't really accept that because the Minister says that it is obvious that we are prepared to look at anything. Mr. Chairman, this Minister is not just a person who observes, looks, and reflects on what he sees. This Minister has an active responsibility in my opinion. Maybe that's not his opinion. But I think that as the person responsible for the overall educational programs in the province in the Public School System in this regard that he has more than an obligation to look at whatever appears, but rather to start making an effort to see to it that people who are actually using material have the opportunity to use the best material that is available, and I would like to think that this Minister goes beyond looking at anything that's presented.

Now Mr. Chairman, in regard to this "Building the Pieces Together" I find that it was developed — this program was developed by the Child Development and Support Services of the Department of Education, by the Ministry of Corrective and Rehabilitative Services, by Education Services of the Department of Health, and by a Department of Health and Welfare of the Government of Canada, so that the Department of Education apparently accepted the responsibility of assisting in the development of this program.

Now that I understand from the Minister that he is prepared to look at whatever comes to light, I believe that he can support my statement that he has looked at it. The reason I say that, and now I can quote from a newspaper article which seems to — well, which deals with "Building the Pieces Together" and says, I quote, "Recently however, Cosens," and of course that meant the Honourable Minister, "told a meeting in the Interlake region that his department hadn't approved of the program's use." Then the article goes on to say, "Then the Alcoholism Foundation gave River East Division notice it was discontinuing funding for the program at the end of June because the Foundation's budget was also subject to restraint." Czuboka, who is being quoted here, apparently the President of the Association of School Superintendents, said the department might be hesitating to endorse the program because of allegations that it tends to pry into people's personal lives or stress morals. I wonder if the Minister can therefore comment on having I assume looked at this proposed program or the program that is in use. He can comment not only as Minister but as an educator.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that my department and the Minister of Health's department will be conducting a careful assessment of this program. I believe the Minister of Health made that particular assurance to the Member for St. Johns during the debate on his Estimates, and I would suggest to the Member for St. Johns that it would be presumptuous indeed if he and I were to assess the program at this time. I will await the recommendations that come from that particular assessment.

MR. CHEIACK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate who from his department, is involved in this assessment.

MR. COSENS: The people who would be involved from my department, Mr. Chairman, of course would be those in the Program Development Section of our department.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has on each occasion, said we will be looking or they will be studying; does that mean there has nothing been done yet on this?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Minister of Health, now that he has completed his Estimates, is in the process of formulating an assessment committee.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, it is good that the Minister of Health has been released from the arduous and lengthy review of his Estimates, but I don't believe that he personally is going to be involved in evaluating this. Is the Minister of Education just sitting back and waiting for things to happen, as will be motivated by the Minister of Health? Does that then mean that the Minister of Education himself is not involved in the planning of this review?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I certainly have had conversations with the Minister of Health in this regard and of course the review will be carried on in conjunction with the Department of Health. The Minister of Health certainly would not go forward on this without consulting me and without having the expertise that resides in our department being utilized in the review.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I don't have the quotation of what the Minister of Health said but as I recall it, the Minister of Health said that he had stopped, he had ordered the Alcoholism Foundation to stop promoting this program. The reason he gave — these are not his words and I'm trying to remember how he put it — that it was felt that it was a difficult psychological problem. He didn't use that word, nor did he use the word "traumatic", but it seems to me that he indicated his fear that the teaching of this program would be something that would be very upsetting for the children and it was on complaints of parents that he ordered that be stopped.

Now, that was a positive action. It was not a negative thing, that said, well, we will sit back and we will wait to see what our Evaluation Committee arrives at, but rather he gave an order and he gave the order on the basis of concern, even fear, of the impact or effect of this program on children who are being taught. Does the Minister know that this is the concern? Does he acknowledge the possible validity of that?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I can acknowledge the validity of that particular statement.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I made the point to the Minister of Health, and it may be a month ago that I made that point, that if there is any cause for concern along those lines that it was the Minister of Education who was carrying on himself an important responsibility of permitting this program to go on without that evaluation. I just turned it around the other way, Mr. Chairman. I did not know that there was any validity for that concern. I, in my uneducated — and I use that term advisedly in terms of my not having an education designed to assess and evaluate a program — looked through this program rather extensively, found what to me appeared to be an exciting and useful way of teaching some pretty important basic values or assessments of value to my pupils, and I thought this was a great thing. But then I don't have the qualification to make that judgment for others, nor does the Minister of Health have any more than I have in an academic way of being able to judge it.

The Minister of Education, however, has the advantage of having been in the teaching profession for quite a long time and if there is any possibility that the Minister of Health's concern has validity, I have to ask the Minister of Education how it is that this is still being taught in the schools or available to be taught in the schools.

The Minister of Health said, "All I did was to order the Alcoholism Foundation to stop promoting . . .", but there is nothing to prevent it being used, then. He said he understood that every School Division had them. What does the Minister of Education say about that concern about matters being taught within the School System that might be damaging to the mental equilibrium, if I can use that phrase which again isn't the phrase of the Minister of Health, of the children who are being taught this program?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Health, in stopping the promotion of the program, in no way stopped the program. He merely was underlining what I have said earlier in that the usage of this program is a local decision.

I think the Member for St. Johns is well aware, as I am, that across this province we have communities of people of different racial origin, different cultural origin, different religious beliefs, who have strong feelings about certain topics and how they are treated. In some communities certain supplementary materials are taken exception to; in others certain materials can be approved by the parents and by the School Board of the community and be utilized without any problem. But, once again, the Minister of Health was respecting that local decision-making option and saying that he was not going to promote the course but that it would be available to those School Divisions who wished to use it, who wished to examine it, who wished to discuss it with the parents of their

area. And then after that examination if they found that their community was of a mind to utilize that type of material, then he was certainly not standing in their way in utilizing it and in that particular decision I certainly support him.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I am really disappointed in the Honourable the Minister, who has backed off from giving a direct answer on his evaluation of this program.

Mr. Chairman, I was a member of a School Board which served one-quarter of the children of Manitoba. I was also a Solicitor for a School Board, and thus attended all the meetings of the Board of a much smaller suburban School Division. I don't recall that the members of the School Board were really very much involved in the selection of programs, of the teaching materials that were taught within the school, but they were certainly under the impression that their teaching staff, their superintendent and senior program people were involved in it and they relied a good deal on the Department of Education, first as to the Core Program, about which there is no question; but, secondly, for the development of programs, and that's what we're talking about here, Program Development, support for the development of educational programs and this Minister has, I believe, carefully and deliberately avoided expressing an opinion about this program.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that it is his responsibility to state a position on it. He said it would be presumptuous for him or for me to take a position on this. Mr. Chairman, how long is it going to be presumptuous, in view of the fact that they haven't even yet got an Evaluation Committee set up.

This matter was caught — I use that word, I think correctly — was stopped early this year, I believe and the reason it was stopped was not because there wasn't enough money. The reason given was concern of the impact of the program on children.

Now the Minister says, "Well, you know, we have different communities with different racial, cultural and religious backgrounds." I don't know the extent to which the Department of Education is going to be influenced by the concerns of religious, cultural and racial vested interests. It seems to me that if there are problems that affect or concern any racial group — I don't use that term racial; I call it ethnic, mainly because Mr. Hitler made the term racial pretty unattractive, but there is nothing wrong with the term of course — but if there is a racial or an ethnic group that has concerns about a teaching tool then I think if those concerns are justified they should not be taught anywhere in the province.

If there is a religious group that takes exception to some manner of teaching device and if that religious group is right — and an educator should make a decision on that — then I think it's a matter of concern in all the schools.

I am saying that this Minister, I complimented him on having the additional attribute of having the training, academic, and the experience as a teacher, to be able to form a more educated opinion than others — I don't know whether it's much of a compliment to know he doesn't use it — because a Minister who doesn't have that background would have to rely on those people who are employed in his department to advise him and guide him. This Minister I thought, had an advantage. He could even assess the validity of the advice he's getting. But he has not indicated that he has had advice. He has not indicated that he has an opinion. I assume he read it because, somewhere or other — and I don't have that clipping — but somewhere or other I believe that he expressed a definite statement. You know so far I have quoted him as being sort of negative, like saying, we have not approved the program, but I believe he said somewhere he didn't like it. I haven't yet found it but maybe he will confirm that he had occasion to say he didn't like this program. If he didn't like it I'd like to hear why he didn't like it, because if it is being taught — and he says that it is available to be taught now in the schools — then if he doesn't like it for a valid reason why is it being taught? But if he doesn't have a valid reason, then we have a right to discuss why it is that he is catering to some unnamed, undescribed group of people.

Because the Minister of Health did say he received calls — I don't know if he said he received letters — but he received complaints by various people about the nature of this program. Where is the Minister of Education, who knows so much more — and should know and that's his responsibility to know — than the Minister of Health about programs of this nature; what is the department's opinion? Is there none? Does the department sit back and distribute material or permit material like this to be distributed, not knowing whether it's good, bad or indifferent and then stand back and say, I support the fact that any School Division can bring in what it likes on a local basis?

Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether that's the way the responsibility of education should be carried on in this government. Maybe this government just believes in issuing cheques, receiving requests, turning down requests, firing the occasional civil servant, and generally just redistributing the moneys that come in and go out, and leave decisions of the basic things, education, leave that to local School Boards.

I refer to the fact that I have had contact with School Boards in my time. I believe that the School Board's responsibility was the role of financing the education, seeing to it that there are staffs available to treat it, seeing to it that there is physical accommodation available to handle education and seeing to it that any additional educational programs would be available, such as art or swimming, or the athletic program, or whatever, to see to it that the administration of the school system carries on.

I did not visualize, in the time I was involved with School Boards, that it was their responsibility to plan or be involved in curriculum. I thought — and I don't think I was wrong in thinking — that it was the Department of Education that firstly redistributed some tax moneys amongst school divisions and secondly, and most important, gave some direction, gave some attitude. If this Minister would say, "I've reviewed this. I think it's dangerous. I think that it's wrong. I think it's not useful." We could discuss that. But this Minister takes his hands off and says, "Firstly, it's the Department of Health", so he washes his hands of that. He's a member of the government. He has an associate in the Department of Health. I don't know if he's part of that inner group of Ministers that meet on occasion to discuss matters of common interest, but one would like to think that when one deals with a matter such as this in the Department of Health he doesn't slough off responsibility by saying, "Well, it's that department that handles it."

But most of all I think that he has a responsibility to deal with it, and he has not dealt with it, Mr. Chairman. He has been very careful not to express an opinion, not to indicate whether or not he sees any problem in the fact that it is being taught now in the schools, nor any desire to help them, in the words of this specific program, support for the development of educational programs. Is this an educational program? Does it deserve support? Is it not an educational program? Does it not deserve support? But can we get some answers from the Minister on this?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, if I'm interpreting the remarks of the Member for St. Johns correctly, he's saying as a former School Board member that he thinks it should be the responsibility of the department to make the decisions as to the materials that will be used in the schools of the province. And that was the situation, Mr. Chairman, that apparently pertained in this province for many years, and apparently a few years ago, within the last eight years, there seemed to be some change in that regard and we have had materials produced by other departments of government that have been introduced into the School System apart from the Department of Education, and they have been introduced not as approved programs by the Department of Education but approved by some other department. And so I say to the Member for St. Johns, if he is saying that the department should approve all courses, that School Boards, the local elected officials, should not be put in the position of having to make any decisions as to supplementary materials and so on that go into the schools, I find that rather interesting because apparently, from what I can gather, that is reverse to the policy that has been adhered to in this province for the last five, six, or seven years. Certainly there are arguments on both sides of the question but I suggest to him that we are merely living with that policy that has developed that says, for local autonomy's sake, where School Boards and their professional officers, their superintendents, people who are very knowledgeable on educational matters, make a decision that they would like to supplement a program that is acceptable to the people of their area with some additional materials beyond that found in the educational system at that time, that they may do so. That is the situation, Mr. Chairman, and of course if the Member for St. Johns is suggesting it should be changed, I would be interested in hearing his opinion.

MR. CHERNIACK: I have never said that the decisions shall be made by the department. The decisions as to what shall be used, I do not believe that the provincial department shall make the decision for all School Boards. But Mr. Chairman, sloughing off any responsibility, such as I think this Minister is doing, is equally wrong, equally bad and maybe even moreso, Mr. Chairman, because I think that for one thing, I'd like to think that our children right across Manitoba have equal opportunities to get the advantage of educational programs.

But what I do believe is that the department has to play a role in the development of educational materials and play a role in making them available and play a role in making it possible for teachers and School Boards and Superintendents to know what is available and how it can be used. And I believe that this Minister is now deliberately trying to avoid expressing a point of view in regard to this program. He is not prepared to say it's not good. He's not prepared to say it is good. He is prepared to do nothing more than act as a lending library that sends out the material to School Boards. I think that that's the position because this Minister has not yet — he says, "Well, I think you're trying to say that we should make all of the decisions." Well, that may be right, but then it would be a departure so maybe we shouldn't be making all the decisions. I am not saying make all the decisions. I am saying, what about this program? Are you prepared to recommend its use?

are you prepared to recommend it should not be used? And if it is correct to say that there is concern as to whether or not this has an adverse impact on the mental or moral stability of students, won't you have the guts to say so?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I will be quite prepared to make a very clear-cut recommendation concerning this program at the time our assessment, joint assessment, Departments of Health and Education, has been completed. It would be presumptuous indeed of me to stand up and say that I am the prime assessor, that I will make the decision without the benefit of having the recommendations of the experts, the people with general expertise and with unique expertise having looked at the program and made their recommendations. At the time they have completed it I will certainly make a firm declaration.

MR. CHERNIACK: I do appreciate the forthright answer I've received from the Minister of Education, forthright to the extent that he says, "I will certainly do something if, as, and when I receive a report." Well, Mr. Chairman, I feel forthright enough to point out to the Minister that I first heard about this manual on February the 8th, 1979. I wrote to the Minister and I'll read my letter. It's a short one, dated February 8th, 1979: "I'm informed that you were asked about a manual whose title was something like "Bringing the pieces Together" and that you stated you had read it and didn't agree with it. I would appreciate it if you could let me have a copy of the manual and information on where it is being used and how and by whom and to whom it is being distributed," and I said, "Thanks". I was right in saying thanks, Mr. Chairman, even though I said thanks in advance of when I received a reply from him dated February 19th, which reads as follows: "According to the notation on the fly-leaf, this program was co-ordinated under the direction of the Alcoholism Foundation." It gives the address and phone number. "I am informed that the manual is being used in one or more schools in each of the 20 School Divisions at the present time. I regret that I do not have an extra copy for you but I expect that the Alcoholism Foundation could provide you with one." That's the response I received from this Minister. There's no obligation on the part of any member of the Treasury Bench to assist any member of the opposition, or of the Backbench, in obtaining material or answers to questions and therefore I don't fault the Minister one bit when he said, "I believe you can get a copy from the Alcoholism Foundation. Try it out."

All right, I did that, and my point in raising this is that on February 8th I wrote him. By that time he had already been interviewed and made some statements in regard to this document. That was two and a half months ago, Mr. Chairman, so it means that it's more than two and a half months since he's known about this program and had an opinion, and there is still no committee set up, he doesn't know yet when it will be set up, he notes that the Minister of Health has completed his Estimates and therefore he assumes that he is setting up a research committee, and I tell you, Mr. Chairman, that that's a pretty rotten way to consider a program which is in use in the schools, which may be of some concern — may not be — and this Minister in his forthright fashion says, "I will certainly make a statement when I get a report."

I think it's a matter of enough concern that there should have been a report long ago. I don't know how long it takes. Honestly, Mr. Chairman, I've read this and I am not a teacher. You have a couple of teachers, a couple of people with a great deal of experience, go through this program which for me is very lengthy, but it consists of probably 400 pages or so, lots of pictures — it's easy for people to read especially in today's day and age where pictures are part of the medium that is used to deliver a message, for them to go through it and form an opinion. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is a delinquency on the part of the Minister and of his department to just sit back and let things happen along these lines without in any way dealing with it. So, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister if he's familiar with the document entitled "Confronting the Stereotypes" which was produced under the sponsorship of the Manitoba Human Rights Commission and the Department of Education and is dated 1977?

MR. COSENS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm quite aware of that publication.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well then, I'd appreciate knowing from the Minister the extent to which it is being used in the School System and whether or not it is being used with his knowledge, concurrence, subject to his objection or what attitude he has to its use.

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I understand that it is being distributed and is generally available to all sectors of the School System.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I only obtained it a few — well, I think I've had it for awhile but I've only read through it the last few days, and I find this a very interesting document. To some

extent I think it goes overboard. It deals, Mr. Chairman, the stereotypes that exist within our educational system whereby, for example, it is suggested that in our general attitude in society and in the school books, it is natural to say to a little girl, "What will you be when you grow up, a nurse?" Whereas one will say to a little boy in the same grade, "What will you be when you grow up, a doctor?" And that is, I think, just a very simple example of the kind of book this hundred page document is, pointing out means to teachers of making sure that attitudes of a stereotype nature are not continued, are not carried out in the kindergarten and continued.

The idea about racial backgrounds of various people is dealt with, not only sex differences but ethnic differences, economic differences of that nature. It looks to me like it is a very useful tool but the Minister said he understands that it exists within the School System. I really asked him whether he has formed an opinion, and now I'll elaborate on it, and to what extent is his department approving of this, recommending it as a teaching device, or is it just like, as I said earlier, a lending library which says, "Here it is. Do you want it? You can have it." Without any positive or negative, but definite recommendation as to whether or not it should be used. Is it used that way?

MR. COSENS: Certainly, Mr. Chairman, the particular publication that the Member for St. Johns refers to is one of a range of materials that we recommend and provide to teachers to help them supplement their general teaching programs.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, I am not sarcastic when I say, that's good. I'm glad the Minister said that. I'm pleased he said, "we recommend," because that's not a word he used at any time today until now, so that they do recommend this document "Confronting the Stereotypes" but I'm assuming, and I think correctly, that the Minister is not recommending "Building the Pieces Together". So I can see that distinction, and he says, "I will certainly make a decision about that when I get the report from that research committee." I was just looking for the publication date of this "Bringing the Pieces Together" but I see reference to 1977. I'm guessing that it was about that time it came out and the Minister, who has been Minister for some 18 months, I believe should have done something about deciding whether or not to recommend that or not.

Now, Mr. Chairman, last night I was interested to learn and I tell you honestly and frankly I did not know very much about a program that was developed and distributed by the Co-operative Curriculum Project — the sponsorship appears to be, from the front page, the Department of Co-operative Development and the Department of Education — and it appears to have had assistance from a very great number of educators of a very widespread grouping and I believe it was carried on with the assistance of various groups within Manitoba in the co-operative field in Manitoba. It is an extensive series of books, not one alone, and I would like to know what the position of the Department of Education is in relation to the use of this material in the school system?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Chairman, I can inform the Member for St. Johns that some months ago I sent out information to all school divisions stating the material was available. Copies of the different pieces of material were sent out to school divisions and they were notified that these were available for their use.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I was listening for one word which I didn't hear. In connection with the document confronting the stereotypes, the Minister used the word, and I "recommended" it. I did not hear the word used in connection with this program on Co-operative Curriculum. Did the Minister recommend it?

MR. COSENS: I can't remember, Mr. Chairman, if I used the word "recommended" nor can I remember if that was the word that I used in connection with other supplementary materials that we have stated in our publications are available or we have stated in letters that have gone out to school divisions across the province. I think the very fact that I would state that these materials are available within the department and can be used by schools as supplementary material suggests a certain element of recommendation in itself.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, then it seems to me on the same basis of definition that this document Building the Pieces Together carries the recommendation of his department.

MR. COSENS: . . . document or the particular program that the member is speaking about, again, I remind him, rests within the Department of Health. You know, Mr. Chairman, I have some problem, the Member for St. Johns' government developed the program. If they were convinced that this was a sound, educational program, it may well be the assessment may in fact confirm that. If it

does, then why did it not exist within the Department of Education. It was some months, Mr. Chairman, before I found out that this program even existed, period.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, then I have to point out to the Honourable Minister that he said that the document confronting the stereotypes was distributed to the schools with information that it was available and whatever words he used carried his recommendation, and this document was produced under the sponsorship of Human Rights and the Department of Education, so maybe it was distributed by the department. The document, "Co-operation and Community Life" was not produced by the Department of Education —(Interjection)— Oh, yes, I'm told it was. So that he assumes responsibility for, but I gather from what he says that he does not accept responsibility for the distribution of Building the Pieces Together within his department, that's my understanding.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, on the Co-op Education Program, I feel that I must say a few words. Seeing that we are talking about the deceased, all the programs that have been killed, so let's talk about another one and then move on to whatever there may be remaining of the living. —(Interjection)— That's right, that's right, it includes the civil servants that have been killed.

Mr. Chairman, I'm surprised that the Minister of Education says that if we had endorsed this program why weren't we promoting it, why didn't we set it on track? The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that during the year 1977, it was being brought on track and it was a program that was developed working in close conjunction with all sectors of the Manitoba community and I think that the acknowledgements contained in both programs ought to be read into the record so that the Minister and others would know that this was not something developed by the New Democratic Party government and shoved down the people's throats, but that we worked in close co-operation and liaison with a variety of people — teachers, administrators, people in the co-op movement, and others.

There were three program outlines developed. One tied in with the Grade 11 Social Studies program, another with the Grade 11 Business Education program, and a third that ties in with the Grade 5 Social Studies program. But all three of those programs, Mr. Chairman, I hasten to add, were designed in such a way that portions of them could be plugged into and integrated with practically any subject area in the school program.

I would just like to turn for a moment or two to the Business Education program because it does contain a brief historical outline of the development of the program and it indicates that the development of it goes back to 1972 when the first initial steps were taken to develop it and then it grew from then on. Working, as I have said, working together in developing the materials and testing and piloting the materials in various schools and I would like to remind the Minister, he ought to know of this because as he will find on the inside cover, that both the names of the Department of Co-operative Development and Department of Education appear there.

The high school program was piloted at a number of schools throughout the province, including urban and rural schools — Beausejour Collegiate, Crocus Plains Regional Secondary School in Brandon, Goose Lake High School in Roblin, Gordon Bell High School in Winnipeg, Grant Park High School in Winnipeg, Margaret Barbour Collegiate in The Pas, and W. C. Miller Collegiate in Altona.

The elementary program was piloted in West Park School in Altona, Carman Elementary School in Carman, John M. King School in Winnipeg, Lakewood Elementary School in Winnipeg, Pelican Rapids School in Pelican Rapids, Ruth Hooker School in Selkirk, Shaughnessy Park School in Winnipeg, Southwood School in Steinbach, and Wanipigow School in Hole River.

So there was involvement of teachers and administrators every step of the way in the development and assembly of materials and the production of the finished product, the testing and the piloting of the program in the schools. Finally, in late 1966, the program which we now have come on track.

But it should be pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that this is not the type of a program that one could simply send a memo around and say, here it is, or that one could simply send a memo from the Department of Education and say we have a co-op education program for those who want to use it, and even add the words, "We recommend its use." Even that is insufficient because it is a type of program that does require the department to take the extra step to acquaint the teachers with the methodology of the proper and effective use of the material.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. It is now 4:30 and in accordance with Rule 19 Subsection 2, I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour. The Committee of Supply will continue

tonight at 8:00 o'clock. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson): We are now in Private Members' Hour. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. James, Bill No. 33, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. (Stands)

On the adjourned debate on second reading on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster, Bill No. 29, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. (Stands)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Wellington, Bill No. 34, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. (Stands)

On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster, Bill No. 1, standing in the name of the Honourable Mr. Speaker. That will stand in the Honourable Mr. Speaker's name.

RESOLUTION NO. 5 — MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed Resolution No. 5, proposed by the Honourable Member for Logan, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, to prepare myself for the debate on the minimum wage I did some scientific research. I even went to see my doctor for some professional advice. I said to him, Mr. Speaker, "Doctor, you studied anatomy in medical school, you have performed many operations on human beings. You know what people look like both on the inside as well as outside." Then I said to him, "Can you tell me from your own experience, as a doctor, whether some people have minimum stomachs and some have maximum stomachs? Do some people have small stomachs and others have stomachs ten or fifty times bigger," or twenty-five or a hundred, I don't know even the size.

My doctor, Mr. Speaker, assured me this was nonsense. He said all people have about the same size stomach — some a little bigger and some a little smaller, but on average about the same. My honourable friend from St. James, I believe, he doesn't look skinny to me either, Mr. Speaker, he's talking about my stomach but . . . —(Interjection)—

Then my doctor, Mr. Speaker, looked at me and said: "Well, Father, why do you waste my time by asking such silly questions? You know answering your silly questions isn't even covered by Medicare." But I was trying to explain to him and I told him that I need his expert advice because I was going to talk on the minimum wage. I have to convince the fellows on the other side, Conservatives naturally, that all human beings have the same size stomach like anybody else, regardless of his political belief, might be a Conservative, Liberal, NDP or Social Credit. Do we have any others, I don't remember? All people have the same need for food of at least 2,000 calories a day. In our kind of climate all people must wear clothes that are at least warm enough to keep them from freezing to death. All must have adequate shelter.

But, Mr. Speaker, the question before us is whether people can get all that on the minimum wage? Can people get enough food, clothing and shelter, plus a few other things, on a wage of \$2.95 an hour? We heard that the minister, last Friday, he announced that they are prepared to raise a little and first it will be ten cents I believe, effective July 1, and then the people have to wait for another half a year for another ten cents.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Honourable Member for Churchill, several days ago presented some important statistics to show the need for an increase in the minimum wage. Others likewise have presented some important facts. There are enough statistics to choke an ox to prove the need for an increase in the minimum wage.

But in heavens name do we need statistics to prove the cost of living has increased in the last two years? If I'm not mistaken around 33 or 34 percent, something to this effect. And this fact is starting since two years, and every month on the basic food is going on and on and on. Prices have constantly been rising before our eyes. The only thing that has not been rising in the last two years is the minimum wage. But everything else is going, just name it. But I'm concentrating most on the food, the basic food, which every person needs for every day

The argument the Conservatives generally put forward is that the economy can't afford it. This is the only argument they have. Raising the minimum wage, they say, would have an adverse effect on the economy and business. I will deal with this in a minute, Mr. Speaker.

But first I want to deal with the view held by some people that those getting the minimum wage are young people, living at home, and are working just to get some spending money. Then there are those who think many of the minimum wage earners are housewives who want to earn extra money, even though their husbands can well afford to support them. Even if this were true, and it were the whole story, it would be no excuse for having an inadequate minimum wage. There is an old saying that 'the worker is worthy of his work.'

But, Mr. Speaker, we must face the fact that among the 40,000 Manitobans who get the minimum wage there are heads of families. There are deserted wives and widows who have to work and support themselves and their children. They have a hard time getting by on the present minimum wage — and even if we raise it by 60 or 70 cents, that will still only give them \$4.80 a day more. You don't buy many groceries today for \$4.80, according to the statistics which was shown here in this Chamber by my honourable colleague, the Member for Churchill. Mr. Speaker, I will say no more on this point. I think there is general agreement that \$2.95 or even \$3.20, which it will become next year, is an inadequate minimum wage for even a minimum living standard.

Our honourable friends on the other side through the years have always thought that their strongest argument against minimum wage increases was the economic argument. They always said the economy can't stand it. A higher minimum wage, they said, would force a lot of businesses to close up and therefore add still more to the unemployed. My honourable friend from Pembina, he agrees with that but I would like to see him to live on this minimum wage, then he will sing differently. But he's telling somebody to live on \$2.95 per hour. You should be ashamed of yourself, my friend. I would just like to find out how you go to bed knowing that your constituents, they are starving. You don't think about it. He is rich, well he won't even believe that somebody is starving, but this is the case and we have lots of them.

Mr. Speaker, these are the kind of arguments that have been used all through the years in opposing wage increases. But these arguments have been proven false over and over again. The most outstanding proof of this was provided by Henry Ford over 50 years ago. In the Twenties the average wage in the auto industry was \$2.50 a day — not \$2.50 an hour — but \$2.50 a day.

Politically, old Henry Ford was an ultra Conservative. He would be even further to the right than the Honourable First Minister of Manitoba —(Interjection)—

Mr. Speaker, the Ford Motor Company at that time was just getting into its full speed in the mass production of cars. It employed a few thousand workers. But as Henry Ford watched the workers coming to work he noticed they came to work on bicycles and by streetcars and bus — they were not driving Ford cars. —(Interjection)—

Ford thought there was something wrong and he started to manipulate, what is the cause, why? His workers who worked for him, they are coming to work on bicycles and other transportation but not on the product which they are producing here. So old Henry scratched his head and put a few figures on paper. He figured out that by the time the average worker feeds himself and his family, buys clothes and pays the rent there is nothing left over out of his \$2.50 a day.

So Ford was in the business of producing the cars. He wanted this car to be sold. He wanted people driving cars, especially people who worked for him. So what he did, he came to the point and he said, "No more will I pay my people \$2.50 a day." And, Mr. Speaker, this is a historical fact that he increased not only at 3. something percent, or 10 percent, or 20 percent — 100 percent, Mr. Speaker — and he doubled that and he established a minimum wage from \$2.50 a day to \$5.00 a day. —(Interjection)So, Mr. : Speaker, we must remember in the Twenties \$5.00 a day was considered a very high wage. It was an unheard of minimum wage for that time.

But did that \$5.00 a day minimum wage hurt the economy at that time? Did it cause many bankruptcies? Far from it, Mr. Speaker. The thousands of workers who had their wages increased from \$2.50 a day to \$5.00 a day started living a little better. They spent more money on a great variety of goods they couldn't before. And many of them even saved enough to put a down payment on a car so more cars were bought — they were buying from the company they worked for.

Today politicians and economists and businessmen talk about the need for economic expansion. They are looking for ways to stimulate business. But it takes customers with money to stimulate business. No business can expand unless more people are able to buy the goods and services being produced.

Most Canadians today, Mr. Speaker, are probably better off than they've ever been before. But there are still a large number of people who are in need of better housing and a great variety of goods, if they are to share in our high living standards. Mr. Speaker, unless people are given the chance to buy whatever they need they will have to continue living at a low standard of living — and they will not be able to provide much stimulation for businesses.

Honourable members will remember that a short time ago the Federal Government raised the salaries of some top government officials. Some had their salaries raised from \$60,000 a year, Mr.

Speaker, to over \$78,000 a year. Now I am talking, Mr. Speaker, that when they got a raise I am talking about \$18,000 a year more.

Now our people who are working who are getting a minimum wage, they are making \$5,664 a year and when they will be getting a raise of 3.34 percent, I believe, so for the year they will be receiving \$169 a year more, Mr. Speaker. What can they buy for \$169 today?

And again I am coming back to those federal officials who are making \$78,000 right now. This is a big difference; this is a really big difference. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to figure out why they got this increase. Surely no one getting \$60,000 a year can be hard up. They are already overloaded with material things. They can buy whatever they wish.

So what will these people do with the extra money they are getting? They can spend it on holidays. Where? Not in Manitoba or even British Columbia. Probably they will go to the Bahamas, to Miami or wherever, but not here. Some of them can put some more money in Swiss Banks for their special accounts, or they can put it under different things. But this does nothing for the economy, Mr. Speaker. It does nothing to stimulate business.

But every cent earned by those in the low income groups is spent on the essential things of life. In the minimum wage increase proposed in the Resolution, suppose if it will pass and the increase goes into effect, the money will immediately be spent on all sorts of consumer goods and services here in this country.

In the last two years the Prime Minister, the members of parliament and the senators had two big increases. Members of the City Council gave themselves a raise. We had our indemnities increased. Even some in the highest income brackets had their incomes increased to keep up with the cost of living. Why does this government want to discriminate against those low-paid workers on the minimum wage? Why deny them an increase — a reasonable increase?

Mr. Speaker, our aim should be a decent standard of living for all our people, not only for a few.

I will conclude with a quotation from a 17th century philosopher, I believe you will remember him, Benedict Spinoza. Spinoza said, and I'm quoting his words . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has two minutes.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Two minutes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

"Men who are governed by reason, desire for themselves nothing which they do not also desire for the rest of mankind."

I am sure all of us in this House enjoy a good standard of living. Why then would any member of this Assembly want to deny others the opportunity for a better living standard?

I say to honourable members on the other side, Mr. Speaker, you have no excuse, no excuse whatsoever, and no logical reason for voting against the minimum wage increase proposed in this Resolution before us. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I had to rise to comment on a good number of the points that have been raised and in particular the formula to which the Resolution refers. The Resolution seems to have government consider the advisability that future increases in the minimum wage in Manitoba be established by a formula which had been recommended unanimously by the Minimum Wage Board in 1976 and repeated in 1977.

I notice the fact that these recommendations of the Minimum Wage Board have not been stated or referred to within the Resolution.

As indicated in the Resolution the proposed formula would require that future increases be calculated on the 60 percent of the Manitoba Industrial Composite average weekly earnings recorded each June and to come into effect the following January.

There are several considerations that have to be dealt with in regard to that particular formula. Specifically, those identical recommendations — and I refer to where they were minority and where they were unanimous — were made. Those specific recommendations, Mr. Speaker, were made to the previous administration in 1976 and 1977 on a unanimous basis but the NDP government of that day, for their own reasons, recognized the difficulty with implementing the formula and I haven't heard to date, privately, confidentially, in the halls or in the House, why that formula could not be or should not have been accepted by the previous administration.

On July 26 in 1977 the Minister of Labour under the previous government sent a memo to the then Premier and members of Cabinet, in which he stated, "I make no recommendation as to an increase in the minimum wage at the present time." He ends up by saying, "For your information I have had no pressure for an increase, as of now." That recommendation was made to the then

Premier and Cabinet in July of 1977.

In a copy of a report forwarded to the previous Minister of Labour under the previous New Democratic Party government, the Chairman of the Minimum Wage Board indicated that in 1974 a minority report had indicated that the formula should be 60 percent of Manitoba's average weekly earnings industrial composite. This recommendation was presented again in 1975 as a minority report of the Minimum Wage Board.

On May 17, 1977, the Chairman of the Minimum Wage Board recommended that the minimum wage be increased according to the formula, the same formula, Mr. Speaker, that's being proposed by my honourable friend from Logan.

However, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the Minister of Labour chose not to listen to those particular recommendations. I can imagine, Mr. Speaker, I can only guess, because though the previous Minister of Labour is a long-time acquaintance of mine he has never told me why he chose not to recommend it, but I'm sure that he made the recommendations and the content of the recommendations available to his colleagues opposite. U

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to draw to the attention of my friends opposite to the minimum wage and its relation to the average weekly earnings industrial composite during the past several years. I will give you the minimum wage at a given point and its percentage — and I think this is important — its percentage of the average weekly earnings for the same point in time.

And the reason I make this point, Mr. Speaker, is there appears to be — and I only say "appears" because I don't know of the late Sixties Conservative government's philosophy in relationship to a formula and I don't know the philosophy of the NDP government as it relates to a formula — but when I read off the figures you will find in fact there has been a ratio — and I can give a copy of this to you if you'd like — a ratio of a formula being somehow accepted by previous administrations, both going back to the Sixties and the Conservatives leading into the New Democratic Party's era and into ours.

In December of 1968 the \$1.25 equalled 49.6 percent; in 1969 the \$1.35 equalled 51 percent; in 1970 the \$1.50 equalled 50.9 percent; in 1971 the \$1.65 equalled 51.6 percent; in 1972 the \$1.75 equalled 50.6 percent; in 1973 the \$1.90 equalled 51 percent; in July, 1974, the \$2.15 equalled 51.7 percent; the \$2.30 in 1975 equalled 52.8 percent and there was an additional increase in 1975 of 30 cents, which bounced it up to 53.4 percent. And in September of 1976, the last increase bounced it up to 54.9 percent. In December of 1977 it related to 51.4 percent; in March of 1978 it was 50.3 percent; in December of 1978, 48.4 percent, and I haven't calculated it but I would take a rough guess that the 10 cents in July will probably bring it back to 49 or 50 percent and the 10 cents possibly in January, because of the changing of the composite average, will possibly keep it at the 50 or the 51 percent.

So what's really happened, Mr. Speaker, is that when the NDP Party came into power the minimum wage was slightly over 50 percent of the average weekly earnings industrial composite. And if you follow it through somebody some place maybe worked on these figures during the last few years, and I suppose going back to the years of the Conservatives, and felt that 50 or thereabouts might be acceptable by conscience or by politics or by the industry or by the people or by the philosophy, I really don't know. But it appears that between 48, 49 and 51 and 52 when it's averaged out, and that seems to have been an unwritten formula that has been accepted by governments in Manitoba, going back 10 years, and that's as far as I went back.

But the minimum wage was slightly over 50 percent of the average weekly earnings industrial composite when the New Democratic Party came to power and during the eight years that the NDP were in power the percentage ranged from 50 to a high of 54 in September, 1976. The average for that period, Mr. Speaker, was 51.9 percent. One percent, Mr. Speaker, one percent to members opposite, who present themselves as champions for low wage earners and who are making such loud noises now, saw fit to really increase the rates of the minimum wage to average earnings industrial composite by approximately one percent, if you take the era in the period of time that they were in office. And I can provide the figures to them, over an average over the period of time during that year.

And I can't be convinced, Mr. Speaker, with . . . The Member for Churchill mentioned today that his friends in the labour movement talked to that particular Party. I doubt that they weren't talking to them during those eight years and I doubt that the researchers and the knowledgeable people in the labour movement weren't making them aware of where the formula was really at. And I doubt that the labour movement wasn't telling them that really all you have done is average a 1 percent increase over the period of your eight years in office.

Mr. Speaker, the same members of the opposition now want us to increase the minimum wage to 60 percent of the average weekly earnings.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to suggest that the members opposite are knowledgeable and that they had very good reasons, those reasons they haven't chose to spell out, Mr. Speaker, but I suspect

that they're knowledgeable enough and they had very good reason for not further increasing the minimum wage even though they received minority reports and majority reports recommending that they should tie themselves to the 60 percent formula. I can only suspect that some realm of common sense prevailed someplace that they didn't charge off and implement the 60 percent formula when they were in office and had the opportunity to do so.

I'd like to quote from a statement made by one of the members of the NDP who in 1973 said "It's only small business that fear this government because the small businesses are afraid of the increased minimum wages that we are legislating" so it'll be these small businesses that are being squeezed by the Social Democrat governments. Mr. Speaker, some of the members of the NDP government recognize that a higher minimum wage, and I say they must have recognized it, they recognized by the record, the record is very clear, they recognized that a higher minimum wage could create hardships for small businesses, and therefore, they did not increase it substantially beyond the 51 percent which is the average for the period of time that they were in office.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder why today when they had 8 years to research and to study and to compare and to look at industry and business, and the same people in those days, the same philosophies applies to the wages they were receiving, the same kinds of people, the same troubled people who had difficulty living on the minimum wage were there in those days. That's no different; that's the same as it is today.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, today they're insisting that we give consideration to 60 percent. Mr. Speaker, this government believes that small business is the backbone of Manitoba economy, and we want to see them flourish.

Had this formula been implemented, based on the average weekly earnings industrial composite for June of 1978, we would find ourselves now with a minimum wage of \$3.62 per hour. A rate that would have come into effect on January 1st, 1979; this rate would be 25 cents higher than the Quebec minimum wage of \$3.37 which is the highest in Canada; it would be 37 cents higher than Saskatchewan's \$3.25 and it would be 62 cents higher than the \$3.00 minimums in British Columbia, Alberta and Ontario.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker that serious damage could be done to our competitive position, particularly in certain right of manufacturing and light industries. Quebec recently departed from its policy of adjusting the minimum wage on a basis of a formula. Granted the Quebec formula was different from the one proposed here because it was based on a percentage increase tied to the Consumer Price Index every January and July; that's a different sort of a formula, but it was a formula, Mr. Speaker. However, when the province froze the minimum wage and undertook its review of the formula, the minimum wage was \$3.27; yet we have before us a resolution that proposes to establish by a formula a minimum wage rate far higher than the one which had cost such great concern to the Government of Quebec. Premier Levesque, after review, broke away from the formula and announced a 10 cent increase in October and a further 10 cents an hour increase in April 1st of this year. Levesque said that Quebec could not afford to continue to widen the gap between its minimum wage and that of neighboring provinces, nor could it freeze the salaries of those who earn the minimum wage. So really, and I could be wrong, but what I read into what happened is that they had promised to tie themselves into a formula, found that the formula was putting them in a uncompetitive position and I should add, creating a tremendous amount of unemployment within their province; they found this to be the case, Mr. Speaker, so I suspect that to keep within the spirit of what they had said they were going to do and there was going to be an increase on a regular basis, they got away from the formula and they went to 10 cent increases.

The Honourable member has indicated in his proposed resolution that the average weekly wage in Manitoba is lower than all except three Maritime Provinces. While the previous government was concerned, as they should have been, with the people who work for minimum wages they somehow forgot about the people who pay the wages; not only those who earn low wages, but also those who are more highly skilled and earn higher wages.

Instead of attracting or promoting the development of a strong, high wage, heavy manufacturing sector, or an expansion of small business in the province, instead of doing those things, which would have resulted in higher wages generally, the previous government, by their general negative attitude towards business tended to discourage such development and expansion.

For the information of the member I would like to point out that were such a 60 percent formula, as has been proposed, implemented in each province, the hourly minimum wage rates in Canada as of January 1st, 1979 would have ranged from \$2.90 in Prince Edward Island; \$3.36 in Nova Scotia; \$4.15 in Alberta; \$4.55 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. The honourable member has two minutes.

MR. MacMASTER: . . . \$4.55 in British Columbia, as mentioned earlier, Manitoba's would have been \$3.62, ahead only of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. Can you imagine the effect of such minimums on international, competitive position of our country and on the numbers of jobs available to Canadians and industries subject to such competition? I suppose the real question is what would the unemployment rate be?

In terms of relation between the minimum wage rate and the average wage rate as reflected in the Industrial Composite Estimates produced by Statistics Canada, Manitoba enjoys today as it has for many years a fairly good position vis-a-vis the other jurisdictions. In terms of the minimum wage as of January 1st, 1979 as a percentage of June, 1978 average weekly earnings, Manitoba stood at 48.8 percent. Four provinces had higher ratios, but five provinces had lower ratios. Ontario's, Mr. Speaker, was 45 percent, Alberta's was 43, and B.C.'s was 39.

The honourable member points out that the minimum wage of Manitoba has not been increased since September, a period of 32 months. I'd suggest that Manitoba is not the only jurisdiction that hasn't increased it.

The day seems to have passed when it's an automatic thing in jurisdictions in this country, and I would suspect that it has a lot to do with what we've been talking about here today.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's time is up. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was rather interested in the minister's arithmetic. It seems to me that all of the Conservatives are dealing with basics; back to the basics, reading, writing, arithmetic and we had a taste of the Minister of Education's arithmetic yesterday, whereby he calculates 1,000 to be 73 percent of 2,000; where 8,000 times 1,000 is 16,000,000; and where 16,000,000 minus 3,000,000 equals 16,000,000.

Today, we have the Minister of Labour and he read the statistics to me, Mr. Speaker, I don't have them here on paper, he said he passed them over, but I remember most of them; that in 1969 the minimum wage was roughly 49 percent of the composite industrial average; that in 1970 they went up to perhaps 50.9 percent, approximately that amount; that in 1972 they went down to 50.1 percent; that in 1973 or thereabouts, they went up to 52.9; that in 1974 they went up to 53.9, and he got, Mr. Speaker, up to approximately 54 percent, perhaps almost 55. 54.9, almost 55 percent, Mr. Speaker, and then he said, in September of 1977, they were down to 50 percent; and he came out with an average of a 1 percent increase because that particular average suited him.

What he would have everybody not believe, Mr. Speaker, is that the minimum wage rose steadily from 49 percent at the commencement of the New Democratic Party administration to 55 percent just before the termination of the New Democratic Party administration, and he knows as well as do all the people of the Province of Manitoba that there was a scheduled minimum wage increase to take place in the fall of 19. . . —(Interjection)— January of 1977 and he takes the period at the end of the line where he gets down to 50 knowing that there is an increase scheduled, which increase if it followed the pattern of the previous ones would have seen a minimum wage of 55 percent of the industrial average.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to try to salve his conscience, he says that we are at the same place that they were at, but his figures, Mr. Speaker, don't say that. His figures say that the minimum wage under the New Democratic Party, and I hadn't really realized that we did that well, I'm glad that he told me, went up to almost 55 percent from 49 percent; and with the increase that they would have had at that time, it would have stayed at roughly that point and maybe would have gone further. But the honourable minister says that this represented a 1 percent average increase in the minimum wage, Mr. Speaker, because it suits his purpose to so declare.

However, Mr. Speaker, I don't really want to deal with the arithmetic. I want to try to deal with my honourable friend's understanding of what is the legislative process because he says that the passing of this resolution would require a 60 percent of the industrial average composite minimum wage. Mr. Speaker, this resolution wouldn't require anything; the only thing this resolution would require is consideration, is for the government to sit down and consider a formula, and if he says that we won't consider it because you didn't consider it, Mr. Speaker, then we have again the Tories saying that the New Democratic Party administration was a model to be followed; it wasn't a government which was to be ejected from office, but it was a model government and we intend in the future to model our system after the New Democratic Party administration. —(Interjection)— Well, pardon me? Well, he said no such thing. Well, Mr. Speaker, if he's not going to model it after the New Democratic Party administration, will he please stop referring to us as the "precedent"? There is now, before the members of this Assembly, a suggestion that legislation ask for the government to consider the advisability, Mr. Speaker, of tying the minimum wage to

a formula; that's really what it says — the figure of 60 percent, some people want it to be included in the consideration and they can't force what consideration takes place, but isn't the substance of the resolution for a person who believes it should be 50 percent.

To say that minimum wages should have some relationship to other wages paid in community; that they should be regularly increased and that increase shouldn't depend on the whim of the government at the particular moment; that these people who are at the lowest end of the wage scale and have no bargaining power should have their wages keep pace with wages paid to other people in the community. That's what you are voting against. You who say you're voting against 60 percent, the only people you are fooling are yourselves. Nobody else is fooled, and I doubt, Mr. Speaker, I doubt whether they are fooling themselves. I think they know. I think they know that the 60 percent is a considered figure — considered, that's not a word — is a figure to be considered, to be considered. If the 60 percent doesn't please the government they will have, Mr. Speaker, full authority to deal with a formula of a kind that they think is reasonable, but the Legislative process, if this Resolution were passed, merely goes on record as saying that minimum wages will have a steady relationship to other wages paid in society and will go up on a regular basis and that therefore the minimum wage people will get their increase along with other people in society.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen the Conservative government vote against motherhood on several occasions. This Resolution, and I say it probably has some weakness in that respect but nevertheless it is an attempt, is nothing other than a request that that type of formula be considered. That's number one, Mr. Speaker, and that is, I tell the Minister, the Legislative process, this Resolution would not require a one cent increase in the minimum wage but it does require some attention to be paid by members of the government as to how it should be formulated and doesn't then require any Legislation — although certainly one would hope that if the consideration was favourable and if the government was sincere we would hope to see that — but it doesn't require anything. It requires consideration. That's one aspect of the matter, Mr. Speaker.

I want to deal with the second aspect of it which the Minister felt to be such a terrible thing. You know the Minister said that if this formula was adhered to wages would be \$4 in Ontario. They would be \$3.80 in Nova Scotia. I'm not using the exact figures, I don't remember them. They would be \$3.65 in the province of Manitoba. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, imagine that in our society one person would have control over another person's time for a period of sixty minutes, every minute at the horrendous price of \$3.65. Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether it would be economically feasible at the moment, but it would not be terrible. \$3.65, do you say that that Resolution that the member — is it the Member for Churchill's Resolution? — (Interjection) — Your Resolution.

You know, you say that a guy who moves a Resolution in the House, that a person get \$3.25 an hour or \$3.60 an hour is looking for votes, that the reason for the Resolution is somebody is trying to get votes! Mr. Speaker, who would vote for anybody who would say that they should work for \$3.65 an hour, rather than giving him votes, they should say, Mr. Speaker, that he should be drummed out of office. He puts that Resolution not because \$3.65 is something that he thinks the people should get, but that, Mr. Speaker, out of consideration for the fact that there has to be some form of bargaining position for the people at the lowest economic rung of the ladder, and that that bargaining position cannot be obtained through organized labour because organized labour is unable to organize at those levels of society. What the member says is that despite the fact that this is a terrible wage that I wouldn't want my worst enemy to work for it — now just a minute, maybe my worst enemy should work for it but, Mr. Speaker, that I wouldn't want to be the person who is forced onto that wage — we put a Resolution to the House. I don't think there is any electoral support in moving that somebody work for \$3.65 an hour.

I venture to say that in the Member for Logan's constituency, which is composed in large respect of skilled tradesmen, skilled tradesmen, many of whom work at the Weston Shops, and whose wages are — I throw it out to you — \$8 an hour, that if they said that Bill Jenkins is trying to get them \$3.65 an hour he might even be able to elect a conservative in Logan, and you know that's the last seat, if you're going to win 57 seats Logan is likely to be number 57 that you'll win. But if he said that his constituents should work for \$3.65 an hour they would vote him out. So, don't talk about this Resolution being some sort of demagoguery. This Resolution will help all of the people in society but the ones that it is aimed at, the \$3.65, it's not something, Mr. Speaker, which has electoral appeal. It's something that you need as a matter of self survival.

You know, the honourable members talk about the minimum wage as being necessary from the point of view of maintaining the economy. I am surprised. I wonder, why did the Member for Morden applaud, and I think I saw him applauding vigorously when you announced a ten cent increase in the minimum wage? Why was it increased at all? Why, indeed, was it not decreased if the reduction in the minimum wage would result in more jobs, a more stimulating economy, happy days are here again we've reduced the minimum wage to \$2.00, why don't you do it? Because you know, Mr.

Speaker, that there hasn't been any statistics which you can demonstrably show, or which even tend to show that the increases in the minimum wage have done anything to make Manitoba's economy less attractive, or have resulted in a loss of jobs. I think that my friend, The Member for Logan, has indicated that no jobs were lost as a result of all of the increases in the minimum wage which took place between the years 1969 and 1978 when the minimum wage, excuse me 1976, when the minimum wage went up from 50 percent of the industrial average to 55 percent of the industrial average. That's what happened, Mr. Speaker. The minimum wage went up from 50 percent or just under 50 percent to almost 55 percent, and anybody who is trying to make that an average 1 percent increase over the years needs, with great respect to my honourable friend, some introduction to the basics. The basics, the education of the basics which is so well loved by my conservative friends. There should be some of that type of education.

But, Mr. Speaker, supposing, supposing that conservative society depended on a \$1 minimum wage as against what we pay now which is \$2.95. What's it gone—\$3.10 now? \$3.05. —(Interjection)—Horrendous sum, Mr. Speaker, I mean just imagine the economy, Manitoba is going to go down the tube if \$3.05 is paid for an hour's worth of a person's time. An hour's worth of time. May I tell the Minister of Labour who has some knowledge in this field that exactly the same argument that is now being used by the Member for Morden with respect to the minimum wage, exactly without even an amendment in the language, was used to try to retain child labour in the mines in the United States, but exactly the same argument. The Member for Morden is laughing. I will show him the speeches, exactly the same arguments. If we can't have our child labourers the people who depend on them for their living will be the ones who will suffer because they will lose their jobs and their parents can't get jobs and their families will suffer. That is one of the things that they said; and secondly we will become less competitive and we will have to close the mines and there will be no jobs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in what respect is what I have just said, which was the argument for the maintenance of child labour in the mines in the United States and every other place where they were maintained, in what respect does that differ from what the Member for Morden . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. The hour being 5:30 Private Members' Hour is over. When this Resolution next comes up on the Order Paper, the honourable member will have an additional 5 minutes. The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour, that the House do now adjourn. It is my understanding that the Committee of Supply will be meeting only in the Chamber tonight to consider the estimates of the Department of Education.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 p.m. Wednesday afternoon.