

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, April 3, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery, where we have 60 students from Jefferson Junior High, under the direction of Mr. Zuk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

We also have 31 students of Grade 5 standing from Precious Blood School, under the direction of Madame Annette Bouchard. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here today.

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to distribute one of our new Manitoba Fishing Guides to the members of the House here and personally extend an invitation to them to visit some of our very beautiful lakes we have in Manitoba this summer.

A MEMBER: That's if the ice ever gets off them.

MRS. PRICE: Think positively.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Economic Development. Would he be good enough to favour the House with a copy of his speaking notes from the speech which he made in Morden last night?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I don't have any written speech that I spoke of in Morden. I just spoke to the group at the Pembina Valley yesterday, and I'm afraid I don't have any written speech.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Could the Minister indicate to the House whether he has done any feasibility studies on the industries that he proposes to attract to the province of Manitoba, namely: fighter aircraft manufacture, and health care products I believe was the other.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the department is working steadily and the fact that we have somebody that is specifically assigned to the Fighter Aircraft Program, working on the benefit of Manitoba, and there's been a lot of work done by ourselves and the Aerospace Industry in Manitoba on this subject.

The other feasibility studies that I spoke of — I said that the health care products business would be one that we should be looking at in Manitoba, and our department has been doing a lot of research and work on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Health. In view of the fact that he made a brief to the Senate, and also released it to the media, will he extend the same courtesy to this House so that the members, too, will know what was in the brief?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Yes, Mr. Speaker. That is in process.

MR. FOX: I do not understand the Minister, Mr. Speaker. How can it be in process if he's already released it to the news media, and also to the Senate? And is that a policy that he has released?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Province of Manitoba was asked to submit a presentation to the Senate Committee on aging. A position was prepared; it was scheduled to be delivered by me to the Senate last Tuesday, and that date was cancelled with the call of the federal election. At that point in time we issued it in printed form to Senator David Crowl, the Chairman of the Committee, so he could have it for the record. Naturally, there was some public attention attendant upon that. I'm having copies made for distribution to all members of the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question to the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister could advise the House as to when Budget might be expected.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I can't give my honourable friend an exact date at this stage. I'm not being facetious when I say that in the relatively near future — and by that I mean a matter of weeks.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could take the opportunity to respond to the question of the Member for St. Johns concerning an Order-in-Council he was enquiring about. The Order-in-Council in question related to the Department of Economic Development, and an agreement with the Manitoba Research Council respecting the food products testing facility at Portage la Prairie. That Order-in-Council was delayed in order that a joint announcement might be made by the Minister with respect to another agreement under the industrial sub-agreement of DREE relating to the City of Winnipeg. Those two announcements have been made, and the Orders-in-Council respecting both of those agreements have been filed.

I can add by way of postscript, of course, that the practice is not an unusual practice — it's been followed through a number of administrations-in-Council — to delay filing of Orders in anticipation of public announcements.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Honourable First Minister for his explanation. I'm just wondering whether the practice that he refers to and which, I would assume that he approves of, includes delaying announcements of an Order-in-Council already passed unrelated to any other issue. The Honourable the Minister said that he was waiting to be able to make an announcement relating to two specific matters, which as I understand it are not related to each other. Does that justify that . . . ?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LOON: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry if I was confusing in my response. The two Orders-in-Council are related that they are both under the same industrial sub-agreement and it was the desire of the Minister to make a joint announcement on the two of them which he has done.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I gather then that there are two different recipients related to the same fund. And may I ask, Mr. Speaker, it would be convenient if the number of the Order-in-Council were made known to us so that we could relate it to, unless the Minister has made the statement in such a way I haven't — seen it, let's put it that way, and I would like to

be able to understand it. The other point is, could the Honourable Minister indicate the effective date of the Order-in-Council 152?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: The Order-in-Council referred to as the First Minister says, was an Order-in-Council authorizing myself as the Minister to sign an agreement with the Manitoba Research Council on the management of the expanded Food Product in Portage la Prairie which is part of the sub-DREE Agreement. The other one that I wanted to announce with it was also an authority for the Minister to sign an agreement with the Manitoba Research Council on the management of the Winnipeg Technology Centre to help industries in Winnipeg. It is the Manitoba Research Council that will be administering the management. They're both under the DREE agreement and were released today to the Press. They were both announced the same day. The reason for holding up the other Order was they are both referred to the Manitoba Research Council. I wanted to do them both at the same time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, further to the answer of the Honourable Minister, could he advise the House, because some of us have not seen the press release yet — could he advise the House the number of staff that will be engaged at the Portage Food Products Centre and also the number of staff that may be engaged at the, I believe he referred to as the Winnipeg Technology Centre or Technological Advancement Centre.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: It is anticipated we will have 7 people when we are in full operation at Portage la Prairie with the expansion, and when the Winnipeg Technological Centre is ready we will have 13 people.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: I address my question to the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker. Could the Honourable Member inform the House if he has any plans regarding the municipal building in the City of Flin Flon?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I have met with the Mayor of Flin Flon and the Members of Council with respect to their concerns in this particular regard and I have written recently the Mayor of Flin Flon advising him that it would appear that the only possibility of providing any funds to the City of Flin Flon for the construction of a municipal office building would be under the community services agreement with the federal government which is still in the process of negotiation, Mr. Speaker. We expect to get an answer shortly from the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Corrections in terms of the proposed Flin Flon building which was supposed to include a jail; a holding facility for the RCMP. Is the Minister satisfied with the present arrangement whereby prisoners are being shuttled back and forth between Flin Flon and Creighton, Saskatchewan because of the lack of facilities in Flin Flon?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be fair to say that, along with my honourable friend, I'm never satisfied with anything less than perfection, and obviously the system is not perfect, but we have a challenge with respect to the correctional institutional situation at The Pas, and that comes first on the list of priorities at the moment, so I would have to answer him by saying that in a qualified way I'm satisfied for the time being.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question then to the Attorney-General, and ask him

whether he has received any complaints from the RCMP about the lack of adequate holding facilities in Flin Flon?

mmr. SPEAKER: Would the Honourable Member for Elmwood care to repeat his question?

MR. DOERN: I don't believe the Attorney-General heard me. I would ask him whether he or the Minister of Corrections has received any complaints from the RCMP about the lack of proper holding facilities in Flin Flon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, there's been a general discussion of facilities for the RCMP in Flin Flon, and as the member probably knows, the provision of facilities for the RCMP under these circumstances is the responsibility of the municipality.

MR. DOERN: I then ask the Attorney-General whether, in his discussion with members of the local council, whether the council expressed a concern in regard to the possible withdrawal of services by the RCMP, which was expressed to our government several years ago. Has the town expressed that concern to the Minister now, namely that the RCMP may cancel their contract if they don't get suitable facilities?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, that matter has been resolved for the time being, between the town and the RCMP.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: A supplementary to the question posed by the Honourable Member for Elmwood. Has the Attorney-General, in his discussions with the Federal Solicitor General received any indication during the past year that RCMP services may be eased out insofar as urban centres of 10,000 and over?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: No, Mr. Speaker. We are presently in the process of negotiating a new agreement with the RCMP and the whole agreement is under negotiation.

MR. PAWLEY: I appreciate the fact that the Attorney-General has indicated he's re-negotiating a new contract. I'd just like the Attorney-General to indicate whether or not the existing contract continues until 1981, that had been my understanding.

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the existing contract does not expire until 1981, and as I have indicated the eight contracting provinces are in the process of having met, and I recently wrote on behalf of all eight provinces to indicate some preliminary concerns of the provinces to the Solicitor General and we're hopeful that a meeting of officials will be arranged fairly shortly.

MR. PAWLEY: Would the Attorney-General advise whether the federal government is continuing the process which they had commenced in 1976, to gradually ease away more and more from the federal cost-sharing responsibility for RCMP services, a process which they had commenced in 1976.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I received no indication that they wished to move any further away, of course, the fact that the province's share of costs of RCMP services has risen 1 percentage point per year over the last five years is of a concern to us and all of the provinces who contract with the RCMP for their services, and it's an item that will be negotiated with the federal government, but there haven't as yet been any meetings between the provinces and the federal government. To date, the provinces have been putting together the position we wish to take with them.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him. In the recent publications of the Manitoba Gazette, there have been changes indicated in the hail insurance and other crop insurance regulations. Could the minister indicate

whether there are any substantive changes in policy in those regulations?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister confirm whether a change in the regulations of crop insurance dealing with the distance between a farm on the same contract has been increased from 10 miles to 25 miles, as part of the same unit?

MR. DOWNEY: I didn't quite understand the question, is the member referring to the distance in which two crops can be insured in the same contract? Any change in that regard, is there? I'll take the question as notice to let the member know.

MR. URUSKI: Yes, Mr. Speaker, while the minister takes that as notice, could he also inquire, if that change has been made, whether there has been a premium reduction in terms of the larger area that is involved in the farm unit?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Economic Development, in view of the announcement that 14 businesses will get government loans and the body of the item of the news release indicates they will be interest-free, forgivable loans can the minister indicate how many of those loans will be grants and not loans and what the parameters are under which those grants are given?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the agreement of the Enterprise Manitoba with the federal government, which totals \$44 billion, \$5 million of that is awarded to what is called the Rural Small Enterprise Program. There are forgivable loans and I guess you could call them grants, made to small manufacturing businesses in rural Manitoba for new manufacturing or expansion of present manufacturing. The way those grants are decided upon, is there is an application made to the government, to my department for it. There is a group of businessmen in each area of Manitoba who have been set up to examine and advise us on whether it's a feasible type of business. Also my department is available to do research for those businessmen at any time to help them make any recommendations. The process then goes to a committee made up of provincial and Federal people, because they are our partners in this program, and then the actual grant request, final request comes to my desk. And I can assure the honourable members that the the work that's done on all of those is extensive. We work with banks, we work with everybody and we work with people in the area to get the best advice we can as to whether it will be a feasible business.

Mr. Speaker, the Enterprise Manitoba Agreement was signed last April. This is one section of the agreement, and I think if honourable members can remember, I forward to every member of this House last fall the information on Enterprise Manitoba. The grants are 50 percent, up to \$30,000, and it must be in rural Manitoba for manufacturing or expansion of same.

MR. FOX: Can the Honourable Minister explain what the forgivable features are, what the parameters are in order to make it a grant instead of a loan? .

MR. JOHNSTON: I'd be very happy to forward the honourable member and all the honourable members the brochure that's been available for the last four months on that program, which has been sent to them. When we say, "Forgivable Loan", they do not receive all of the money at once. They must start, they must work, they must establish a business, and after they are in business and employing people, then it becomes a forgivable loan, but the grant is not all at one time.

MR. FOX: I appreciate and thank the Minister for his answer, that this is job creation. I wonder if he would consider forgivable interest-free loans to people on minimum wages until his colleague, the Minister of Labour, makes up his mind to give those people a raise so they can be gainfully employed too.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I don't think the honourable member's question really relates to the Enterprise Manitoba, but for his information, there has been \$311,000 made in loans by the

Federal and provincial government under this program. As a total of 15, as the member has said. Of the 15, 12 are brand-new businesses, which means, Mr. Speaker, that it's double. We only go in for 50 percent. So it means there's \$700,000 has been put into the economy of Manitoba since the program started. It has created a total of 45 jobs, and when 2 12 of them are brand-new businesses and new buildings, that means electricians, plumbers, contractors and people working in Manitoba. That's what the Enterprise Manitoba is. And it also does things for small towns in this province that need that kind of help.

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on the same line of questioning and ask the Minister whether it is he that makes the final decision on any application as to its approval or otherwise?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, as I said, after all the research is done, I guess the buck has to stop here. My signature has to be the final one that goes out that says that we will make the loan, then we forward all of the papers to the person that has had the approval, they in turn sign them and send them back. I assure you that it is not done in any other way but on a basis of whether it is a viable business or not.

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

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know by what rule of thumb that we come to a position where one person makes a final decision, as to whether a person or corporation receives a government grant. Given the fact that it's a Federal-provincial agreement, I would have thought that it should have involved at least two people, one of the Federal government and one of the province of Manitoba.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I don't think the honourable member was listening. I said that it comes to the departments after research is done and after recommendations are made. There is then - - - a committee of the Federal and provincial government people sit down and look it over and make the final recommendation to myself. Mr. Speaker, I am responsible for my department I don't know who else could make the final signature on it .

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would then ask the Minister whether he has found it necessary to date at least to reject any of the recommendations that he has received.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I haven't at this point had the opportunity to reject any, and I'm not saying I'm looking for the opportunity. But I have had, Mr. Speaker, the occasion when I have held them up for a certain length of time until I was satisfied that there was certain information that I wanted came to me. That, I assure you, I will continue to do at any time if I'm not satisfied with all the information. There may be, Mr. Speaker, a time when there will be rejections, and I think that we have to be very fair. As I said, the province and the Federal government are putting up 50 percent , and if we don't feel that it's a viable operation or the recommendations are such that we have to be honest with people so that they don't waste their money either.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to thank the honourable Honourable Minister of Tourism for this handsome booklet entitled "Manitoba Fishing Guide". I gather it's at her department's expense that this document was published. In view of the fact that we are currently dealing with her Estimates, would she waive the formality of an Order for Return and let us have the information as to the cost of production of this pamphlet, the number of copies produced, and the method and cost of distribution of the pamphlet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

MRS. PRICE: I have been through that portion of my Estimates. In my advertising, however I can get the information for the member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Attorney-GENERAL. Has the Attorney-General decided whether there will be an inquest into the death of the 86 year old woman who died over a week ago in a private guest home. This inquest was requested by Dr. William Parker, Manitoba's Chief Medical Examiner. Has the department come to a decision on that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

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

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I've a supplementary to the Minister of Health on this matter. Has the Minister looked into the matter of whether these private guest homes will be regulated regarding standards of the guest homes and procedures whereby elderly people are admitted to them?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We are looking into that, and have been looking into it for some months. There's a huge field of guest homes, as the honourable member knows, and there are serious questions posed as to the whole area of responsibility and the need for regulation. We are looking at that and preparing to bring a position forward to the government for consideration.

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

MR. PARASIUK: My supplementary is directed to the Minister responsible for housing, who has been prophesizing some private subsidy schemes for senior citizens. Will the private subsidy schemes for senior citizens in housing, in private housing, relate to people, elderly people living in these, at present, unregulated guest homes?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN (Churchill): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Education. In light of the high levels of lead in tested students' blood at a Winnipeg school, and in light of substantiating scientific studies showing that students attending the school near a lead-using industry may experience elevated levels of lead in blood, is the Minister prepared to encourage the Minister of Labour to initiate a Royal Commission into the effects of lead contamination and poisoning so that we can examine the possible effects that lead contamination poses in all schools near lead-using industries?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I believe if I heard the Minister of Labour correctly yesterday or the — or pardon me, Friday, or Thursday, he said that they were having follow-up studies in those schools that were in areas where there was some concern or had been some concern established a year or so ago. I'm quite confident, if they're having those follow-up studies, that will probably fulfill any requirement there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, to correct the Minister, the Minister of Labour yesterday said they were having a follow-up study in one such school and did not indicate that it would be extended to any other schools. My supplementary is to the Minister of Health. Seeing as how the medical treatment necessitated to deal with the severe crisis in the lead-using industries in Manitoba is costly and in acknowledgment of the fact that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, is the Minister prepared to encourage the Minister of Labour to call a Royal Commission for the purpose of examining and developing ways and means to prevent Manitoba's

workers, students and general population from suffering lead poisoning and subsequently needing costly medical treatment?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: I'm not prepared to urge my colleague to appoint a Royal Commission, Mr. Speaker, but I'm certainly prepared to put it on the agenda of the Community Services Committee of Cabinet.

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

MR. COWAN: Yes, a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. To any member opposite who may wish to reply, or any Minister, in light of the most recent information that the lead poisoning crisis has now extended into the schools and into the environment and is in the workplace of the city, is any Minister or member prepared to encourage the Minister of Labour to call a Royal Commission to study the severe lead poisoning crisis in the province?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest that the honourable member's question is repetitive. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite happy to respond in general terms to my honourable friend and tell him that the Minister of Labour in the estimation of the government has the situation in hand extremely well, considering that the report to which my honourable friend makes reference was made by the previous government, found by the previous government in 1976 and nothing was done about it.

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

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm perfectly prepared to answer the First Minister on that, and ask then if he can encourage or can assure the workers of the province who do not share his faith in the Minister of Labour's efforts, that they are indeed safe from lead poisoning because of the non-existent efforts of his government, and that the students in the schools are indeed safe from the adverse effects of lead poisoning extending into the school places in the province of Manitoba. Can he assure the public of that?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I can assure my honourable friend that unlike him, this government will not go around crying "wolf", but this government will attempt to do what the Minister of Labour has been describing over the last number of weeks in what is perhaps one of the most active programs that's ever been carried out by government, to trace down the sources of lead poisoning or alleged lead poisoning in Manitoba. That program will continue, notwithstanding the rather exaggerated claims that are being made by the Member for Churchill obviously for headline purposes.

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

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the First Minister then, can he indicate what efforts are being taken by his government for the purpose of tracing down the lead problem, the lead poisoning problems in the province of Manitoba, which is indeed, very real and the workers and the students of this province and the people of this province know that it is very real? Can he indicate what they are doing to trace it down to do anything other than react to questions that are asked in this House?

MR. LYON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member, if he will read Hansard, will find from the responses that have been largely by the Minister of Labour, that that department has an active program under way at the present time. Exhortations, exaggerations made by the Member for Churchill do nothing to cure the problem. The problem is being dealt with by the Department of Labour and if further action is needed by the department with respect to any matter that is uncovered by them in this field, I can assure my honourable friend the action will be action with or without his headline grabbing exhortations.

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

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I would just inform the minister that the headlines are that as lead poisoning exists, lead poisoning exists in the workplace, lead poisoning exists in the schools, lead poisoning exists in environment — they have nothing to do with me. The headlines arise out of the lead poisoning crisis in the province now. I'd ask the minister to clarify in detail, in the exaggeration that I, from this side of the House, had made in reference to the impact, the effect, or the extent of the severe lead poisoning crisis that exists in the province of Manitoba today. And I'd like him to detail that out, if he will.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Government House Leader. The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it appears that my colleague has not been crying "wolf", he's just called "lion".

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Transcona that he check the use of parliamentary words very carefully. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon?

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I have just one question to the Premier of the province. We already know that you show your utter contempt for labour, but the former minister who is now the Minister of Tourism, which wasn't bad enough, and now you have the Member for Thompson I would ask the minister, would he please appoint the Member for Wolseley in that position, who may have the guts to look into this problem and do something about it?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, we, of course, are all happy to see the Member for Flin Flon back in reasonable health from his sojourn down south and we wish him continued health. And now, beyond that, as to taking my honourable friend's suggestions as to how one should build a Cabinet, I may have some reservations about that. I always listen with attention to what he says, but on this occasion I don't know that I'm necessarily going to accept his advice, or the premise for his question which I think is a little bit of sort of latter day excitement that he is concerned with too, because he's been the Member for Flin Flon for the last nine years and if he was so concerned about lead, why wasn't he doing something with his own colleagues when they were in government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since the First Minister seems intent on entering into the lead debate today, I'd ask the minister this question. Can he confirm that the most recent scientific, unexaggerated evidence indicates that mental disorders such as hyperactivity, mental retardation and autism have been associated with blood lead levels in children above 25 micrograms per 100 grams of whole blood? Can he confirm or deny that?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. COWAN: Well then, perhaps, I'll ask another question to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker. Can the First Minister confirm that the Environmental Protection Agency, the Centre for Disease Control, the National Academy of Science, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration in the United States and numerous members of the scientific and medical community throughout Canada and the world suggest that lead and blood levels in children should be maintained below 30 micrograms per 100 grams of whole blood, and that they further state — these experts further state — that the population mean for school children should be 15 micrograms per 100 grams of whole blood? Can he confirm or deny that?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I can confirm what the Minister of Labour has confirmed to my honourable friend on numerous occasions in his headline hunting venture, namely that the Department of Labour and the other departments of government are as concerned as any other citizen of this province or indeed, of this country would be about lead standards in the community and, unlike the Honourable Member for Churchill, they're doing something about it.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, they are so concerned with the lead standards that yesterday the minister couldn't even tell me what the acceptable lead standards for children in the province are. He doesn't even know —(Interjection)—.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. If the Honourable Member for Churchill has a final supplementary question we'll entertain it.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question to the minister then, can he confirm that he believes it to be an exaggeration, that results tabled yesterday show that students tested at the Weston School showed a mean level of over 24 micrograms of lead per 100 grams of whole blood which is much higher than the standard accepted mean level for children, and can he also confirm that those students tested at the school also displayed enzyme activity that can be associated and has often- times been associated with lead poisoning? Does he consider that to be an exaggeration, the report that was tabled by his own government?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I can only confirm what the Minister of Labour has said to my honourable friend from Churchill, namely that this matter is being followed up as a matter of urgency by this government, even though it was shelved by the previous government when those findings, according to my information, were made in 1976. So he had better talk to his front bench colleagues to see what they were doing sitting on their hands for two-and-a-half years with that kind of information.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for questions having expired, I would call on the Government House Leader.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Attorney-General that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted oo Her Majesty.

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

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY — TOURISM AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Albert Driedger (Emerson): Committee come to Order. I would like to refer members of the Committee to page 78, Resolution 107, Item 3.(a)(4)Legislative Library, 4(a)—pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I wonder if the Minister could explain why there has been such a small increase in the . . . well, we're seeing two things here: we're seeing a minimal increase in Salaries, which I doubt covers the same number of people, and we're also seeing a reduction in Other Expenditures. So just on the Salaries line, was there any reduction in staff or has there been a very minimal increase in Salaries, which explains that very small increase?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: There hasn't been any reduction in staff; it's just a general salary increase in their annual increments.

MR. DOERN: How many SMYs are there on staff?

MRS. PRICE: Nineteen.

MR. DOERN: Are there any vacancies?

MRS. PRICE: Two.

MR. DOERN: Two vacancies, and does the Minister intend to fill those?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, we do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (4)(a)—pass; (4)(b)—pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Now under (b), Mr. Chairman, there is a reduction of \$4,000 approximately, which I guess, is about a 4 to 5 percent decrease, and I assume this is for the purchase of periodicals and books, etc., and I am just wondering if the Minister can tell us why she is reducing the expenditures for the Legislative Library, which I assume would, over the course of time, have an ever increasing usage, and given also the increase in the price of books and periodicals. I am told, for example, that a few years ago — two or three years ago, 1976 — that an average hard cover book was about \$6.00, in the good old days, and now, you're now talking about \$10.00 on an average. These are figures that I have obtained. Now if that is true, that is an incredible price increase; I guess it would be about a 65 percent price increase.

Secondly, an incredible number of books and publications come from the United States, and we're now talking about an 85-cent dollar, so if we're buying materials from the United States at a devalued Canadian dollar that's also a problem. So I'm saying to the Minister, I'm concluding that first of all there is an absolute decrease in the amount of money spent but when that money is turned over to Miss Combaz and her staff that they're are going backwards. In other words they are not able to hold the line but given these escalating prices they are finding it ever more difficult to operate. So I just wonder if the Minister has any comment about that?

MRS. PRICE: Well, firstly as the member has just mentioned the price of the hard covered books is getting really quite out of reach and we are now using paper covers instead of hard covers. We also have less microfilm equipment readers which we are hoping to rectify in the near future.

MR. DOERN: Could the Minister indicate what percentage, I know this would be pretty hard to do it would be kind of top-of-the-head but what percentage of books in the library or what percentage of books now being purchased would be Canadian, books and periodicals?

MRS. PRICE: I'm advised that all the important Canadian books are being purchased but as far as the percentage, I'm afraid I can't answer that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, it appears that with the most recent change in the House rules there has come about a change in the opening hours or in the hours that the Legislative Library is open. You may recall that as long as the House was considered to be in session even while sitting in the Committee of Supply, the library was still open. But a week ago or so, a change was made in the House rules pursuant to which the House adjourns in the afternoon on days that the House goes into Committee of Supply and then it meets in Committee and I have the impression that the government is placing a very strict and narrow legalistic interpretation upon the phrase, "when the House is in session" that appears on the door. And consequently — now I can't speak for last night, but I do recall on two or three evenings since the change in the rules came about that the House sat in Committee of Supply and the library was closed. Is that practice going to continue or was it closed for some other reason but it will remain open during Committee of Supply?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: Well under the recent changes in the House procedure as you know, the House can adjourn at 5:30 p.m. and then the Committee goes into its deliberations from 8:00 o'clock on and it hasn't been compulsory for it to remain open. However, it was just closed there a couple of nights and it is going to be remaining open.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to hear that response from the Minister because perhaps I should add I can well see that the rationale and the justification for not opening the library when there is a relatively small Committee meeting — a Committee of 5, 6, 10, 12 members.⁹⁰ -91 But when Committee of Supply is meeting, that does take in all of the members, and from time to time a need to use the library does arise. I'm sure that I'm speaking for all members in saying that we will certainly appreciate seeing the library open on those nights, anyway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: The Clerk of the House has informed me that he has been speaking to our Deputy House Leader to speak to your members to see whether or not the members want the library open — so I guess they'll decide between them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Well I, too, share the same concerns of the Member for Burrows, because without research assistance and whathave-you, we rely very heavily on the library. And I've had occasion to use the library after hours myself.

But the question I wanted to ask from a point of clarification; he mentioned that important Canadian periodicals are purchased from time to time . . . how would you arrive at the number of a particular book that you might purchase? In other words, maybe we could use as an example that the Free Press has, this one "Beyond Reason". How many copies of that book would the public and legislative library have — would we buy none, or would we buy one, or would we buy six?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: We would buy one copy — and I think that's plenty.

MR. WILSON: Maybe that was a bad example, but what I'm looking for — under what circumstances would the public and legislative libraries buy, say, 12 or 24 copies of a particular book? Would they always just buy one copy, or is there . . . in other words, what are the guidelines that are established? How would we arrive where we buy more than one of one particular publication or book?

MRS. PRICE: Well, I think you're talking about two different types of libraries — the public library and the legislative library. The legislative library buys one, but I understand — and I don't want to be quoted on it — that the public library generally buys two.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(4)(b)—pass. 3.(a)(5)(a) — the Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: I just wanted to back up, if I could, to finish off on (4). I had written to . . . this is prior to the current Minister being there . . . I had written to the First Minister regarding what I consider was a concern because I could only find one political party being represented through their magazines and periodicals, and the only newspaper that I could find at that time was one called the New Democrat. And I wondered — do we have to pay for that, or is that given to the library free on behalf of the party from Broadway?

MRS. PRICE: I understand it's an NDP donation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(4)(b) . . . The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, I think that my colleague, the Member for Elmwood asked a moment ago as to the number of SMYs in this branch, but I would think that one of the criteria on the basis of which, or which one ought to take into account in determining the adequacy or the inadequacy of staffing of a legislative library, may be the number of reference queries made to the library. Now I appreciate that it's not the only criteria, but I underline that as one of the criteria. So therefore, my question to you, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister: Could the Minister indicate the number of reference queries — the most recent figure that she would have, I suspect, will be for, hopefully, for the year 1978, but at least 1977, or both if she has them?

MRS. PRICE: The total number of questions that have been asked for 1977-78 was 12,900; and for 1978-79 was 12,900 also.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, for 1978-79, that's your estimate.

MRS. PRICE: I haven't got the one for '79-80.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Oh, I'm sorry, yes, yes. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(4)(b)—pass; 3.(a)(5)(a)—pass — the Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, a couple of points here.
Could the Minister give us the SMYs, and also the vacancies?

MRS. PRICE: There are 21 SMYs; and 4 vacancies.

MR. DOERN: I just wonder, in view of the importance of this department, whether those vacancies are going to be filled very shortly, whether for instance they are being advertised or bulletined; what is their status?

MRS. PRICE: Two are being filled in the very near future, we are working on them now.

MR. DOERN: Apparently, in the last couple of years — well, I guess in the 1975 and 76 period of our administration, there were some substantial grants given for libraries. The figures I have indicate that there was a 70 percent increase in provincial expenditures, and that there's been quite a fall-off in the amount of money available, for example, I guess if we look at the figures we're looking at here — \$2,019,000 compared to \$1,978,000 — you're looking at a \$40,000 increase, I suppose on \$2 million. So it looks like about 2 percent, and I was just wondering whether, again, given the increasing cost of books — we're getting cuts in other expenditures, and cuts in grant assistance, and slight increases in salaries, and so on — whether the Minister . . . you know the Minister, the other day, made the statement, which I think all of us applauded, that she was going to attempt to insure that the cultural organizations and culture in its broadest sense would not fall under the ax of restraint; and she was going to try to protect her department to that extent. But it would seem in this area that the ax has fallen, and that the Minister has been unable to find the necessary funds; and I'm just wondering if she is not concerned about the lack of funding for libraries, not only in the city of Winnipeg and in this building, but throughout the province, if she would like to comment on that?

MRS. PRICE: I don't deny that there is a problem in the library system, but I would like to say that it is a problem that has existed for a number of years now. There were four major studies done in the previous government's era, all of which were rejected by Cabinet. It doesn't solve the situation, but we are having a very hard look at it right now to see what we can do with what we have to work with to solve a lot of the problems

MR. DOERN: Well, I sympathize with the minister, because I think that when hard-nose Cabinet Ministers gather around the table this is an area they feel very comfortable about swinging their axe and so, I think the minister is going to have to really dig in to get money from her colleagues. For instance, I understand that in northern Manitoba, for example, there were no increases in grants in the past year. Two out of the six libraries, I should say two of the six received no grant increases. Throughout the province, throughout the province there's an imbalance between provincial and municipal funding and the municipalities are funding two-thirds of the total, or twice the provincial rate. I wonder whether the minister is going to re-examine that per capita grant structure and attempt to provide more funds to relieve some of the burden of the municipalities. I also understand that we have one of the lowest rates of provincial per capita funding in the nation, so I would ask the minister whether she intends to try to even out that funding — either take up the majority of the funding for libraries, or at least to get it to a 50-50 arrangement because it appears to be out of whack at the present.

MRS. PRICE: Yes, there was a \$25,000 grant given to some of the libraries up north and you're referring to a couple of them that didn't get any, the smaller ones, are you not? We are looking in to see what we can do about it as I say, with funds limited, but we do realize we have a problem and I'm the first one to admit to you, and hopefully, we will be able to rectify it.

MR. DOERN: There's just a couple of other points I have here. One is that there was a recommendation in Graeme Haig's report on lotteries, perhaps I could read a section of his report and ask the minister to comment. He seemed to be impressed with the submissions of the public library groups, and he said this in one section of his report, Page 85, I believe. He said, "Certainly the claim for financial assistance to libraries appeared valid and compelling and deserves serious consideration by those responsible for the ongoing funding of libraries in the province. I would be prepared also, to recommend that libraries be considered eligible, if they are not already eligible, for funding from lottery funds for special projects and for special capital equipment grants which would not in the ordinary course of events be available through municipal and provincial tax-based funding." : I assume, Mr. Chairman, that the problem here is that the pie is only so large, but nevertheless, if the libraries could gain access to lottery funds, it might solve some of their capital and operating requirements, and I was just wondering whether the minister supports Mr. Haig's recommendation about allowing them to access lottery funds.

MRS. PRICE: Well, there is a study being done right now, Mr. Chairman, of the Haig report. I think that to funnel some of the funds into libraries has a great deal of merit but I can't comment on it before it has been studied thoroughly through the Cabinet and the decision made of the Cabinet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the minister has indicated that this year's appropriation has provision for 21 SMYs, is that correct?

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Does the salary item of \$255,400 — that reflects provision for the 21 SMYs?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, it does.

MR. HANUSCHAK: So in fact, over the years, there has been a reduction of the number of SMYs from 77-78 to the present, because in 77-78 the latter portion of that fiscal year, during which the minister was a member of this government, there were 24 SMYs approved.

MRS. PRICE: That is correct. There is a reduction of three.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Well could the minister then comment on or at least give us, say a progress report on the present status of regionalization of libraries and the re-organization of library facilities accompanying the regionalization, because I have the recollection that a good portion of the staff time and effort was directed in that particular area in assisting municipalities in organizing their libraries on a regional basis.

MRS. PRICE: We are doing quite an in depth study on this; there will be some rulings will have to be changed in order to qualify some of the libraries to be able to be under a regional program, and we are working on that right now and hope to have something in the very future where it will be much more sophisticated than it is at present.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, do I understand the minister to stay that pending the outcome, the completion of the in depth study, that the move toward regionalization is at a standstill?

MRS. PRICE: It's at a standstill right now, but as I say, we're looking at it objectively and we're going to be having them more regionalized than they are now — that's what I'm saying.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, could the minister then indicate what some of her concerns are about the plan and the program moving toward regionalization, why the in depth study, why the review?

MRS. PRICE: Well, the present formula discourages the larger libraries and this is what we are looking at with an eye towards changing some of these regulations, so that we can embrace the smaller libraries and have them worked into a regional set up. We've got that in the works right

now, and it shouldn't be too long before we have something quite satisfactory to all concerned.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Can we expect this in depth study to be completed during this fiscal year and have some announcement made to the libraries as to the government's policy with respect to regionalization?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, there will be recommendations made and it'll certainly be in the next couple of months.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Could the minister comment upon the lending, I've forgotten the correct term, I think it's the lending service via the mails from the Provincial Library. Has that service been curtailed to the people in Manitoba in any way?

MRS. PRICE: There's 6,900 members, it has been reduced but not curtailed.

MR. HANUSCHAK: It has been reduced, yes.

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes. Is it correct, Mr. Chairman, that the only ones who can take advantage of this mail lending service, are those who had been taking advantage of it in the past; in other words, those whose names already appear on the mailing list? But if someone not previously taking advantage of this service would want to get on the mailing service, that individual will be denied that right.

MRS. PRICE: They have been, at this present time, but this is being rectified also.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'm sorry?

MRS. PRICE: I say they have been denied to the people that haven't been on the list in recent times, but we are changing that too, so everybody will have the opportunity to get on the mailing list.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, could the Minister then indicate, as she said that they have been . . . who has been denied?

MRS. PRICE: The people that haven't been on the list at present, but there are 200,000 that had the opportunity to be on the list, that are on the mailing list.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, how does the Minister determine who will be allowed this mail lending privilege, and who will not be allowed it?

MRS. PRICE: The people that are at present not served by regional libraries.

MR. HANUSCHAK: So that means that if one is served by a regional library, and if that regional library does not have a particular book that a borrower wishes to borrow, that simply by reason of his geographic location, he will not be able to borrow it from a provincial library because he lives within a regional library area.

MRS. PRICE: I think that he can have access to the books simply by writing into our library.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Writing to where?

MRS. PRICE: Into the libraries; right. The people that aren't under the regional library that want a book, or the people that are, you say, that are in the regional libraries that want a book; if they can't obtain it out there, I am sure that they will be able to be serviced in the city.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Serviced in the city; by the Winnipeg Public Library, is that . . . ?

MRS. PRICE: No, from ours.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(5)(a)—pass; 3.(a)(5)(b)—pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, just one small point there. I think the Minister will recall that there was a brief made to her asking for, I think, greater assistance for the visually handicapped. There are, ' apparently, some cassettes. Apparently, our administration bought some 700 cassettes which can be distributed to those people who are legally blind, etc., and that I think she was approached to, I suppose, do more in this area by the CNIB, so that people who have that particular handicap can, I suppose, hear novels and other things read to them via the tape recorders, etc. So I was just wondering if she has any plans to incorporate that or expand that in the public library service?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, we do. We did have, as you recall, \$50,000 this government donated, and cassette machines, to the CNIB for the legally blind. Now we are enlarging on the other people who have the seeing problems.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(5)(b)—pass; 3.(a)(5)(c)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Before we pass (5)(c), Mr. Chairman, I notice a bare increase in the Grant Assistance; it's so minimal that I would not — it's probably a reduction — could the Honourable Minister indicate the amount actually expended under this item in this last year?

MRS. PRICE: For establishment grants for 1978-79 was \$60,000 and it's reduced for 1979-80 to \$52,000; public library grants is \$1,563,000 in 1978-79; 1979-80 is \$1,593,000.00. The grants to library associations has remained the same: \$3.5.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, the reduction of grants I suppose is something that the Minister can explain, but considering the last increase in costs such as has already been discussed, how does the Minister justify what I believe I can honestly call a reduction in the grants to the public libraries?

MRS. PRICE: I guess I can justify it and say that we haven't got the funds right now. We are getting a formula established that we hope we'll be able to rectify some of these problems. We are very well aware of acute problems, but as I mentioned earlier before the Member for St. Johns came in, we inherited a lot of these problems, so I think you should be a little compassionate on and the fact that we can't overturn all the problems in eighteen months. Your government had four major studies done and they were taken to your Cabinet, and all four were rejected, so you know, the problem didn't just start and we are well aware of the problems and we are hoping desperately that we will get it rectified but it doesn't happen overnight.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry I didn't hear earlier reports by this Minister, although I have all the compassion I can possibly muster, I have difficulty in understanding her statement that's, one: "We haven't got the money"; two: "We inherited problems". I know the Minister hasn't been in this job for seventeen months, but her government has been, and I think it's high time she and her fellow party members would learn that they have to stand on their own feet and they have to be responsible for their own decisions without reverting back to previous governments. I must tell her, I have the compassion to inform her that the NDP government in 1970 did the same kind of thing that the Minister is saying, with the equal amount of justification in their own minds, and it's really not very productive.

So possibly the Honourable Minister will indicate what she means by: "We don't have the funds", and how that relates to the problems that they are dealing with. What problems, in relation to the grants to public libraries?

MRS. PRICE: As I mentioned, the problem is that we just haven't got enough money right now. Another thing that we are doing is trying to make a better use of what we have now, both from the staff point of view and from the books, etc., that we have; the setup that we have we're trying to use them to a much more efficient manner than we feel has been done, and until we get more money there is not too much that we can do other than our best, and that's what we're doing.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, again, the Minister seems to tie the lack of money with making better use of what is available. Is she suggesting that if she had more money she wouldn't make the effort to see to it that better use is made of what there is available now?

MRS. PRICE: No, I'm not intimating that at all.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, I am glad that I was able to help the Minister separate her problems, which seems to be that they are trying to make better use of what they have now, and I would ask just what specifically they are trying to do?

MRS. PRICE: Well, I think we're doing the same as we have been doing in a number of other departments in government. We are rearranging them and making better use of the staff, the equipment, the product that we have to work with, we're working on it. Our consultation services, our cataloging, we're working on all these different areas to streamline them, to be more efficient for the people of Manitoba.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, it is becoming apparent to me that I am not clear on this item. I wish the Minister would help me. I read Grant Assistance to Public Libraries to deal with grants and I don't the extent to which that has to do with cataloging or staff or anything else, that the Minister related to. So I apologize, obviously I missed out on something not having been here through most of the discussion' but I would like clarification what grant assistance of over \$1.5 million has to do with these speeches of cataloging and staff?

MRS. PRICE: Well our formula went up in the northern regions from \$2 per capita to \$2.50 per capita. Just last week we gave some grants to the library trustees and to the Public Libraries so we are doing our best to help them. We know there are problems and again I'll reiterate, they're not all our problems and you don't change problems overnight.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry to be pressing this but I do not understand the Minister's explanations. We are dealing with the fact that under the grant assistance item, 3. (a)(5)(c) there is an apparent levelling, a plateauing, and taking into account the increased costs to libraries there is an actual reduction in grants. Now she has mentioned cataloging and she has mentioned staff and now she is telling us of increased payments and formula in the north. Now I cannot relate and I admit my ignorance, I cannot relate what she is saying about problems with firstly increasing the formula and secondly talking about problems relating to cataloging, staff or whatever. What is the connection? Let me ask it differently. Under this item that we are dealing with, (5)(c), is there any salary component involved, is there anything other than grants involved in this item?

MRS. PRICE: The grant formula firstly is tied to the local revenue base and we also have the same number of libraries now as we had last year. That is why there isn't much of a change in the amount of money.

MR. CHERNIACK: So under (5) (c) there is nothing other than actual grants . . .

MRS. PRICE: That's right.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . there's no cataloging, there's no staff. Well then I misunderstood the Minister because I thought she was talking about improvements that she's trying to bring about but the improvements only have to do in this case with assessing the amount of a grant and issuing a cheque. So I don't quite see that that explanation that I received which I didn't understand is applicable and maybe that's why I didn't understand it.

Well now we're dealing with specific grants. The Minister says there are the same number of libraries and the grants are related to their local base. Now all that is very well, but I'm am still saying that we are aware that increased costs must be tremendous, not only in salaries and maintenance but also in the actual purchase of materials, and I heard Mr. Doern referring to the differential in foreign exchange and probably other items. I don't think that it's either a secret nor unknown that costs of books and periodicals has gone up tremendously. In the light of that, is the Minister trying to explain that there is no need for increased grants or is she prepared to rest her entire explanation on lack of money?

MRS. PRICE: I don't say that there isn't any need for extra grants or that there is more needed. I don't imply that at all and I don't mean to. My department also works and helps to supplement their grants through their services our department gives to the different libraries. That helps to supplement them with their grants. And our formula is tied by regulation, too. Isn't it the same as it was in your time? The formula still remains the same.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, one doesn't blame regulations for not doing something — one has control over the regulations and if the Minister has told us that she has tried to change the regulations and floundered somewhere the I could understand it but to blame it on regulations, one government person blaming the other government doesn't satisfy the responses that I hope to get. Now she says there are other supplements, now are there other moneys paid to public libraries in other lines of the Estimates other than (5)(c)?

MRS. PRICE: What I said was that our department offers their services so there is an indirect benefit to them from the services that our department extends to the libraries.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well is that different or more than last year and two years ago?

MRS. PRICE: Do you mean the help from the departments?

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, the amount of . . .

MRS. PRICE: It's about the same.

MR. CHERNIACK: It's about the same. So . . .

MRS. PRICE: Well right now I would like to tell the Member for St. Johns that we are trying to find ways to increase the per capita grant. We're working on that now. We realize there is a problem ; we're quite aware of it. But, as I think your Member for Churchill said today, an old phrase, "you can't get blood out of a stone", and we just don't have the dollars right now. So we are having to find ways and means, but we do realize that there is a problem.

MR. CHERNIACK: I want to make a comment now. I don't think I want to press the Minister any further. She says you can't get blood out of a stone. The stone must be in the hearts and the pockets of the people that she deals with daily throughout her working days and that must mean Treasury Board and that must mean her colleagues on the Treasury Bench.

Now she says that she is trying to get the grant formula increased. If that were the case, where will she get the money? Is there money within this vote that she is trying to get us to approve that it will make it possible to increase the grant formula or is she trying to get the grant formula increased ? Now I know she has to be dealing with that stone which is her colleagues or are her colleagues, those stones which are her colleagues, and if she gets the grant formula to change, where will she get the money?

MRS. PRICE: The stone I am referring to certainly isn't my colleagues. It's the moneys that are available in this province province at the time. I wasn't referring to the Treasury Board or my colleagues.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Chairman, that's the point. This Minister has joined her other Ministers, and it's perfectly logical that she should in saying that there is a stone in the province which won't give her money for libraries. I want to challenge that very substantially; I want to tell her that I believe that most people approve of educational programs are desirous of fostering educational cultural programs and that it is not a reflection of what the province would like to do to improve libraries, I think especially in the rural areas. And, Mr. Chairman, you should be well aware of it, that people are becoming more and more conscious of the advantages of public libraries, of the contributions to their whole style of life, to be able to have available to them library facilities on a greater and greater basis. I would venture to say, Mr. Chairman, that the office of the Minister is full of requests for more and more help to public libraries and it is not the people of Manitoba nor the Province of Manitoba that have told her that we are stones and will not contribute. It is people within the budget-making process that pass Estimates. The people who were prepared to give a 17 percent increase to horse breeders are the same people who told her, there's no money

available to maintain the same level and I'm saying that advisedly, knowing that it's approximately the same amount of money, but it must be a deterioration of level of contribution if there's no recognition of the increased powers.

I point out, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Finance, who made the statement when he introduced his Estimates that there's some, I think, 5.6 or 5.8 increase in this year's budget over last, and I think then we were able to show that there's another 2 percent that could be justifiably shown as an increase in the Estimates. And yet, when it comes to giving grants to outside bodies — to public libraries in the tradition that has been extant for many years — that there is no increase whatsoever, in spite of the increase in costs. And therefore, I would have to say that this government, and the Minister as spokesman for this government, places a lower priority on the public library services, than they do on other things, and I can't help but zero in on horse breeders who did get 17 percent because, and the only explanation that I understood the Minister to make, was that the horse breeding industry produces revenue to Manitoba. I sort of resent the fact that public libraries are put in a lower category than horse breeders or money-producing items. I am now dealing with that aspect of the Minister's department which is cultural, and not tourism.

MRS. PRICE: I don't whether the Member for St. Johns was here also when I explained that we are having quite an extensive study made in our department with an eye to having more regional libraries. I think you'll find that when this happens, instead of a bunch of little ones trying to make it on their own, when they get under one regional library that it will be much more sophisticated and will be improving the services all around.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I want to stop, and yet I feel I'm being . . .

MRS. PRICE: Feel free.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . almost drawn in. Yes, I do feel free to continue.

MRS. PRICE: I mean to stop.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm sure the Minister wouldn't want to stop me, so I do feel free to continue and comment that one of the problems of sophistication and setting up a more elaborate method of dealing with a service like libraries is that a regional library, having to serve a larger district with one central place, might become a little more remote for the people, and I don't know that I can be guaranteed that setting up a regional library will put more books in homes, or in the hands of readers. I don't know that. I do believe that right now — it has been proven to me time and again that we have such a good interlocking arrangement between libraries, amongst libraries in this province, that it doesn't take long to get hold of a book. If there's only one book in the Province of Manitoba I know that our legislative library will find that book and produce it very quickly. So that there is the ability, now, for books to be transferred and save costs involved in increasing the number of books.

But I don't know whether regional libraries will increase the number of books and the number of hands into which those books come. And if so, I doubt very much if it'll cost less. I think it'll be a greater service. The Minister talked of a bunch of little libraries. I would think, Mr. Chairman, not even knowing what town you yourself reside in, that if there's one of those little "bunches", or one library is part of a bunch, that the number of books in that library would be much less than there would be available through a regional library set-up. But I don't believe it will cost less to provide that.

Mr. Chairman, now that I can confirm in my mind that Grunthal is your town, I'm just wondering the extent to which even your town has a library, little or large as it is? But regardless of that, I'm not sure that I could be guaranteed that a library in Emerson, or in Vita, or somewhere else, is going to supply the people in Grunthal with the books that one reads other than reference books, at a lesser cost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Minister indicated that they were doing studies on the possibility of giving support to regional library groups. What is the status of the various regional associations that have been established and have requested provincial in-put in the last year or two? Just where are they with their requests for grants and assistance?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MRS. PRICE: Can I take that question as notice and answer you before we're through here today. I'd like you to repeat it.

MR. USKIW: Yes. My understanding is, Mr. Chairman, that there are a number of regional library associations, or something along that line — maybe they're not called just that precisely — that have been asking the province for assistance in regionalizing library services. I would like to know just where that's at. In particular, I would like to refer to a couple of calls that I received from the EastMan Library Association, who have been pursuing the department for some period of time, but so far, as I understand it, have gotten nowhere with their request; and if we could have a specific on that one as well. —(Interjection)— No, well, it's general and in particular. It's not . . . it's all of eastern Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(5)(c)—pass. 3.(b)(1)—pass. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: There's one area I wanted to cover here with the Minister, and that concerns something I know is very dear to the heart of Miss Bayer, and that is the endangered . . . well, the ad says "spaces"; I was thinking of "species", but the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, close to Portage and Main — that is a gorgeous building. I mean, that is a 60-65 year-old structure. Beside it is the Bank of Hamilton. I have never seen the Bank of Hamilton, but I have seen the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce and I think anybody who's been inside that building knows that the thought of that being demolished is almost too much to bear. Because once that building goes, if that building ever goes, we will never see the likes of it again in this province. And there is no doubt in my mind that it would be expensive to renovate. We threw out some wild estimates on it a number of years ago, but I'm sure that the minimum amount of money to put that building into shape would be a quarter of a million — and a more realistic figure would be \$1 million or better. I don't know what figures are being talked about.

There isn't much in the way of functional space. There are a number of floors — small floors on one side. And then there's this enormous, beautiful vault or central banking hall with Grecian columns and a beautiful ceiling, etc., etc. It really is a sight for sore eyes. I was just wondering whether the Minister has taken any position on that structure; whether she has been approached, whether she has volunteered, whether she is familiar with the situation. Because I think that it is of such a special character, and such a precious resource, that everything possible should be done to stop its demolition, first of all, and secondly, that the province should play a role in renovating that facility and making a contribution — financial — seeing that it is used in some sense and is available to citizens and tourists to view, because it is really an aesthetic and gorgeous building. I just wonder if the Minister could comment on that.

MRS. PRICE: I haven't been approached, but I have been kept informed of what is going on, and it is in Winnipeg's hands right now. I understand, and I read in the paper too, that the bank is trying to see if it's at all possible to save it, and I certainly agree with you that it does have aesthetic value, and it should be saved if at all possible.

MR. DOERN: Well, then I would simply urge the Minister — I know that Miss Byyer alone would have all the necessary information — but I would urge the Minister to take an active interest in the project, and to attempt to join with the city of Winnipeg, and anybody else — the historical society, any other interested groups — to save that bank. And even if it costs the province several hundred thousand dollars to do so, I think that, in the years to come, people will thank you for that endeavour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Does this item include museum grants? Under Historic Resources.

MRS. PRICE: Pardon me, is what under grants?

MR. HANUSCHAK: If I may explain, Mr. Chairman, at one time, in fact, when the Minister became part of the government, museum grants operating assistance to approximately 62 museums was included under Grant Assistance paid out of this appropriation. Is that still contained in there?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, it has been continued.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Thank you. Could the Minister indicate the number of staff man years in this branch?

MRS. PRICE: Twelve.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Twelve staff man years. Now, it would seem, or rather, I would want to ask the Minister this question, that at one time, well two years ago, other expenditures under this appropriation amounted to \$157,000 whereas now it's reduced to \$64,000 — it's cut down to less than 50 percent, to about 40 percent of what it was in 1977-78 — and at that time a good portion of other expenditures was devoted to professional fees for various archaeological architectural and historical projects.

Then looking at the other expenditures: printing and stationery supplies; printing of reports; travel; cost of plaques; etc., it would seem that there is very little left in that \$64,000 appropriation to enable this branch to do the type of work which I think that it ought to do, and must do, in order to do that which it's charged with doing; namely, to preserve, protect, restore, reconstruct, commemorate and interpret significant themes in the history of the province in a balanced, well co-ordinated manner, in order to engender a respect and understanding for the groups, individuals, places and events that have shaped Manitoba.

MRS. PRICE: Weil, the reduction is because we had a choice of reducing either staff or some of the programs that were going on in expenditures, and we chose the latter.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, so that leads me to the next question. If this branch has had a very serious cutback in the appropriation for archaeological research and study, then it leads me to the question: What does the increased staff from 7 to 12 — what does it do if it doesn't have the funds to do the types of things that I've just listed, which are related to the preservation, protection, restoration, etc., of places and matters and items of historic significance?

MRS. PRICE: In the previous year, they didn't have to account for contract or term employees, which we do now. There is no reduction in the staff, it's exactly the same number; 7 permanent, and 5 contract and term.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Seven permanent, and 5 contract and term.

MRS. PRICE: Yes, and it's the same as it was.

MR. HANUSCHAK: But, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that that answers my question with respect to . . . well let me ask the Minister then; what is her appropriation for professional fees in this branch?

MRS. PRICE: \$32,800.00.

MR. HANUSCHAK: So that has been reduced by more than 50 percent, from \$76,400 in 1977-78, to \$32,000, so here again we have evidence, Mr. Chairman, of a reduction in the branch's capacity to do the type of work that it was assigned to do, and that it is expected to do by the province of Manitoba.

MRS. PRICE: That is correct.

MR. HANUSCHAK: That is correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)(1)—pass; 3.(b)(2)—pass — the Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, before we pass 3.(b)(2); no, I have no question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)(2)—pass; 3.(b)(3)—pass — the Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: On 3.(b)(3), Mr. Chairman, on Grant Assistance. In 1977-78, approximately 62 museums in the province of Manitoba received operating assistance of \$100,000.00. Now, it's been reduced by 32 percent, to \$68,000, over that two year period, despite the inflationary pressures and everything else occurring which no doubt, increases their operating costs. Could the Minister

explain the rationale for this drastic reduction in the assistance to museums?

MRS. PRICE: You're going back to 1977, aren't you?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, I certainly am, Mr. Chairman. In 1977-78, and these were the Estimates that the Minister inherited when she became government in the middle of a fiscal year. The appropriation was \$100,000, so there was a reduction of 32 percent, over that two year period. In fact, I'm sorry, reading the column on the left-hand side, there was a reduction of 32 percent in one year, because it was \$68,000 last year and remained at the same level for this year, which is even worse.

MRS. PRICE: There's a request being made right now for a grant of \$50,000 from the Lottery Trust Funds.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)(3)—pass — the Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Now, in 1977-78, paid out of Grant Assistance, out of this appropriation, in addition to grants paid to museums, there was another beneficiary — another two beneficiaries — one was a Manitoba Historical Society, and the other the Historical Society of St. Boniface. Is the province still supporting those two organizations, and if it is, out of what appropriation or is it not?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, they are being supported, and out of Lotteries.

MR. HANUSCHAK: That, too, is out of Lotteries.

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Could the Minister give us a progress report on the Canadian Register of Heritage Properties, which is a cost-shared program with the . . . no, in fact, well I'm not sure about now, but it was two years ago 100 percent recoverable from the federal government.

MRS. PRICE: The federal government dropped it, it's not being funded at all by federal funds.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Why has it been dropped; why did the federal government drop it? Did it give a reason?

MRS. PRICE: I don't know what reason they had, but they did drop it.

MR. HANUSCHAK: So the Minister doesn't know the reason. Is the Register of Heritage Properties being continued by the province?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, it is.

MR. HANUSCHAK: And that is paid for out of where, out of this appropriation?

MRS. PRICE: It comes out of part of our Capital appropriation and part of the acquisition.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Ah, so then that raises another question — we'll deal with it, I suppose, in more detail when we come to it, but may I ask the Minister this question at this time; will we find some staff man years under Resolution No. 108?

MRS. PRICE: Yes we will.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Thank you, we'll deal with that item later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)(3)—pass; Resolution 107: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a Sum not exceeding \$6,824,100 for Tourism and Cultural Affairs and Historic Resources—pass.

4. Resolution 108 — the Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Now I'll repeat the question which I put to the Minister just a minute ago. Well, I'll give her two questions: One, could she give a breakdown of the expenditures under this item for last year, and for this year; and also explain in a bit more detail, the answer that she gave me a moment ago, that there are some staff man years contained under this particular item as related to the Canadian Register of Heritage Properties, which at one time was under the previous item?

MRS. PRICE: As I mentioned earlier, the federal government is not doing any funding and our department is trying to fund and operate the register themselves.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Now my other question was, could the Minister give us a breakdown of the expenditures of this appropriation for the fiscal year just ended and the projected expenditures for the fiscal year ending 1980?

And also explain, here again, about a 20 percent reduction?

MRS. PRICE: There's Maison Turenne and Bohemier House at \$75,000; the Regional Historic Sites, \$40,000; the Van Horn Rail Car, \$20,000; and Stabilization of Historic Structures, \$20,000; for a total of \$155,000.00.

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'm sorry, that was for what year?

MRS. PRICE: 1979-80, that's what you asked for, '80.

MR. HANUSCHAK: But, Mr. Chairman, the Minister's Estimates show \$618,000 for Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets, so \$155,000 really takes care of 25 percent of the \$618,000.00. There's still \$450,000 to be accounted for.

MRS. PRICE: Well, in the Cultural Affairs: the Museum of Man and Nature there is \$200,000; multi-cultural capital grant \$70,000; the Centennial Centre Corporation \$100,000 and miscellaneous capital projects \$93,600 for a total of \$463,600.00.

MR. HANUSCHAK: That is what the Minister plans on doing during this fiscal year?

MRS. PRICE: That's right.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Burrows also asked, what was the breakdown of expenditures last year; that's one thing, and the other is: are all of these expenditures of a capital nature, that is, for structural improvement?

MRS. PRICE: For structural identification.

MR. CHERNIACK: Structural what?

MRS. PRICE: Identification, and for improvements too.

MR. CHERNIACK: For the large items: Museum; Centennial Concert Hall; are they for physical improvements?

MRS. PRICE: Yes.

MR. CHERNIACK: Fine. Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid you're about to pound that gavel. Could we ask then, that if the Minister does not have the information now, that we get it at the next meeting, the breakdown of last year's expenditures under this item?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, I can get it for him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I was hoping and of course it is now obvious it isn't possible to finish this afternoon, and I realize that the Minister has a commitment this evening, so I was just wondering if she could indicate where we go from here? If she has a commitment that is to be fulfilled, then we would certainly be agreeable to not proceeding with the committee tonight, and to go at it tomorrow and/or Thursday if that is necessary to free the Minister for a commitment — I don't know what it is but I know it is important — and I know that she wants to attend it. So I think she has every right, and we would be agreeable to postponing the conclusion of the Estimates tonight. However, if she wants to proceed tonight, then we can do so, but I would urge her to express her personal preference and we would accede to it.

MRS. PRICE: If I tell you that the answers that I have promised the members here that I will give them to them, would that suffice, and that we could finish my Estimates now?

MR. DOERN: I'm not following the Minister.

MRS. PRICE: I said, I have been asked for some questions from these people. . .

MR. DOERN: No, first of all I believe we're precluded from continuing but my own estimate of what will occur is that there probably will be a debate for an hour or two on the Minister's Salary, so therefore I believe, we're looking at an evening or an afternoon still to go, so I would say to the Minister that, you know, we can continue this evening which means she would not be able to fulfill a previous obligation, but we'd be more than happy to not proceed tonight to work in the Health Committee Estimates and to commence tomorrow and see what happens.

MRS. PRICE: No, we'll finish tonight. I'm sorry that you didn't do like we had talked about, however, you didn't, and we'll be back at eight.

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

SUPPLY — HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats(Radisson): I would draw the honourable members' attention to Page 48 in the Main Estimates, Health and Community Services. We are on Resolution No. 64, Social Services and Community Health, (k) Rehabilitation Services to the Disabled: (1) Salaries—pass, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of personal privilege and of course I want to refer you to the action of some of the backbenchers in yesterday's Committee, Mr. Chairman, and I'm not referring to the heckling. Maybe there's too much heckling being done, I certainly do my share but I found that most of the heckling has been done in fun by all members of the House. I am referring to something else.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't want to exaggerate. I've been here 20 years and I know that there is nothing as frustrating and as boring as the role of the backbencher. And I know that there has been some drinking over the period of years by all parties and that is being done and I don't object to that that much. But, Mr. Chairman, usually when this is done the people stay in the Caucus Room and they come in for a vote or if they can come in, they don't stay that long and usually their colleague takes them out. Now yesterday there is no doubt a few wouldn't have passed any breathalyzer test. And, Mr. Chairman, I think this is getting serious. I don't want to name anybody, as I said I don't want to exaggerate that, I don't want to say that they're not good members but, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that we have the right to let the role of the Committee or to let any members disrupt the work of the Committee. If we do that, what's going to happen. It's going to go down and down and it's going to get worse.

When this is done I think that the members should leave the Committee because I don't think you can mix liquor and the work of the people of Manitoba or that you can look at important things such as a department review, something that we feel is important like the dental program of yesterday. As I say, it's not the heckling, Mr. Chairman, I'm not saying that that is good — if there's any guilt on that I'm one of the guiltiest members of the House. I've always felt that my role and the role of most of the people was in fun but yesterday as I say was disrupting the work of the Committee and that cannot, and I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that cannot be condoned and it can not continue. I think that all the members of all Parties should realize that and I think that there is

a time to celebrate and there's a time to be serious and to look after the affairs of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, before we start on this item, the Minister of Health has said that he was going to give some answers on the dental program yesterday and I would like to remind him of that before we embark on the other program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, there are one or two specific items that the Member for St. Johns asked to be tabled and I don't see any difficulty in tabling them. I have asked for them to be copied and made available for tabling in the Committee and they will be tabled as soon as I receive them from my office.

The other questions I believe were answered to the best of my ability. There may be still one answer to come from the Director of Dental Services in the department. He's not here at the moment and if there is such an answer still to come that will have to wait for his supplying me with that mathematical information and I'll supply it to the Member for St. Boniface at that time.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry that I was slow in rising. I wanted to ask the Honourable Minister if he could indicate to me which item in the Estimates would deal with his brief presented on retirement age and pension benefits and if we could be assured that we will get that material before we deal with that item?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well if there is no specified item under the the Estimates we can deal with it under my salary, Mr. Chairman. I don't know of a specific spot in which one would want to slot it. It's an outline of this government's objectives up to this point in time for retirement age policies and programs. Although it is not officially a White Paper, it is in the form of that kind of document for discussion and debate. I would suggest it could be discussed under my salary if the honourable members Opposite want to challenge it or debate it at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass, the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER: I wonder whether the Minister could give us some information to start off. The amount shown last year in the salaries in the print was \$130.2, it's now shown at \$134.8, I assume that the increase is due to the general salary increase. Was that amount underspent or was it overspent? Could we have a report on that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, that amount shown for last year will will be underspent. There was an administrative officer's position which was vacant and had been vacant for some time and that position has been abolished so that the total complement in staff man years comes down from 8.5 to 7.5.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, then am I to assume from that that if there is a staff decrease from, what is it — 8.5 to 7.5 staff man years, is there a diminution of service in this area? I'm concerned about this because it is an area which I think everyone recognizes has to be developed rather than a retraction take place or a reduction take place.

Looking at some of the other items it would appear that there's actually a decrease in some areas and in others there's a decrease, to all intents and purposes, or in fact because it doesn't reflect the natural increase due to inflation. So that, my concern is that in an area such as this, which provides rehabilitation services and assistance to the physically and mentally disabled, that this government should be sort of drawing back an essential service such as this.

I know the C.N.I.B., which I believe is one of the agencies that's involved here, has expressed concern already that they have accumulated a considerable debt over the years — I think their debt today is about \$100,000, that's accumulated and they have no idea yet where they stand for the coming year. Their year starts January 1st. They still don't know where they stand as far as the government is concerned.

They did receive money last year, and if that figure they indicated was not increased — I think it was \$435,000 last year, which was not enough to cover their operations — that if that figure

was not significantly increased, they indicated that, I think the word they used, as a matter of fact, was it would be a disaster if they were kept to that low, low level. And although I know that there's probably an amount shown in here for the C.N.I.B., I'm wondering whether, in fact, there is a substantial increase so the C.N.I.B. can continue to offer the services at the same level that they did in the past. What they had to do last year is cut out certain programs — certain aspects of their operation — and it has hurt their operation. So I'm wondering whether the Minister could comment on this aspect of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I want to assure the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that there is no diminution of service, in answer to his question. This is not a service position and it's not a field service component that we're looking at. This is the central office staff, and what has happened is an administrative officer position, which was vacant, has simply been abolished. In terms of service to the field, and service in the field, nothing has happened; there is no diminution and no reduction. But the administrative overlay is not as heavy as it was, and had not been for some time due to the fact that the position was vacant to begin with.

Notwithstanding the figures that the honourable members see in front of them in the printed Estimates Book, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that in the more important of these areas, we were underspent in 1978-79 in relation to the voted amounts shown in the Estimates. If you look at Financial Assistance, for example, we show a voted amount for the year ending 1979 of \$1,855,000; in fact the operations accounted for an underexpenditure of approximately \$250,000.00. And if you look at that particular area over a two-year period — the year 1977-78 as against the year we're coming into 1979-80 — we're looking in fact at an increase of approximately 50 percent in funding, Mr. Chairman. In 1977-78, the actual expended amount in Financial Assistance was \$1,167,000.00. The amount we're budgeting for, as members can see, this coming year is \$1,757,000, which is approximately \$600,000 more — \$590,000 more — and that represents an increase of 50 percent over two years. Admittedly, we're looking at two years here. But that's a significant advance, so that contrary to any suggestion of reduction or diminution of service, service and funding is being expanded.

And if one looks just in terms of 1978-79 as against 1979-80, the actual increase that we're requesting under the Financial Assistance line is approximately \$150,000 over what was spent in the year just ended.

MR. MILLER: Could the Minister at this time also, then, indicate what is meant by "Financial Assistance". The next line is External Agencies, and those would be grants to agencies such as the Crippled Children's Society, I suppose, or the C.N.I.B. But, what is actually the expenditure which falls under Financial Assistance?

MR. SHERMAN: Financial Assistance, Mr. Chairman, has to do with fees for purchase of service for clients attending workshops; it has to do with subsistence, with transportation of clients, and with fees for the purchase of training for clients other than workshops. We have about 1,075 disabled persons at any given time on any one day in the 24 rehabilitation workshops that are operated throughout the province, and fees for the purchase of service for those clients, and their subsistence and their transportation and their training, adds up to the component known and described here in the Estimates as Financial Assistance.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I find it interesting that the Minister claims that there was an underexpenditure last year, and therefore his smaller request this year is justified, when in fact the C.N.I.B. has made it known that they've had to cut back on transportation. The Minister noted "transportation" as one of the items covered under Financial Assistance, and the C.N.I.B., which is part of this operation has transportation for elderly blind people, has had to cut out that program because the grants made by government to the C.N.I.B. were inadequate, and they were forced to cut some programs — and one of the victims of that cut was a transportation for elderly people; to pick them up and take them various places.

Another area C.N.I.B. had to cut back was the employment training service to aid people entering the labour force. So if the Minister was underspent within that Appropriation, surely the C.N.I.B. should have been assisted so that as an agency, apart from government or in addition to government — the government's own operation, since they're covering people who fall into the category of disabled and physically disabled — then surely the funds were there to assist the C.N.I.B. to maintain their level of service they had achieved over the years, rather than forcing them to cut back.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, we haven't got to the C.N.I.B. yet. We're talking about financial assistance. In fact, I'm not sure that we're finished talking about salaries, yet.

A MEMBER: We passed salaries.

MR. SHERMAN: Did we pass salaries? We'll get to the C.N.I.B. under External Agencies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)—pass. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR.D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Chairman, there was a matter that I wanted to discuss with the Minister that I haven't been able to find listed anywhere within these Estimates. I'd like to ask him now whether this part that we're on, assistance to the physically and mentally disabled, would also include those who have a hearing disability? Would this come under this department or this Appropriation, and if not, which one, please?

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Chairman, that doesn't come under this particular item. That's covered under Medical and Public Health, 3.(b) in the Estimates: Medical Public Health Services, and the subject was dealt with or available for dealing with at that time. If the honourable member has particular concerns, he can certainly put them to me privately or on the Salary portion of these Estimates, but that particular subject doesn't come under the appropriation we are now discussing.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister again compares apples and oranges, and it seems that . . . I don't remember of any time that I've been in this House that we've done this. The Minister is comparing not what was asked for last year and what he's asking for, for this year, which has always been the way that things were compared, and I don't mind that once in a while, the Minister for some reason, because you know that . . . well, that money was all spent, and this is what we spend, so actually we're asking for more. But the Minister has done that on practically every item. Now, I think if we're going to go back on it, he might . . . probably will tell me the same thing. I know that in 1977-78, they didn't spend the money that was voted, but we're talking about this item. In 1977-78, it was voted for financial assistance, \$3,246,000, and he is saying there is no decrease. Now he might tell me all that wasn't spent; that's possible. And it's also very possible that what he's asking for this year will not be spent, and next year it will be the same thing. He'll say, well, this is not the amount; this is the amount spent, and there is no point in trying to deal if we don't know. I think that any government and any Minister is supposed to ask what he thinks is he will need. You know, there is no point in asking for something and not spending it, because he can say any sum if we don't allow that; we have to know.

Now, I would take it for granted that the Minister says he is going to spend this, this year, and that next year we won't have a comparison again, you know. Now he's saying, well, we're going to spend more, because in effect, it wasn't as we have printed here \$1.8 million; we didn't spend it, and he's making comparison with what was spent. Are we going to have that every year? Then there is no point; we can't get at anything, Mr. Chairman. There is no doubt that you cannot fall right on the item, right on the nose, there is no doubt. And there is no doubt that at times when we did the same thing, in many items, that we couldn't help, for instance, the Dental Program, when we brought it; we couldn't go as fast as we wanted to and we were underspent. There is no dou about that.

But the comparison was never made continually on what not was asked or what was voted last year. You know, we voted so much last year and we're asking to vote this year, and the comparisons should be there, not on every item that we go back and say, well, we didn't spend this money. What guarantee do we have that this is not exactly the same thing that's being done this year, that they're asking money with no intention of spending it? What guarantee do we have? The Minister went through the same routine last year. He said, "Well, you didn't spend the money, so therefore we're asking that and we're going to spend more", and he made a point when we were saying that he was reducing programs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, is there that much that we had in 1976-77 — I'll go that far back — the voted was \$3.325 on this item. The following year, what was voted was \$3.246. Maybe that was too much; there was a reduction. Then there was quite a reduction last year to financial assistance, from voted \$3.246 to \$1.8, and the Minister is saying that this is not spent. So both governments have been guilty, if they're not spending that money, of asking for money and going all the way down. But we're both being guilty for some reason or other of not doing enough then. When we've

got this money and the people are saying they haven't got the funds, and that money is being passed by this Committee, and if we're not spending it, there is something wrong, and this is a futile exercise because we haven't the faintest idea of what will be done, Mr. Chairman.

Now the Minister said, when we were talking about Salary, that there was a vacancy, and they didn't replace that man. That vacancy wasn't there last year at this time. That vacancy happened during this year and they didn't replace him. You know, they did away with one man. That vacancy did not exist last year at this time and it didn't exist when they took over from our government, so you know, it's not just somebody that left and it didn't matter because the position wasn't filled, so therefore we're not losing anything. That position was filled.

So, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister — I think it's under this item — can break that down a bit. I think that we are now looking and I am interested in that in the different workshops in the province. I wonder if the Minister could tell us how many workshops they have; who are they serving; how many people are they serving; and then break down I think that you have also the financial assistant for the client that is attending these workshops and also the fee for vocational training. That's part of that; I think that even goes in some instance to the university and so on. I'd like to know more about that; how many people are receiving help, and then there's the transportation, what has always been a very very important thing for the people in the workshops, because workshops are in certain centres and they have to be bussed there, Mr. Chairman.

And then the support for the community, the residents for the mentally ill. This was an area that was quite difficult. It was felt that there wasn't enough funds in there. That was increased some, and it was felt by, certainly the people receiving the money, the client that we have, that this wasn't enough. Could the Minister give us a little bit more about that, and tell us about the workshop that they have? Are they functioning well? Are there any closed? Are there any new ones and so on, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, with respect to that eliminated position — as I have said, it was an administrative officer's position, that was vacant as of last spring. The Member for St. Boniface no doubt is correct when he suggests it wasn't vacant at the time we were going through our Estimates last year, although we started the Estimates of the Department of Health and Community Services on May 16th last year which was two months later than we started them this year, and I would have to check to be sure. But in any event, it was last spring, some time last spring that that position became vacant.

MR. DESJARDINS: Excuse me, on this, if I can help the Minister, I can assure him that I am not playing games, and if I am wrong it's because his figures that he gave me last year, I can check for him now. And what he gave me last year, they were double checked to make sure. There were no vacancies. Rehab Services for Disabled was 8.5 for 1976-77; 1977-78, 8.5; and he was asking for 8.5 when there were no vacancies at that time.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, then that would have been based on March 31st, 1978, Mr. Chairman, and obviously that's accurate and precise, but the vacancy did occur subsequent to that and had not been filled and was not deemed a necessary position in that particular office, and now has been abolished.

With respect to the discrepancies and the variations in the requested amount and the voted amount, and the amounts that are actually spent, I agree with the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, but the science of estimating is not a precise one, as he well knows, and as he himself has conceded, I guess all governments have made the same kinds of attempts to be accurate and precise in their estimating but have fallen short of the target or missed the target in actual practise from time to time, and I don't know that that can ever be entirely eliminated. In the category of underspent amounts, for '79-80, we are looking at a substantially reduced underexpenditure in comparison to the preceding year. In '77-78, the underexpenditure was approximately twice that. This year, hopefully, we're very close to target with our Estimate, but I can't guarantee him that it's exactly on to every dollar and cent, because I know he's gone through the same exercise himself and it's an inexact one.

In this area of financial assistance and workshops, we're looking at a total, Mr. Chairman, of 24 workshops, of varying forms throughout the province. I want to say at this juncture that two new occupational activity centres were started in fiscal '78-79. One is in Thompson and one is in Notre Dame de Lourde, and included in the 1979-80 Estimates, on which we're asking the Legislature's approval right now, are funds for 40 new spaces in the city of Winnipeg and transportation costs associated with those spaces. So that the thrust in support of the rehabilitation

workshop concept remains unchanged and remains a direction and a policy of emphasis and we're attempting to expand in that field as rapidly as we can in a practical sense.

The 24 workshops already in existence that I've referred to are located in the following points: Altona, Arborg, Austin, Beausejour, Boissevain, Brandon, Cardale, Dauphin, Flin Flon, Neepawa, Notre Dame, Portage la Prairie, Selkirk, Steinbach, Stonewall, St. Malo, Swan River, Thompson, Virden, Winkler and Winnipeg. The number of clients in each of them varies widely, Mr. Chairman. The biggest total is to be found in Winnipeg — 239. The smallest one is Thompson with 2, but it's just started up and is supposed to accommodate 8, yes, I think it's supposed to accommodate 8 anyway, possibly as many as 10. Total is 1,127 clients in these 24 workshops.

I mentioned earlier that about 1,075 disabled persons can be found in these workshops on any given particular day, but the total enrolled, total spaces is 1,127. Financial support for this whole component of the program, Mr. Chairman, is \$1,757,000.00. The breakdown, if the honourable members would like to have it, is made up of the four items that I referred to earlier, the fees, subsistence, transportation, etc.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, I thought the Minister meant breakdown of all the workshops. Yes, we'd like to have the other, and I think that you have the odd new ones. Were there any that were closed for some reason or other? Could the Minister tell us that, because you just announced that there were two new ones at least?

MR. SHERMAN: There were none closed that I'm aware of, or I recall or that my officials recall, Mr. Chairman. I believe the figure we quoted last year was 22, which now goes to 24, and there are plans for some additional group homes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Meer for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: This is still under the VRDP, that is the Vocational Rehabilitation Plan. There has been no change in that funding at all. So this is 50 percent Federal funding is that right?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes.

MR. MILLER: And is the 50 percent paid on this line, that is financial assistance, or does it also cover some of the external agency payments as well?

MR. SHERMAN: It's paid on this line on Financial Assistance and on staff to the external agencies, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MILLER: Budgeting \$1,757,000 for Financial Assistance, and staff in external agencies, and are recovering \$1,880,000 from the federal government. Does that represent 50 percent of the actual cost? Is that the sort of thing that's audited by Ottawa to represent 50 percent, and if there's a shortfall, does the anticipated revenue drop accordingly? In other words, do you lose . . . dollars if in fact you don't expend as you didn't last year.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, the staff we're talking about here, of course, are approved staff — we're not talking about administrative staff. We're talking about the staff approved for VRDP sharing in terms of servicing these agencies and that doesn't encompass administrative staff. If the honourable member would repeat the last part of his question, I would appreciate it.

MR. MILLER: What I'm wondering is this, Mr. Chairman, whether the staff referred to, which is covered under VRDP federal funding — the staff would be approved staff — would they be those only within the Department of Health and Community Services, or as well, staff who are recognized, whether they be in C.N.I.B. or the Crippled Children's Society — the agencies, in other words, the outside agencies — would they also be part of this cost-sharing and would the Manitoba government receive money for them?

MR. SHERMAN: They're both, Mr. Chairman — both our staff and staff that are direct staff of the agencies themselves. But our field staff come under a different item; they come under Regional Personal Services 3.(t).

MR. MILLER: So, what we have here, then, is the fact that the federal government does pick up

50 percent based on an audit, I suppose, to satisfy themselves that this money is expended. So to the extent that you underspent last year, under Financial Assistance, then the amount you indicated that you might receive last year was therefore proportionately out, I assume. So I ask this question — could you not have therefore made the grants, the assistance to the C.N.I.B. — increase their assistance so they wouldn't be faced with a deficit, and wouldn't have had to cut back services, as they've been forced to do; and in so doing still retain, protect the federal grant.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, the answer to that, Mr. Chairman, is that the underexpenditure came in the Financial Assistance category. It didn't come under the grants to external agencies.

MR. MILLER: Thank you. That may be so, Mr. Chairman, but we're really dealing with one Appropriation; whether it's 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 10, it's still 3.(k) that we're dealing with — and certainly within the whole spectrum of Social Services and Community Health — so it's one appropriation and it's easily swung anywhere within that appropriation.

So the question I'm asking is, since the external agencies had to cut back, as they put it, because they've been forced to tighten the belt to the point where it's harming their services I'm asking the question, why could not the assistance to them have been increased, and thus not have jeopardized and perhaps lost some of the federal financing that was available.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, in the Financial Assistance category, Mr. Chairman, we pay those workshops at a rate that is based on the number of clients, and with respect to the external agencies, I'm not sure but I assume what the Member for Seven Oaks is trying to get at, or trying to insist, is that there have been cutbacks or reductions in support to external agencies. In fact in most categories, there is an increase. In most categories in the external agencies area, in fact in all categories, there is an increase in 1979-80 over 1978-79.

Certainly I would concede the point that if we reduce the support for external agencies, we lose a certain amount of cost-sharing — that's right. I concede that point. But I'm not prepared to concede that we are in any way reducing the support for external agencies. The budgets are tight, but they are greater than they were last year.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Mr. J. Wally McKenzie (Roblin): The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Before we leave this item, could the Minister tell us what the fees paid to the activity centres are now?

MR. SHERMAN: Is the Member for St. Boniface referring to the Employment Preparation Centre, ARM Industries and Skills Unlimited? The Employment Preparation Centre has 80 clients, and the fee paid is \$90 per client. And that applies to all of them. ARM Industries has 90 clients, and Skills Unlimited has 105 — and it's \$90 per client in each case.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (k)3)—pass. (k)4) External Agencies, \$3,435,600— pass. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, here I would ask again the question, was there an underexpenditure for the \$3,261,000 shown last year?

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Chairman, there was no underexpenditure in this area.

MR. MILLER: All right, so there's no underexpenditure. So, Mr. Chairman, I then have to in a sense ask this question again. We know that although there was an increase last year over 1977-78, it obviously didn't keep up with the cost of inflation to the extent that certain programs had to be cut back at the external agencies. They've had to tighten their belt, because it was part of the restraint program of this government, but in doing so, I am suggesting that by underexpending in one area, which is Financial Assistance, and since it must have been obvious to the Minister very shortly after the beginning of the fiscal year, certainly by the fall, that in fact there would be an underexpenditure in Financial Assistance — why he didn't see his way clear to increase the grants to the external agencies who are dependent upon provincial support, financial support, in order to provide the services they provide.

And in the case of the C.N.I.B., where they had to eliminate their transportation services for elderly blind, for example — that's just one example where they had to let certain staff go, because

they simply didn't have the funds, the grant wasn't large enough, and although it may have been larger than the 1977-78, it obviously wasn't large enough to cover their increased costs to just maintain the service, never mind expanding it — just to maintain the level of service. And so, I'm wondering why the Minister chose not to increase the grant when he had the money in Line 3, and could have, perhaps' qualified for federal funding of 50 percent?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, we have applied some of the underexpenditure to meet some shortfalls but the final determination of the underexpenditure was not made that early in the fiscal year. It was made, of course, late in the fiscal year, and at that point in time the budgeting with the external agencies had been set, and they were working with it, living within it — I'm not suggesting they're not living within it without difficulty, but that was being done — and we have other areas of shortfall, often in the area of salaries for institutional staff and others where whatever kinds of underexpenditures can be applied, and of course, obviously there is restriction on the shifting from one appropriation to another — it can only be done within certain parameters — but there aren't very many instances where we can't make very adequate and very desirable use of underexpenditures to meet unanticipated overexpenditures in other areas. And that is largely the explanation of the application of the underexpenditures on the Financial Assistance side.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I know very well that the Minister, or any minister, is limited to what he can transfer from one appropriation to another. And if you had to take it from a totally different appropriation, you'd have had to have an Order-in-Council to do it, and that's the only way you can do it. But in this case, we are dealing with the same Section (k), or Subsection (k) Rehabilitation Services to the Disabled, and it's really a very simple matter to underexpend and overexpend in another area. It wouldn't have required anything except the desire by this Minister to do it.

And when he says, well, they were given their budgets early and we were going to maintain their budgets, even though he admits that the amount given to them was not as much as they wanted. Mr. Chairman, there's a difference between as much as they wanted, and what is needed to maintain a level of service. They are forced to cut back; they can't maintain the level of service they had in 1977-78 — that's what they have said publicly. And, in the article I was referring to, they made a point of saying they don't want to go public on this — they don't want to embarrass anybody. They are really an organization that has given yeoman service for decades to the blind, and they're not the kind who would normally go public at all.

So that, when the Minister says, well we gave them a budget early in the year — it may have been a tight budget, but they're going to have to live with it — then I feel very strongly that he is simply applying the clamps irrespective of what happens at the other end. And he's, in so doing, trying to, I guess, continue the image of a thrifty government — I call it a government of penury, but okay, a thrifty government — and the agencies are going to have to make do with what he gives them.

But if he showed us that, in fact, there was no money in this Appropriation at all, that in fact he'd overspent or had spent all the money under Financial Assistance, and there just wasn't any to be gotten, and he didn't want to go for a special Order-in-Council, special warrant, then there might be some justification. But here he had the money within that category, and yet he allows a service such as the C.N.I.B. has been offering to be downgraded, to be lessened, and to cut out vital programs. I don't think that transportation for the elderly, disabled blind is a luxury or a frill. I think, in this day and age, this should be recognized as a basic service. And when they find that they have to cut this out, and are in the process of having to maybe cut out other programs, then they are being underfunded, whether the Minister says, well that's what we decided and that's what we're going to give them, it leads to underfunding, and underfunding means that certain services which have been provided are no longer being provided.

So the Minister's explanation that they had decided on their budget, they'd been notified, and notwithstanding any further need, they simply weren't prepared to increase that. I'm sure by November and December, they must have known pretty well, if not to the penny, to within \$100,000 whether Financial Assistance was going to be underspent or not. And that amount of money — even part of that — would have made a difference to the C.N.I.B., so they could have maintained a service.

Mr. Chairman, would the Minister also, when he's on his feet, give us the list of the agencies, the amounts received in 1978-79, and how much it's anticipated they would receive in 1979-80?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Just before I do, just with respect to the main point raised by the Member for Seven Oaks, I think it has to be recognized at the same time that the government is looking at its 1979-80 revenues, is looking at the amount of money that is available for operation

of all these programs in 1979-80, and the transfer of funds along the lines that the honourable member suggests would have created an entirely different base in terms of the total amount appropriated for external agencies. And going into 1979-80 if we had only been able to appropriate or budget the \$3.4 million that we're asking for in the printed Estimates then I am sure and he would have been quite right in doing so. I'm sure that he would have been up on his feet asking us why we were cutting back in funding for external agencies. So I think it should be recognized that that is a consideration that has to be taken into account.

We were looking into 1979-80, what kind of revenues we would have, what kind of support we could provide in this field, and to have inflated a position for the agencies in 1978-79 that could not be maintained in 1979-80 would be damaging and negative and would have as I suggest, I'm sure, brought members opposite to their feet with a very legitimate question. So I don't think that the simple idea of a transfer of the kind that he's talking about can be viewed entirely in isolation from the overall Budget that I knew that I had to live with in 1979-80.

On the identification of the agencies funded under this line, Mr. Chairman, they are the CNIB and the support in 1978-79 was \$433.5 thousand. The requested vote for 1979-80 is \$491.8 thousand. Next is the Society for Crippled Children and Adults — 1978-79 is \$2,009.8 thousand and for 1979-80 is \$2,058.4 thousand. Next is 1010 Sinclair, for 1978-79 was \$336.3 thousand and for 1979-80 is \$341.9 thousand. ARM Industries, in Brandon — 1978-79 was \$169.4 thousand and for 1979-80 is \$173.8 thousand. Skills Unlimited — 1978-79 was \$156.3 thousand and for 1979-80 is \$199.4 thousand. And, Mr. Chairman, the Employment Preparation Centre which is the Society for Crippled Children and Adults — 1978-79 was \$155.7 thousand and for 1979-80 is \$170.3 thousand. For the total requested of \$3.435 millions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (k)(4) —pass, the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, what we have here is what, about a 5 percent increase in total? 5 percent. Then, Mr. Chairman, these agencies are going to be in trouble again this year because there's no way the Minister can convince anyone that their costs of operation, to maintain the same level, can be done with a 5 percent increase whether they are transporting clients, the people who work who are taken to these various work shops. In the case of let's say, Skills Unlimited or the ARM in Brandon, or whatever, or the staff they have to pay, the instructors they are hiring, there is no way that it can be done with a 5 percent increase. And so what you are going to have in 1979-80 is what you had in 1978-79, again a contraction of what the agencies are able to provide, simply because this government is squeezing, is tightening the belt on them so that they have no choice but to cut out programs. I suppose that initially they're may have been a thought, the government did think I suppose, that all these agencies were so fat and overblown, that they could take the kinds of cut, not cut but the diminution of grants that they were given last year and somehow absorb it without decreasing their services. But it is obvious that hasn't occurred, I know in the case of CNIB it hasn't occurred, and what is being noted here, or being mentioned here for next year isn't really going to give them that kind of elbow room. There're still going to be in trouble.

And again, I say to the Minister since some of these funds can be recovered from Ottawa, not all of them but some of them, then surely if Ottawa is picking up 50 percent of the cost then surely the government in this case can show its concern for an element in our society that somebody has to show a concern for and it should be the government that takes the leadership in that direction. It shouldn't be left to the attempt to raise funds by some charity drive to maintain these services. And I deplore the fact that these agencies are just being squeezed to the point where it took many years to develop their services to the level they have achieved and to be proud of, not that their services are so grandiose but they're basic human services and those human services are now being rapidly eroded within a 24-month period.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I would like the Minister to explain how, in this period of restraint, how the grants or the money that goes to the funding for the agencies how is that worked out? Does the Minister get a certain lump sum, let's say block funding of some kind from the Cabinet that they will allow him, and then he divides it amongst the groups, the different agencies, or does he look at the Budget of the agencies, does he have staff look at it with them, look at the service that was performed during the past year and then look at their legitimate increase. For instance, for staff salary which I would imagine is fairly important also and go from there or it might be a combination of both. But I wonder if the Minister could tell us is it just a grant and say, "okay, go ahead and do what you want, it's up to you. If you have to cut down on services, go ahead",

or the Minister has said many times that he would welcome more of these organizations and so if the Minister is welcoming, and the government is welcoming, more of these organizations, yes, we could say that he's more or less contracting out to these people responsibility for some of the work that normally — well I won't even say normally because the Minister will debate that with me — but that under some circumstances the government certainly accepts the responsibility and the government would have to deliver these services.

Now, of course, you know the Minister can go ahead by having more of these agencies, he can cut down on his own staff, but then does he bleed them, does he bleed the agencies? I want to know if they're looking at the budgets of the different agencies and they might break it down. I would imagine that the agencies would have to breakdown it justify it and then and what happens when this is done, is there still a reduction? Or does the Minister as I said recently, does the Minister get the amount and then have to make do with that and then he has to cut down even if they justify their budget and therefore that would mean a reduction in services.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: The manner in which the process operates I don't think has changed under this government from previous governments, Mr. Chairman. The agencies themselves submit budgets. It's true that, if you want to take the process in terms of the department in total right back to its point of origin which is somewhere in the month of October or the month of November, the Minister for that department like the Minister for the other departments is advised by the Minister of Finance what the forthcoming fiscal year looks like in terms of the financial position of the province and essentially what kind of an overall budgetary increase we should be attempting to remain within. But at that point in time, the agencies themselves are not subjected to any particular constraints or restrictions by the Minister. The agencies submit their projected budgets for the next fiscal year. They are approved by our Agency Relations Branch and the director of that branch, in consultation and discussion with him, based on realistic guidelines and appraisals of the situation and his experience with those agencies and other agencies in the past and the best kind of estimates that can be selected or cited for the future, for . T the coming year in to hose budget positions then are built that particular division of the department that comes forward under the Directorates for that division to the ministerial estimates review at the level of the individual Minister, in this case, the Minister of Health and Community Services, as part of the initial estimates review by the Minister.

In the case of this particular subject area, funding for external agencies, I don't believe that any requirements to meet any budget limitations for the department were superimposed on the external agencies and sent back to them with the instructions that they had to reduce. Certainly when the initial departmental estimates came in front of me, and I doubt that this has ever been any different in any other year, there were requests that exceeded those that my department officials and I felt could be justified and so there were excercises undertaken and attempts made to rationalize and tighten and produce an overall picture of estimates for the department that could be justified both in terms of social service and in terms of the budget limitations that we had to meet.

But there was no situation in which we went back to the external agencies and said: "Look, your way beyond what we can do and you're contributing to an expansionary budget and we want to cut this budget and therefore you will have to cut." We certainly did make some rationalizations in the overall budget. We looked at the reduction of work activity projects and in fact are reducing the funding in the work activity project field, as honourable members know. But those were departmental programs. That kind of excercise was not carried out with the external agencies. They submitted their budgets through the process that I have suggested and the Director of Agency Relations knew, of course, of the kinds of overall budgetary targets that we were aiming at, and he guided the discussions with the External Agencies within that framework, and they were then built-in to our departmental Estimates. When we then came to look for reductions in order to ensure that we had a budget that the Legislature and the taxpayers of Manitoba could live with, we didn't look at external agencies for further cuts or reductions.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Minister, when he came into office, is this one of the areas that he felt that maybe the previous government was throwing money, that we were too rich in the grants that we'd made; did he find this to be the case when he dealt with these particular agencies that we are talking about today? I wonder if the Minister could tell us that. I think we can go from there because then that might be the point, if the Minister felt that it was too rich, that the funding we were giving was too rich — did he find this out?

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Chairman, I did not find that out and I have never felt that to be the case. I have said, and I don't think we want to get into this general debate, I felt the previous government spent a lot of money as a government in general terms, that did not need to be spent, but the external agency field was not one of those fields. I think they've always been required to hew to a pretty tight budget.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister really believe then, that an increase of 3 percent or less, does he feel that any agency could make do, could perform their same services in this period of inflation, with an increase of less than 3 percent? If the Minister said that we weren't throwing money away, they weren't getting that much money; now does the Minister feel that he can still say that there's no reduction in salary if he provides an increase of 3 percent or less for some of the agencies?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, about all I can say about that, I guess, is that we have made it plain that we expected everybody connected with and related to the delivery of services in this province, whether directly in government or associated with government through government funding, to examine and cull their operations from top to bottom — and we expected government to do the same, and our departmental officials to do the same — to see where our dollars could be stretched to go further.

It's not a comfortable exercise for anybody, but I think it has been applied fairly in that it has not been exclusive to one sector or another of the service operations of the province of Manitoba. It has been applied to both the public and private sectors and I believe that it has produced some greater efficiencies; it has reduced and eliminated some inefficiencies and has in effect given us more value for the dollars available.

Now, I would be the first to agree with my honourable friend that that sort of approach can only be carried so far — it can't be pushed beyond reason, and I don't intend to push it beyond reason, and I don't intend to preside over the demise of any of these agencies that we are looking at — but I honestly don't know how, Mr. Chairman, and the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is a businessman, and the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks was a businessman, and both of them have their own homes to run, too, and I don't see how any of us in our homes or our businesses or our services or our agencies or our government can ever get at the most effective use of 90 or 95 cents out of every dollar that we have unless we put ourselves through this kind of a searching examination of funding. That has been what the government of the day has been embarked upon in order to get to the point where we are getting the most effective use out of those dollars. But as I say, it cannot be pushed and there's no intention on my part of pushing it beyond that point of reasonable efficiency.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I understand what the Minister is saying, what he's trying to say. I sympathize with him, and the direction that he has to go, I recognize that; but what gets me is that the Minister has repeatedly stated that there are no cutting down on services and that's what gets me. Because the Minister today, when I asked him, said no, this is not an area where you were wasting money. And the Minister said we're going to be fair and in the Minister's way of thinking he probably is, if he's given so much money — and as I say, I sympathize with him — by the Cabinet, and he has to cut all over the place. But why does he insist repeatedly, that their services are not cut?

You know, the argument is on this, and that would be a fair argument on all sides, that this present government is saying, "We cannot afford it." I've used that example, and I've said the same thing, maybe not as much, but I've said the same thing. I've said, for an example, all right, compare it to the family. You know, little Joe wants a wagon; and Tom wants a bicycle; and somebody else wants something else; and if you buy it all, you have to budget.

All right, you have to budget, and you have to say, okay, I can't afford it this year, and that's what the government is saying. But why do they have to? Aren't they convinced enough of their position, are they ready to defend that position — why do they so unfairly come in and say, we will not reduce any services because it was wasted under the former administration, and we're going to stretch. And then the Minister said, well, I don't want to push too much. I say — and we can argue on this — you've pushed too far already, that's my point. And I'm ready to say, fine, I think we should spend a little more money; and I'm ready to be criticized on that; and I think we're ready; and I feel that the government should do the same thing. If there's any scandal, somewhere you're wasting and you're doing that; your bringing some of them that we're trying to defend; some of them we have trouble with; but not a blanket accusation right across the board, and that you are God Almighty and that you are right; and you say we could go and you've got the right figure

and the right amount all the time. You know, you have a job to do, and if you'd say to the people of Manitoba, "It was too rich, you will have to cut down on the services," I would understand. And we would argue, we would say, for instance, that the dental plan should be a universal program; and we can argue about that, and you can say, "No," and you might win the argument. It's possible. We can't be God either and say that everything we do it perfect, either. I understand that.

Maybe we are, maybe we were too generous in certain areas. Maybe we were, and I can tell you that the years that I was the Minister, I held back every new program that was suggested, except the dental program that was a commitment of the government. I realize that, and I know what the government is trying to do, but it's a question of how much, like the Minister said.

And, Mr. Chairman, we've got to look at not just this year. It would be wrong if we just looked at this year; we've got to look from the day that this government took office, because you know one year can be pretty tough, and you can push quite a bit, and then you can say, okay, we'll pay the odd deficit and fine, but one year after another year of the same restraint, makes it very difficult. And I submit, and I just took this — the first one on the top — as an example is the CNIB, and I think that they made — I know how responsible these people are — and last year, you see this year, I figured the overall, I took your 6 percent, but last year they received less than 3 percent, and they had a deficit. And I think they did exactly — and you have a mandate, and they have the responsibility to stay within their budget. They have to try to do that, either that or they have a choice, and if in their own conscience they feel that they cannot deliver the service, they just give you the key or the books or whatever and say, "No thanks, we can't do it." It's the same as the hospitals do. But they have the responsibility, they're not politicians; you have a mandate, and they should try — and I think that everybody is really trying to cut down — and when you say you're getting support, they don't like it, they don't believe in it in certain areas — some might.

But I say that you've gone too far in this one, and this is what my honourable friend is saying, "Have another look at that." It's okay to say, you know, and if you can't and if you haven't got the money, if you don't want to get any revenue from taxes anywhere else, and if you want to stay with that, fine. Look at your priorities, and look at their priorities — and tell them that they've just got to take less people, you've done that in other areas.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

RESOLUTION NO. 1 — RIGHT TO WORK

MR. SPEAKER: We are now under Private Members' Hour. Second reading on public bills. The Honourable Member for Inkster is not present, so we'll proceed with resolutions. The first item under Resolutions is Resolution No. 1 and a proposed sub-amendment which I took under advisement the last time the matter came up. The reason I took it under advisement, I'd like to read to honourable members Citation 120 of Beaudesne, which states: "Foremost among his many responsibilities, the Speaker has the duty to maintain an orderly conduct of debate by repressing disorder when it arises, by refusing to propose the question upon motions and amendments which are irregular and by calling the attention of the House to bills which are out of order." The question that I seem to be facing at the present time is whether or not the proposed sub-amendment placed by the Honourable Member for Kildonan is irregular or not. And I would like to hear the arguments from both sides of the House as to whether or not this amendment is in order. So I would solicit information from both sides of the House. The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, the resolution that is before you dealing with the question of the right to work, the original motion urged the implementation of — or at least that the Legislature approve the principle of the right to work and urge the implementation of such public and private programs as will ensure that every person in our society seeking employment will have the opportunity of obtaining same. The amendment that was proposed by the Member for Roblin sought to delete all that portion of the operative clause after the words "right to work". And what the proposed sub-amendment is doing now, or is endeavouring to do, is to replace that which the amendment purports to delete. And I suggest, Sir, that the same results could be achieved by simply defeating the amendment that is before the House.

So if the House decides to negate the amendment proposed by the Member for Roblin, then it achieves precisely the same results as supporting the amendment by the Member for Kildonan,

and in that connection, Sir, I draw your attention to Beauchesne's, Citation 436, subsection 2, and it reads as follows: "An amendment which would produce the same result as if the original motion were simply negatived is out of order". And on those grounds, Sir, I submit that the amendment now being proposed by the Member for Kildonan is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would concur in what the Honourable House Leader is saying, but he must also remember that an amendment may have another thrust besides the original that was deleted to make the amendment that we now have, and I would suggest to you respectfully, Sir, if you read my amendment, it does not have exactly the same inclination or intent as was in the original motion. And therefore I am proposing another proposition which the members can vote upon in lieu of the fact of just deleting that section which was in there before.

MR. SPEAKER: I have listened . . . The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: I wonder if I might add a suggestion on this. It seems to me that it is very clear that the proposed amendment to the amendment is a design to state not the urging of implementation in the original motion, which the Member for Roblin proported the amend, not that, but rather to indicate the belief that the right to work cannot be accepted as having any meaning unless employment opportunities exist, and has no reference to public or private employment as in the original resolution, and therefore we do have the opportunity, if you approve of this amendment to the amendment as being in order. We have an opportunity to express an opinion on what the right to work would mean if it stands alone, and what it would mean, and we could debate that. And, Mr. Speaker, if you don't accept this amendment, then we can't really debate whether or not the phrase has meaning, and that is the point as I read it in the proposed amendment. I would like to urge on you, Mr. Speaker, that one should consider the opportunity that members should have to debate an issue, and that that really is the opportunity you can give us by accepting the amendment, saying, "All right now, you do have a matter to debate and that is what is before us".

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, if we were to accept the proposition of my honourable friends that the sub-amendment is proposing a new set of circumstances, and I understand that the Member for Kildonan and the Member for St. Johns are suggesting that, that here is something new that is being introduced, then I draw your attention, Sir, to Citation 437(2), which says, "An amendment may not raise a new question which could only be considered a distinct motion after proper notice". So in either way, it would seem to me that my honourable friend's amendment is out of order.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I'd like to elaborate. Obviously I didn't get my message across to the Honourable House Leader. I believe that this sub-amendment now defines or purports to define the phrase "right to work". Now, that's not new, that elaborates on what right to work is, and the proposed amendment limited the resolution portion, so that it left it only with the principle of the right to work. It is not a new issue, it is an elaboration of the definition. Now, it seems to me that the important thing is to give us an opportunity to debate it, and then see how the Chamber supports any amendment, but it is not a new thought; it is a — the Member for Kildonan, said, "a thrust". I rather see it as an elaboration of a definition which is rather important when one is asked to vote on the right to work as would be the limitation if we are not allowed to amend the amendment itself.

MR. SPEAKER: I want to thank all honourable members for their contribution and I will study it quite carefully. If you will give me time to consider the opinions that you people have submitted to me today, we'll now proceed with Resolution No. 4, which includes an amendment moved by the Honourable Member for Transcona yesterday, which I took under advisement. And again, I would like to ask the opinions of members of the House on whether or not this amendment is in order. The Honourable Government House Leader.

RESOLUTION NO. 4 — INCOME RELATED SHELTER ALLOWANCE PROGRAM

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the amendment, that is being proposed by the

Member for Transcona, in my view, Sir, it does introduce an entirely new concept into the Resolution. On subsection 2 of his motion, he introduces the question of the minimum wage, which already is being debated on another motion. And I think it would be improper, Sir, to be debating that subject on two separate motions during the same hour of business.

But to further strengthen the argument, I draw your attention to Citation 424(5), which says, "Any irregularity of any portion of a motion shall render the whole motion irregular." And I submit, Sir, that that particular portion of his amendment dealing with the minimum wage is out of order and is irregular. In addition to that, Citation 437(1) also deals with that particular matter in these words: "An amendment setting forth a proposition dealing with a matter which is foreign to the proposition involved and the main motion is not relevant and cannot be moved". So on two citations in Beauchesne's, Sir, I submit that the amendment introduced by the Honourable Member for Transcona is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, this amendment deals with the question of making housing affordable for elderly people, single parents and many Manitobans, which is what the main motion talks about. The main motion has within it a resolution that — a means of doing so would be to introduce shelter allowance; a means of making housing affordable for many Manitobans who are at the poverty level, at the minimum wage, would be to increase the minimum wage, or another means of allowing elderly people to afford housing, which is again the thrust of the main motion, would be to take away some of the increased fees that the government is levying on older people, so that they would have more disposable income, to again afford proper housing. That is the main thrust of the motion, and the amendment that I have introduced is entirely consistent with that thrust of providing affordable housing. And the question then comes down to: How do you define affordable housing? The price is of course relevant, and the income that one has to buy or rent the house or rent the apartment is again relevant, and that's why, in this resolution, I have put forward one that is completely consistent with the main motion as introduced, it is not irregular, it is not foreign, and therefore I would suggest that it does have relevance and should be debated.

Furthermore, as a final point, we previously as a House, accepted an amendment from the other side for debate which referred to an item which was brought forward in the Throne Speech. That was allowed. It wasn't declared irregular at that particular time. You, Mr. Speaker, didn't take that as being irregular. This doesn't bring in anything that is referred to in the Throne Speech, but rather brings in the item of affordability from two perspectives: price and income, and I think, therefore, Mr. Speaker, debate should be allowed to continue on this motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, if I may, notwithstanding all of the laudable objectives that my honourable friend has in mind in proposing his motion, your task is to make a decision, not on the objective that my honourable friend has in mind, but on the rules that we have before us. And I submit, Sir, that the proposition that my honourable friend has made before this House is clearly out of order in the two citations that I have cited and, Sir, that is the guideline that you must follow. You must be guided by what our rules provide; not any laudable objective that may be introduced. You don't make your decision on the basis of the merits of any proposition. Make your decision on the basis of whether or not the motion that is being proposed is within the rules of this Chamber, and you can only refer to the Rule Book that we have before us, and I submit, Sir, again, that the motion according to our rules — according to Beauchesne — is out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. With all due respect to the House Leader, he has talked about the laudable objectives, and I haven't talked about laudable objectives. I've talked about the rules that exist in Beauchesne. He is providing an interpretation that to him says that this material, or this motion, or amendment, is foreign, and indeed, Sir, I have provided I think, very concrete evidence to indicate that the amendment that I brought in refers specifically to affordable housing and that there are two aspects to affordability. One is the price, and the other is the income of the purchaser or renter, and surely, if we exclude any discussion of the income of the renter or the purchaser, then we really are then tying our hands behind our backs — which I don't think Beauchesne wants — with respect to discussing affordable housing.

The issue of the resolution before us is affordable housing, and the amendment that I brought forward is completely within the rules of 437(1). I looked at it very carefully; I consulted very carefully

with people; it is within the context of that rule; and therefore, Sir, I respectfully suggest that debate should continue.

MR. SPEAKER: Has anyone anything further to add to the comments I have already heard? If not, I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to Citation 123 of Beauchesne, where it states: (1)The speaker may rule out any question which violates the procedures of the House in the same way as he deals with irregularities in motions and amendments. He may make alterations to propose motions, or he may refer them back to the member for correction.

I have carefully perused the proposed amendment of the Honourable Member for Transcona, and it is my belief that probably Section 2, and probably Section 3, of his amendment do not meet with the rules of the House and I would suggest to the honourable member that I would give him the opportunity of withdrawing the amendment and re-submitting it later on if that is what he wishes to do.

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

MR. WALDING: Just on that point, if I can just ask for clarification, whether you are referring that back to my colleague simply because the proposed amendment contains the words: "pertaining to the minimum wage", or are there further reasons in there that you would seek to see changed by my colleague?

MR. SPEAKER: He mentions: "increasing the minimum wage", "cancelling the Manitoba supplement for the elderly", "removing the increased fee for Pharmacare", "reversing the transfer of payment for needed public service", and "bringing in a relation to the progressive ability to pay principal". For those reasons, I would suggest the present proposed amendment does not meet with the criteria as laid down in Beauchesne and would suggest that the honourable member may care to rephrase his amendment.

The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that under advisement, if you allow, and I'll try and make some amendments to that and bring them back before the House in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. We will now proceed with Resolution No. 6, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster. Will that be allowed to stand? If it does, it drops to. . .

MR. JORGENSEN: I believe, Sir, that it would be courtesy to the honourable member if we allowed this to stand, because I know he did want to speak on this resolution, and he's not here, so that's quite agreeable to us.

MR. SPEAKER: I realize that when a resolution comes up, it is supposed to be carried through. We cannot allow. . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I am quite aware of the fact that according to the rules, we should be voting on this resolution. What I was offering, Sir, is a suggestion to my honourable friends, which, if accepted by the House, we can do anything by unanimous consent, and if that is acceptable to my honourable friends, we would agree on this side of the House to allow the matter stand to enable the Member for Inkster the opportunity of speaking on this resolution.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I say that I appreciate the courtesy being offered by the Honourable House Leader, and we on this side not only would agree to unanimous consent, but do so with a sense of appreciation for the courtesy being shown by the House Leader.

MR. SPEAKER: Is unanimous consent then granted? (Agreed) I declare that this will then stand.

The next resolution is a proposed resolution by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

RESOLUTION NO. 7 — CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

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

MR. LEN DOMINO: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Portage la Prairie,

whereas many Manitobans have expressed concern and alarm at the ever increasing number of murders in Manitoba and Canada today; and

WHEREAS many Manitobans have expressed dismay over the abolition of capital punishment;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House recommend to the Government of Canada that section 218(1) of the Criminal Code be amended to provide for the death penalty upon conviction for first degree murder.

MOTION presented.

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

MR. DOMINO: Mr. Speaker, a discussion and debate on Capital Punishment is one that can easily become very emotional, and last year when this resolution was proposed and we had the opportunity to debate, I remember recalling at that time my years as a high school student in Transcona and the annual Transcona model parliaments that were held by the Junior Chamber of Commerce. And I recall that very often or on several occasions, we discussed this very matter, and I can recall then, what happened. We were children, we were not mature, and I can recall vividly how the question quickly became a matter of personal belief, not a matter of verifiable facts. We were high school students and we were young; we were inexperienced; we didn't have the patience or the tolerance that I would hope would come with maturity, and we allowed our debates to sink to a level of name calling, and we spent most of our time challenging the members opposite — challenging their motives — not exchanging ideas, but exchanging insults. I think that, and when I look back in retrospect, that children can be excused for this kind of behaviour. I would, however, hope that the level of debate in this House will be somewhat higher, and that when we discuss this issue of Capital Punishment in this Chamber, we're not going to resort to name calling and that we're not going to resort to an emotional debate.

Mr. Speaker, I made almost the same plea, word for word almost, last year, before I began my remarks, and I was very disappointed by the Member for Inkster because he rose right after myself and he talked about the Member for St. Matthews stirring up hatred; and he talked about the lynch mentality; and he made a very emotional speech; and he made a speech which attacked my motives. Let me assure all members of this House that my motives are sincere and that my only motive is that we can protect the lives of innocent citizens; that we can do a better job of protecting the lives of innocent citizens by bringing in, or returning to capital punishment for premeditated murderers.

Mr. Speaker, I don't expect unanimous agreement on this resolution. Certainly not all the members of this House will agree with me. This is a moral issue and I accept that I will not have unanimous agreement. Mr. Speaker, I also accept that those members who disagree with me are not deceitful; they are not hardhearted or cruel; they are not animals. Mr. Speaker, I accept the possibility of an honest disagreement between civilized human beings. Mr. Speaker, let me say right now that I accept that most of the abolitionists that I have talked to are also sincere in their motives, but there are several things that in this debate on Capital Punishment, I cannot accept.

I can't accept that capital punishment is not a deterrent. I cannot accept that the death penalty is a return to barbarism, and, Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept that vengeful motives destroy the value of the death penalty. And above all else, Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept that capital punishment is morally wrong.

As I mentioned, during my high school days as a student in Transcona, we often debated this matter, and at that time I could find no conclusive incontrovertible evidence that proved or disproved the usefulness of capital punishment. Then, as now, I sincerely believe that the burden of proof though, must be borne by those people who suggest that capital punishment is not a deterrent. The burden of proof must lie with those people who believe that they have located the point of marginal return; the point of zero marginal return.

It's almost three years ago, Mr. Speaker, in July of 1976, that the Governor-General of Canada gave Royal Assent to a bill abolishing capital punishment in Canada. In the legislation that was brought in July of 1976, first degree murder is generally defined as being premeditated planned murder, while second degree murder is a murder committed on the spur of the moment. Now, upon conviction of first degree murder, the Criminal Code allows for a penalty of 25 years in prison, but, parole is possible after only 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster last year, who was the only member opposite who spoke on this resolution, and he indicated at that time that he would probably be the only member no matter how much time was devoted to it. I hope the members opposite will change their minds; I hope they will engage in this debate. But last year, Mr. Speaker, the member opposite indicated

that he thought the issue was a dead issue, and pardon me; it's not a pun. He thought the issue had been settled.

Mr. Speaker, those politicians and those community leaders who think the issue of capital punishment has been settled, they are indulging in wishful thinking. The controversy has never died; the majority of Canadians have never asked that the death penalty be removed, and today a majority of Canadians do not accept as correct the abolition of capital punishment. Last year I referred to it; I think I should refer again to what I think is classic example of why we need capital punishment. I referred to the murder of the shoe-shine boy in Toronto, because when people in our community, they cry out in protest, when they see cold blooded murderers sentenced to prison terms. Murderers who in that particular case, coldly, and in a calculated sense, decided that by killing that boy, their chances of escaping punishment would be greater.

Our present laws promise to those murderers that what they did to their victim, will never be done to them. Mr. Speaker, that promise strikes most people as wrong. Mr. Speaker, that promise strikes me as being totally wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I've got a lot of contact with my constituents and I've followed this issue closely ever since I was a teenager, and I believe the majority of Manitobans believe the following: (1) That death should be the penalty for first degree murder. (2) That the death penalty is useful in securing the lives of innocent citizens. The death penalty is a deterrent. (3) That it is morally indefensible to let convicted murderers survive at the expense of the lives of innocent citizens who might have been spared, had we shown the courage to execute murderers.

Mr. Speaker, the question arises after the evidence for the usefulness of a death penalty in securing the lives of citizens. In other words, the question arises as to whether capital punishment is a real deterrent or not. I had a hard time finding any hard and fast evidence. I had a hard time finding statistical evidence that demonstrated beyond any possible doubt that capital punishment is a deterrent. I could not find absolute proof; I couldn't find absolute proof of a marginal deterrent effects; I couldn't find absolute proof of the deterrent effects over and above other alternatives. That was 10 years ago, however, in the last few years new and more sophisticated research is being conducted, and I refer members of this House to the extensive research done by Professor Isaac Erlich. He studied the death rates, the punishment procedures in the United States between the years 1933 and 1969, and let me quote from an article he wrote, "An additional execution per year may have resulted on average in seven or eight fewer murders." Seven or eight fewer murderers per execution.

Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite would like to refute that research, if they would like to find some evidence provided by other criminologists, if they would like to look at that piece of research, I have a copy, and I'm willing to table it. And further, I can suggest that if they don't like my copy, they can refer to the American Economic Review of June of 1979. The paper is entitled "The Deterrent Effect of Capital Punishment — the Question of Life or Death". Attempts have been made to refute Professor Erlich's research and in my opinion all those attempts have been unsuccessful. However, arguments continue and I am sure that the matter of the deterrent effect will remain controversial. I'm sure that I'm not going to convince any individuals on the other side of the House, who already have their minds made up.

To this point I'm willing to concede there is no incontrovertible evidence that proves or disproves capital punishment as a deterrent. However, in the face of uncertainty, I believe it's wiser to assume the possibility of deterrent than to reject it. If there is just a possibility that the death penalty will deter, then we must retain the death penalty. And I believe from the evidence that I've been able to put together, that there is a possibility — to be exact, there's more than a possibility, there is a probability that the threat of death will deter. Mr. Speaker, I believe the choice is to trade the certain shortening of the life of a convicted murderer for the survival of innocent victims, whose future murder by others may be less likely if the convicted murderer is executed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, last year I talked, it may be foolishly I was a new member of this House, and I talked about some possible experiments that we could conduct as a society, and I recall the headlines, "Domino suggests capital punishment on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Wednesdays" or something like that. I'm not going to get into that at this point, except to say that I believe if we were in a position and we were able to conduct some experiments, such as the one suggested by Maurice Arpin, prominent Winnipeg lawyer that we would find that capital punishment in a real sense did deter murder, and what Mr. Arpin's suggestion was, he suggested that we would set up a big list and everybody who believed in capital punishment and thought it was deterrent would add their name to the list. And all those people who didn't believe in it, would put their name to the other side of the list. And if a person was murdered in a premeditated fashion and his name happened to be on the capital punishment side, the murderer would be sentenced to death. If he chose to have his name on the side of the abolitionist list, then the murderer would be sentenced to 10 years in jail.

Mr. Speaker, my wife, myself and my family would be on the list for capital punishment and I'm sure that over a number of years it would be demonstrated, you'd see there would be a big difference between the murder rate on both sides of that list. Now, I don't want to be misunderstood, I'm not suggesting we conduct an experiment like this. I'm not sure society is willing to conduct an experiment of that sort but I am sure that if we did what the results would be. Mr. Speaker, it's been also pointed out to me many . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has 5 minutes.

MR. DOMINO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it has been pointed to me many times that murder is an irrational act. It's an act of passion and you can't deter acts of passion with capital punishment. Mr. Speaker, I accept that and I point out to the members in this House that this resolution does not call for the death penalty for acts of passion. It does not call for the death penalty for crimes of passion, not for second degree murder. It calls for the death penalty to be used against cold-blooded premeditated murder, first degree murder, murder that's planned.

If most murders are irrational acts, it would seem to me that the traditional threat of death has been successful; it's been successful in deterring most rational people or most people when rational from committing murder. That's hardly a reason for abolishing the death penalty or else we would have to abolish penalties whenever they succeeded in deterring any crime. Mr. Speaker, I further realize that some criminals cannot be deterred by any threat, but some people are deterred, and can be deterred and most people respond to the size of the threat addressed to them. Since death is the ultimate penalty, the greatest threat available, it should be reserved for the ultimate crime, even though we know that the death penalty will not always prevent that crime.

Mr. Speaker, some people have suggested to me that the return to the death penalty would be an act of barbarism. We hear such statements as "Laws which punish homicide themselves commit it". Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to people who are going to propose that argument, that the difference between crimes and lawful acts is not physical but legal. Crimes differ from other acts because they are unlawful. For example, we should remember that driving a stolen car is no different physically from driving your own car legally. We should also remember that kidnapping, an illegal act, is no different than lawful arrest. The only difference is society has called one lawful and the other unlawful. To accuse the state of barbarism is to deny that the execution of a convicted murderer differs from the act of murder.

Mr. Speaker, there are also many others who reject the death penalty because they believe that one of the motives of a death penalty is vengeance. Mr. Speaker, vengeance is a compensatory and a psychological satisfaction for the injured group or injured party. I do not see that vengeance is morally blameworthy. When regulated and controlled vengeance is socially useful. Legal vengeance solidifies social solidarity against lawbreakers and probably legal vengeance is the only alternative to the very disruptive private vigilante type of revenge. And if we're not willing to provide legal vengeance to the injured parties, they will take it upon themselves and indeed, you'll have lynchings, and indeed, you'll have vengeance, vendettas, and killings. At any rate, Mr. Speaker, vengeance is irrelevant to the function of the death penalty, because the death penalty must be justified independently by its purpose, not by the motive of the man who proposes the death penalty, but by the purpose of the death penalty. No rules should be discarded, no rules should be called morally wrong or morally right, because of the motives of those who support it and I've said that, Mr. Speaker, on many occasions in this House, because it applies to a great deal of the debate that goes on here. Actions, rules, penalties are justified not by the motives of the supporters, but by their purpose and by their effectiveness in achieving the purpose without excessively impairing other objectives.

Mr. Speaker, capital punishment is warranted if it achieves its purpose. Mr. Speaker, its purpose is doing justice and deterring crime regardless of whether or not it is motivated by vengeful feelings. Abolitionists, Mr. Speaker, argue that the execution of a murderer is morally wrong. I disagree completely. Every individual, Mr. Speaker, has an absolute right to an uninterrupted, natural lifespan. I would agree. Mr. Speaker, abolitionists claim that if the innocent victim had a right to live, so does the murderer. Mr. Speaker, that takes legalitarianism too far.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired. The honourable member does not have leave. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have one question for clarification to put to the Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The member's time has expired. The Honourable

for St. Johns.

M. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I remember some years ago, when a former member of this House was deriding certain ones of us, bringing back to mind certain occasions when we appeared to be on the verge of tears, and it came back to me because I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that although I started to listen to the honourable member who introduced this resolution in a sort of a casual way, that as he progressed with what he had to say, I was moved emotionally towards the condition of tears. I had a cold shiver running down my back, Mr. Speaker.

I have participated in high school debates much longer ago than the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, and he invited that we should participate in the debate. As a matter of fact, he said he's waiting for members opposite to participate in debate, so one would wonder, and I know the question that the Member for Burrows wanted to ask was, was he speaking on behalf of his Party? And I would certainly invite an interruption on his behalf to say, yes, he was speaking, or was not speaking on behalf of the Party.

MR. DOMINO: Mr. Speaker, the member has asked . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I do know that it's contrary to the rules. . .

MR. SPEAKER: We can only have one man on the floor at a time. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: I know it's contrary to the rules, and I would be quite prepared to, but it seems to me I heard a remark across the way that would indicate that this is a technique I used that was objectionable. No, apparently there's no objection to my inviting the honourable member to reply with a yes or no as to whether he spoke on behalf of his Party.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for St. Matthews.

MR. DOMINO: Mr. Speaker, I propose this resolution as a private member, it's a resolution which I feel strongly about personally. It is not being caucused, and it's not a resolution that comes from the Progressive Conservative Party.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: I appreciate that clarification, Mr. Speaker. In any event, he invited that there should be debate from this side of the House. Mr. Speaker, I had no intention and I want to refrain from appearing to debate with the honourable member. This is not a high-school forum; we are dealing with a subject with is not academic such as it was in high-school.

I recall when I was in high school, one of the important debates I was involved in was the question of euthanasia — the question of easing a person out of this life if that person is irrevocably doomed to die under pain and suffering. And you know, that was a hypothetical debate. It was a debate, a high-school debate in which I participated, but Mr. Speaker, when it came down to the practicality of a death in my own family, following a lengthy and serious illness, it was not a debate, Mr. Speaker, it was an emotional, traumatic experience to live through. So I don't want to debate this. And I don't want to discuss experiments, whether they're good or not, or whether last year the honourable member was foolishly suggesting an experiment or not. This is much too serious a matter to either deal with or to ignore, and my inclination was to ignore it and not participate in any discussion, but I was prompted so to do, and I'm doing that now.

I couldn't stand the words, there is a possibility, no there is probability that the death penalty will deter murder. Imagine, dealing with death, that final act of killing a person; executing a person on the basis that there's a possibility, no indeed, a probability that it would help. That is not acceptable to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am far from being a biblical student; I am far from being a person who is knowledgeable in any religious concept, but it's maybe a coincidence that I had occasion within the last week to be reading a section of the Bible which dealt with that lesson about "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth", and I was interested in reading the commentary on that, that my previous conception that it was recommended that there shall be an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth was not what the learned scholars interpreted it to be but rather that there shall not be a greater punishment than an eye for an eye, because in the primitive society in which that concept was presented and discussed, it was not unheard of to punish much more severely than the crime itself indicated; that when there was a theft of a loaf of bread, or let's say cattle, there

was the death penalty. And the lesson was that one should not do more than an eye for an eye or a tooth for a tooth, or a life for a life.

As a matter of fact, it goes on to discuss that if a person's son is killed, then not the murderer shall be killed, but that murderer's son should be killed. That concept is one I don't accept, I don't teach that lesson. As a matter of fact, it was subsequently, I believe, that Christ taught a different lesson altogether when he talked about turning the other cheek. And again, I'm no biblical authority, and am not one to talk about what Christ thought, nor believe that what any of the prophets taught is in itself a law we should follow.

But I'm mentioning only that my misconception of the lesson about an eye for an eye was that no greater than that shall be a punishment, and I follow the teachings that went beyond it, saying a lesser punishment than the crime itself is more acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing in a large extent with people who are involved in murder, who are sick people. I have it on my conscience, Mr. Speaker, as do so many others, that they were involved in the killing of healthy people, mentally stable people, that during the war it was acceptable to plan an atomic bomb, and to gird ourselves for battle. And I was one of those that wore a uniform and did what was allotted to me — to kill people, knowing full well that they thought their cause was righteous or acceptable; that their religious leaders told them, wished them well in battle, wished them success — that's on my conscience, Mr. Speaker. I will not let it be on my conscience that I agreed to the execution of people, many of whom are sick, all of whom are sick because it is a sick thought to plan to deliberately kill, as this member, this debater so glibly talked about it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would just have to say, it's not part of my conscience. I cannot accept the approval, the concept, of killing someone because of the probability or the possibility that it will deter others. Imagine the concept of vengeance being socially useful — to me it's such a contradiction in terms that again, it's either a debating concept, or it is an appeal to baser emotions which I think many people have risen beyond. And the reactive concept of "let's kill them" — and I've heard that here, I've heard it said here by a former minister of the Crown on our side, "kill them". That's an easy thing to say, but it's not an easy thing to do.

The idea that Morris Arpin apparently proposed — and I didn't listen too carefully to what it was, I don't know — but I would like to know whether every person who intends to vote in favour of this motion is himself prepared to be the one to carry out the execution, to put the head on the block and bring down the axe, or to trip the trap door, whatever is done, on a hanging, or to take somebody into a gas chamber and turn the valve to permit gas to go in, or to trip the switch on an electric chair. If that person is prepared to do it in full justification and full conscience, then I suppose he ought to support the motion. Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to do it. I am not prepared to let the Member for St. Matthews do it. No, Mr. Speaker, it is much too vital a thing . . . I'm sorry, it is much too serious a consequence to judge that in all probability, or in all possibility, this is a good thing to do. And vengeance in itself — somebody has called it "sweet vengeance" — but in the member's term, vengeance may be socially useful, otherwise we would have lynching.

I cannot accept that concept. The law does not accept the concept of lynching, and if the law is going to legalize lynching, and legalize vengeance, Mr. Speaker, I would have nothing to do with that kind of a law, and nothing to do to support this kind of a resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, that the point that the member makes about an execution of some one who has been convicted of a murder is a deterrent is irrefutable. But, of course, the argument goes to make the case that the execution of one individual will deter others. And when he makes the case, and he quotes his authority and the sentence that sticks in my mind, "may have stopped seven murders" — this argument goes on and on and on and on whether capital punishment is a deterrent to others in the commission of murder. But the murder defined murder, first degree murder as a premeditated act. It is usually expanded somewhat, and it also includes the killing of some one in the commission of a crime, where some one deliberately premeditates the demise of some one — that is one type of first degree murder but if some one is murdered in the commission of a crime, that also has been in the past considered to be first degree murder.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would not be opposed to the reinstatement of capital punishment on certain conditions — on certain conditions. (1) And I will use the case of Morgenthauer to make my point. I think the jury in the Morgenthauer case erred, but nevertheless I would be willing to subject myself and try and convince others that it is in our interest to subject ourselves to this kind of process; that in the Morgenthauer case there was no disputation of the facts, the facts existed. But a jury

Tuesday, April 3, 1979

of 12 people decided whether in law the Criminal Code had been impinged upon by the acts carried out by Morgenthauer.

If we get talking about murder and premeditated murder, I wonder if we shouldn't broaden this particular debate to include considerations as brought into our consideration by my mentioning of the Morgenthauer case. Because here we could broaden it out to consider just exactly what is "life". Premeditated murder, I'm sure or at least, I assume from what the member said in the presentation of his Resolution, he's not talking about life, the taking of life, he's talking about a particular slice of life, that when some adult, I assume, kills another adult, under the conditions which he has established, then that would be murder. But nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, recently we have a case of a 14-year-old . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order, please. The hour being 5:30 p.m. I'm leaving the Chair and the House will return at 8:00 in Committee.