

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, April 4, 1979

Time: 2:30 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

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

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to lay on the table for the attention of the Minister of Health, a petition signed by 2,700 concerned citizens of Winnipeg, relative to the continuing services provided by Community Health Centres, Health Action Centre, North-West Co-op, and Klinik.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, for information of the members, I would like to have distributed a copy of the fourth annual report of the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute, for their information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, for the information of members, I would like to have distributed copies of the submission from the Province of Manitoba to the Senate Committee on Retirement Age Policies.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the annual report of the Workmen's Compensation Board for 1978.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

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

MR. A.R. (PETE) ADAM (Ste. Rose) on behalf of the Member for Wellington introduced Bill No. 34, An Act to amend The Fatality Inquiries Act.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Health. Can the Minister advise the people of the Province of Manitoba as to whether or not he has a contingency plan which would come into effect when a growing number of doctors opt out of Medicare and decide to double-bill their patients, thereby impairing in a very material way the comprehensive universal medical care program which is paid for by all of the citizens in our province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, that, of course, is a hypothetical question. I can only say what I've said in the past — that we will not permit Medicare to be threatened that way, or to be threatened in any way. We will make the necessary accommodations and make the necessary policies and policy implementation that will guarantee the continuing existence of the principle of universality and universal accessibility Medicare.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Honourable Minister, I did not ask a hypothetical question. I asked him whether there is now in existence, not hypothetically, a contingency plan which would be available to the Minister in the event that there is an impairment of the principle of comprehensive universality of medical care to all citizens of the province of Manitoba at social rather than individual expense.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, there is not a contingency plan in the sense of a written, drafted, formalized document, but there certainly is a contingency intention in the minds of the government.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there being no contingency plan, can the Minister assure the people of the province that he will do everything possible to encourage alternative delivery systems so that there will be an option available to the people of the province, as distinct from having to rely totally on fee-for-service business medicine. Will he assure the House that he will take all steps to preserve those systems which offer an alternative system?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the debate on community health centres is not completed yet, is not resolved yet. I will assure my honourable friend that I am listening to all sides of the debate. Nothing has been foreclosed. We are not at the present time in this province threatened by collapse of Medicare or the universal accessibility principle, and I reject the suggestion that we are. In overall terms, Mr. Speaker, the number of physicians who've opted out of Medicare in the ten or eleven years that the program has been in place in the province has not altered significantly. It's at 10 percent at the present time, which is not bad in national comparative terms.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that the Minister recognizes without my identification, but by his own identification, that community health services and clinics offer an alternative form of delivery system. And may I ask the Minister whether he does not consider that the existence of such systems and the existence of such clinics are in major part, or at least in substantial part, what has provided the good relationship and the good number of doctors who are opted into the plan at the present time.

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

MR. SHERMAN: , Mr. Speaker, I take the honourable member's suggestion under advisement as part of the total subject area of community health centres, the total subject matter which is being reviewed and which I'm considering.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Membrr for Inkster with a fourth question.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister whether he does not consider it desirable that the freedom of Manitoba is enhanced by having available to citizens of Manitoba options as to the use of various forms of delivery of health services, notably fee-for-service and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that we may getting into a debate rather than a Question Period. Does the Honourable Member for Inkster want to ask another question?

MR. GREEN: I hope that the subject matter that I'm raising is not debatable. Would the Minister agree that it enhances the freedom of Manitobans to have options as to the type of medical service that is available to them?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the general principle that options of opportunity enhance the principle of freedom of the citizens of this or any other jurisdiction. I certainly agree with that

principle. That principle, of course, can not be accepted exclusively in isolation from the overall picture that we have to take into account; whether services are duplicated; whether in fact the people of Manitoba are paying several times over for services already in place. These are the things that have to be measured and I'm sure my honourable friend understands that, but the principle I agree with.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY(Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health and Social Development, in view of the tabling this morning of the report of the Task Force in human needs and restraint, my question to the Minister is that in view of the report's conclusions that service personnel in the Department of Health and Social Development felt intimidated and fearful that if they spoke openly they would lose their jobs, their programs and services would be curtailed or reduced or their agencies or departments would suffer dire consequences, could the Minister advise, could he indicate when he intends to put a halt to this intimidation within his department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, a number of my colleagues and I met with the Task Force team yesterday to receive their report. We will be, and I will be making a detailed response to it. Let me say on superficial assessment that there is much in the report that I agree with and there is much in the report that I disagree with.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister prepared to respond to the question itself insofar as the freedom of personnel within his department to relate to bodies such as this without fear of losing their jobs or being intimidated or their programs being curtailed or cut?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that would be one of those areas with which I totally disagree, one of those suggestions in the report that I reject unconditionally.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker further to the Minister of Health and Social Development, the Task Force statement, one of its conclusions is that the assessment of this government's policies today are that they are going to affect the vulnerable people most, namely, the children and the elderly, northern residents, native people and others among the poor are going to be hardest hit. My question to the Minister is, how many of the 24 specific recommendations within the report does his government within his department under his leadership does he intend to implement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, may I suggest to the honourable members that the Estimates of the Minister of Health are presently before the House, questions of this nature should properly be dealt with in those Estimates. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I could just refer to the point you just raised. Let me point out to you that many of the items which are dealt with within the 24 specific recommendations have already been dealt with in the Minister's Estimates and besides, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe it has any relevancy to the Question Period, the fact that the Minister's department happens presently to be under review. So, Mr. Speaker, I would have to again phrase my question to the Minister as to which of those 24 specific recommendations he intends to take action on?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'll just remind the honourable, the Leader of the Opposition that the item having to do with my salary on my Estimates, which is usually an area of considerable wide-ranging debate, and an item that does not always meet the unbounded enthusiasm of members opposite, provides sufficient leeway for him to discuss questions of that kind. My short answer to him would be that I've already given him my answer; we intend to make, I intend to make a detailed response to the report. Surely, he doesn't expect me to respond to it in Question Period.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, also in the Task Force Report there is reference to the fact that there is a lack of open government and specifically the report refers to the funding community health clinics and the fact that evaluation has been done insofar as the community health clinics, but that evaluation has not been made available to the public, nor has it been indicated to the public as

to who has prepared that evaluation. Is the minister prepared yet to table that evaluation and indicate who were responsible for the preparation of the evaluation.

MR. SHERMAN: I've already advised the honourable, the Leader of the Opposition and members opposite of who those evaluations were done by, Mr. Speaker. They're not satisfied that they were done by the Evaluation and Research personnel within my department, and by personnel within the Manitoba Health Services Commission. I am perfectly prepared to permit them to enjoy their dissatisfaction. That is their right but they cannot say that the membership of those . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I believe the honourable minister had answered the question and any other remarks are just delaying the Question Period.

MR. PAWLEY: The honourable minister did not indicate whether or not that report would be made available to the public, to members of this House, so that we can study the basis upon which the evaluation has been completed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have to rule that question out of order. It's a question that should be asked in Estimates. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to address my question to the Attorney-General. In view of the current negotiations between the Jets and Molson Breweries, can the minister indicate whether any overtures have been made through the government to alter the Liquor Control Act in respect to television advertising?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): No, Mr. Speaker, I understand - - . . . through the media that there will be some submission made to the government with respect to that matter.

MR. FOX: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate whether any discussions have taken place by the government members or the Cabinet regarding the discretionary aspects of the Cabinet on the after 10 p.m. T.V. advertising?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, this matter is not being considered by Cabinet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Cultural Affairs and ask her, in view of repeated reports that the Fort Garry Hotel may be closed and demolished within the next five years, does she have any program by which she could intervene to save this beautiful, historic structure?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. NORMA L. PRICE (Assiniboia): I haven't had anybody approach me with regard to the closing of the Fort Garry, and all I know is what I have read in the newspaper, the same as any other member.

MR. DOERN: In view of the fact that the City of Winnipeg is attempting to take some actions now to head off what has been talked about for a number of years, would the Minister be prepared to meet with representatives of the city or any other interested parties such as the Manitoba Historical Society to attempt to head off this potentially dangerous occurrence?

MRS. PRICE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to meet with anybody at any time.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd also then ask the Minister of Urban Affairs, since the city now has no legal power to stop demolition of any building which is not on its historic building preservation list, and since they are apparently discussing an amendment to the City of Winnipeg Act which may be forwarded during this session of the Legislature, would the Minister consider introducing such an amendment to the House during this session if it comes forward?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, we have a meeting with the city this Friday and no doubt if they are interested they'll raise the matter. They haven't submitted as topic for the agenda yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Three and a half weeks ago, two and a half weeks ago, one and a half weeks ago, in Question Period I asked the Minister to ensure that the Winnipeg Health Centres would receive all the data that his department and agencies had collected on them in their evaluation. The Minister each time assured me that that had been the case. He also undertook however to investigate that that would be done. Is the Minister now in the position to indicate to the House whether he kept his word with respect to that undertaking?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Precisely as much as I was when I gave the honourable member my first answer, Mr. Speaker, that has been done, that information has been made available to them. Further to that, officials of my department have been meeting continually with the leadership of those community health centres.

MR. PARASIUK: A supplementary to the Minister. Subsequent to his recent statement a week and a half ago to that effect, I have a statement here from the Board of Directors of the Health Centre, the Citizens Health Action Committee which indicates that the discussions have been seriously hampered by the reluctance of the Manitoba Health Services Commission to release sufficient information . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please. I believe the member already asked that question. The Honourable Member for Transcona on a point of order.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I am prefacing my question in the light of a statement made by a community board to the effect that they have not received information from the Minister. Could I continue with my question?

MR. SPEAKER: Proceed. The Honourable House Leader on a point of order.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN: I rise on a point of order. My honourable friend knows perfectly well that the Estimates of the Department of Health and Social Development are before the House right now and he has ample opportunity to seek information at that time. There is a limit to the kinds of question that can be asked at this particular time and there's also another opportunity available to my honourable friend and that is by submitting a written question to the Clerk to be placed on the Order Paper as a question for the Ministry which will then subsequently appear on the Order Paper in answered form. Now I would think that questions that require some detailed answers would be more appropriately asked in that fashion and a better chance that the House and you, Mr. Speaker, will permit the question to be answered in that fashion. My honourable friends opposite complain bitterly every time that the Minister takes time to answer a question. It seems to me that what they want to do is to ask the questions but really don't want the answers. They want to create the impression that the answers are not available.

MR. PARASIUK: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The review of health centres will not be for some time because the Minister has asked us to refrain from discussing health centres until the discussions have been finished. Yet at the same time, the questions I am asking of the Minister do not require detailed answers; all they require is truthful answers. And given this statement by the Board of Directors . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JORGENSEN: Point of order. The inference of my honourable friend cannot be allowed to go unchallenged.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I was on a point of order and I was rudely interrupted by the House

Leader, and I would like to continue on my point of order. All I am asking — all I am trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is ascertain the fact as to whether the health centres have been given sufficient information or not. The Minister says one thing, the health centres say something else. I would like the Minister to clarify whether indeed he has released all the information in the light of statements from the health centres themselves that they have not received all the information, and that they feel that government is using secrecy as a smokescreen in these discussions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable House Leader raised a question, I think, with reference to the unparliamentary expression used by the Member for Transcona, the inference with respect to untruthful statements, and I would ask for a ruling from you, Sir, as to the use of that word.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say a word. I believe that the Honourable Member for Transcona simply referred to the answers being truthful, no reference was made as to whether answers up to this date had been truthful or untruthful. But what the member is wanting to do is to pursue a line of questioning relating to questions which were posed a week, two weeks, three weeks ago in this House and surely the proper channel for that is, if the questions earlier were posed during the question period, that the member be permitted to continue to pose those questions as a follow-up to the earlier questions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, because of the tack taken by the Member for Transcona and the inferences and imputations in his remarks, my inclination would be not to dignify his question or his performance here by responding. However, I know if I fail to respond, it would be twisted and distorted by him, as a suggestion that we had not been truthful and direct in our communication to the health centres. I want to repeat, not for his benefit, because he refuses to listen, but for yours, Sir, and the members of the Assembly generally, that we have made available to the community health centres, as I've said before, all the raw data and statistical information that was compiled on the basis of which certain editorial conclusions, which are any investigating party's right, were drawn by the group that evaluated the health centres for us.

The statistical information and raw data is there and has been made available to the community health centres. Further to that, my Associate Deputy Minister and Deputy Minister and the Chairman of the Health Services Commission have been meeting regularly. If one reads the media these days, one will note that the health centres' directors and leaders themselves seem to be quite happy with the consultations that are going on.

MR. PARASIUK: A final supplementary to the Minister. In the light of a statement by the Board of Directors of the health centre, that the health action centre is distinctly . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Member is clearly out of order. Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I am prefacing my question with a statement which is in order, can you tell me how I'm out of order? .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has no Point of Order. Orders of the day. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of Health and Community Services and Corrections. I wonder if the Minister is able to tell the House whether or not a decision has been reached to proceed with the modified proposal for a correctional institute at The Pas? Is he in a position to announce that tenders will be called on that project yet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, but I have conveyed to the mayor and council of The Pas the government's official approval in principle of a new adult correctional institution and a new court

house facility in The Pas, and advised them that the design concept is going through the approval stage with government at the present time, and they will be advised as soon as it's finalized.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could clarify what stages have to be gone through yet before the project will be given approval and tenders called for that project for a second time now.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the design stage has not been completed. A modified design of the existing concept has been proposed, but there is also a strongly-held view that total redesign is desirable, and that has not been accomplished yet.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder then if the Minister could give us some indication, since tenders had been let before for that particular complex — since the Minister promised an answer a number of times by the first of this month, or by the end of last month — I wonder if the Minister could indicate when the government will make the final decision on whether they are going to redesign or whether they are going to proceed or not proceed? By what date will that decision be made this time?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, what I think I assured my honourable friend was that a revised concept would go to government for approval. He knows from his own experiences in government that approval and consensus is not always necessarily forthcoming precisely on schedule. The important thing is that we have assured the mayor and the council, and I reassure the Honourable Member for The Pas, that there will be a new adult correctional institution and a new court house facility in The Pas. It will not be relocated to a different site, and it will be there as quickly as we can complete a design that we can reach consensus on and call tenders.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder then if the Minister could tell us whether the proposal that he promised the Mayor of The Pas — that would be taken to Cabinet today — whether that proposal was, in fact, rejected, and he has to go back to square one again? Or was the proposal just not dealt with today?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, no I can't tell him that, and he would appreciate the reason why. What I can tell him is that there is a difference of opinion as to whether the redesign concept is a rational and practical way to go, or whether a total new design is required, and that debate is not yet concluded.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister responsible for Crown Corporations. Yesterday it was revealed to us that the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation had determined, in its wisdom, that it ought to join the Manitoba Club and the Carlton Club and share the warmth of the companionship there. I wonder if the Minister could advise us —(Interjection)— I wonder if Minister could advise us whether a similar decision has been made by the other Crown Corporations within his portfolio, such as the Manitoba Telephone System, the Manitoba Hydro, and ManFor itself.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for M.P.I.C.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, the decision that was made by the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation's Board to adopt this kind of public relations is one that is made by that Board, and that Board alone. It has not been brought to my attention that any such similar decisions have been made by other boards. Nevertheless, that may very well have been done. But, Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat surprised at the leader of the Opposition apparently taking exception to this, since he was rather anxious that the general insurance portion of M.P.I.C. be competitive, and that they do more in public relations. Surely, Mr. Speaker, he is not now suggesting that this kind of public relations or advertising is not the kind of advertising that he would like.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the Minister then concur and be prepared to consider with the Board of Directors of M.P.I.C. whether the sum of some \$1,100, \$1,200 which has been apparently spent this year in order to join the Manitoba Club, might better be used in public relations insofar as all Manitobans are concerned, not just with the membership of the Manitoba Club?

MR. MCGILL: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition is questioning the judgment of the Board of M.P.I.C. in respect to the way in which they will achieve a competitive situation in the general insurance field. That's his prerogative.

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister in charge of the Housing Corporation whether or not there has been any finalization of the land transaction at East Selkirk — the land that was bought for land banking purposes three or four years ago — a year ago he took that under advisement and indicated he would respond whenever there was finalization of that particular purchase.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is quite correct. It has been a year since he asked me that question, and we haven't finalized it yet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. USKIW: Yes, could the Minister indicate to us what the problem is, why they were not able to conclude a purchase agreement?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I didn't catch his last sentence — conclude what?

MR. USKIW: A purchase agreement — why the Minister was not able to complete the purchase. What is holding up the purchase?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I don't follow the honourable member in this respect. He says "what is holding up the purchase?" We have been decrying it was expropriated, and we're trying to negotiate it bak to the previous owner, and that hasn't been done, as yet, and it hasn't been finalized.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, his voice didn't carry across the way here. Would he repeat the last statement? Did he say that they were trying to negotiate it back to the original owner?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we have been trying to negotiate for a year with the people that had the land expropriated by the previous government. We have not any use for that land, and we have offered to negotiate it back to the original owner. If we can't reach an agreement with him, or he doesn't want it, we will then probably put it up for tender and sell it.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would now like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he can indicate to us just what the procedures are with respect to the collection of funds under the buy-up program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, seeing as I am now in my Estimates, I think it would be appropriate to discuss them at that particular time.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the rules provide that the Minister can refer back to Estimates every time a question is put to him. Question Period is for the purposes of seeking information. If the Minister knows what the procedures are, I would appreciate an answer.

MR. DOWNEY: As I said, Mr. Speaker, I'm quite prepared to answer that in the Estimates. We are continuing with the contract, as close as we have been able to, as it was drawn by the last administration.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, is it correct that the Minister is in the process of issuing bills to some

4,000 contract holders?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, again we will discuss that in more detail. The billing will take place over the next few months for the moneys that are owed to the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Two years down the road perhaps.

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

MR. USKIW: Would the Minister indicate when the bills will be sent out, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOWNEY: Soon, Mr. Speaker. But while I'm on my feet I would like to just respond to a question put forward by the Member for Ste. Rose in regard to the closing of the Glenella Creamery. Mr. Speaker, the butter maker at the Glenella Creamery, I have been informed, has been on a conditional license over the past year, and the creamery is not closed down totally. The people who own it are able to bring in another butter maker who is licensable or whether in fact this gentleman were to change some of the practices, I'm sure would be allowed to continue on. In addition, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the producers of that area will still be able to continue to deliver their cream to that same creamery, so that service is still being provided.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister responsible for Economic Development. The other day the Minister referred to various grants being given under the new joint Federal-provincial program and certain jobs being created. Can the Minister advise whether it is the policy to give these funds to companies that are in a marginal category, that is to companies or business people who require this because of the submarginal or marginal nature of the business?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it is not a grant, it's a forgivable loan. The moneys will not be paid out all at once, and they will have the loan forgiven when they are in business and operating and carrying out the contract with us as so stated within the contracts. The Honourable members on the other side can laugh if they please, but they really don't believe in trying to help the rural area of Manitoba, and it's understandable. Mr. Speaker, the loan that the honourable member refers to is 50 percent up to \$30,000 for a new manufacturing business. It's 50 percent up to \$18,000 for expansion of a manufacturing business in the rural area, and it must be loaned to a company that does not have sales exceeding \$500,000 a year. Now, if they qualify, and if they present to us something that will help the economy of the area and create jobs and make things generally better in Manitoba, we do not really take a look at it from the point of view of who they are. We don't take a look at it politically. We don't take a look at it any other way other than they qualify and they're doing a benefit to the province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister confirm that in a speaking engagement outside the House this morning, he indicated that an announcement regarding the minimum wage should be forthcoming from him within two weeks, and can he indicate what changes to the minimum wage can be expected in that announcement?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I answered the member, I think, for Kildonan, a couple of days ago that very shortly there would be an answer to this particular question. I said the same thing at noon today at the university. Shortly is in the terms of two weeks. I don't know what shortly is in the terms of the members opposite, but two weeks is a short period of time.

MR. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister of Labour prepared to meet with school

officials, interested parents and local residents in the Weston School area for the purpose of setting up a comprehensive lead in blood testing program on a community basis in areas contaminated by emissions from lead-using industries, rather than on a school-by-school basis?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, it's brought to my attention that the previous study, the one that was taken in 1976, took approximately a year to put in place. I'd like to suggest to the members opposite and to the members of this House that in no way is it going to take us a year to put something together. Senior officials within four departments of government are presently establishing a program. We will then be meeting with the elected officials in those particular school areas. We will be then meeting with the principals and the teachers. We will then be meeting with parents. We'll be explaining to them what the real problem is. I'm not sure how we'll explain to them that the study was taken in '76, which showed that there was some need for concern, but no concern was shown by the previous administration. The only answer, I suppose, is the position taken by the members opposite and expounded by the Member for Churchill, that there were really only six or seven or eight people that were over. Those were the only ones that we should be concerned with, so I guess the position of the NDP was that they shouldn't be concerned. And that's the way they have dealt with the particular problem, Mr. Speaker. We are concerned, and if we find a particular problem, we are concerned enough that we'll talk to the parents, and I think it's a damn shame that the previous administration didn't choose to talk to the parents of these particular children.

MR. COWAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like the opportunity to enter into the debate with the Minister on this subject. I would like equal time for a speech. I would just ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, because I don't need to embellish my questions with a bunch of rhetoric, it's not necessary. I'd ask the Minister if he can confirm that the most recent evidence coming out of most medical and scientific communities throughout the world indicate that within the past year and a half to two years there has been a substantial review of the literature and the research revolving around high lead levels in children and that that review has shown that what was considered safe in 1976 can no longer be considered safe, and that it is incumbent upon his government to act in the interest, in the best interest of the parents and the students and the workers in the work force and to base their decisions on the basis of the most recent scientific documentation and literature. Can the Minister confirm that he has used the figures of 40 micrograms of lead in 100 grams of whole blood as a danger level for children?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I know my honourable friend is a slow learner, but I draw to your attention a citation dealing with questions, citation 357, or 359, I'm sorry, Sir, subsection (2) which says, "The question must be brief, a preamble need not exceed one carefully drawn sentence." A long preamble on a question takes an unfair share of time and provokes the same sort of reply. A supplementary question should need no preamble. I insist, Sir, that that particular rule be applied.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan. -.

MR. FOX: I would like to concur in part of what the Honourable House Leader says. But I would also to indicate that parliamentary procedure declares that we all treat each other as honourable gentlemen and the inferences that the Honourable House Leader made was unparliamentary and should be retracted in respect to the mentality of the Honourable Member for Churchill and I ask you to rule on that.

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask the Honourable House Leader, I don't remember the exact words
...

MR. FOX: I hate to repeat them but they are "slow learners" and I think he should know better than that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend can show me in Hansard where that is one of the terms that are unparliamentary, I'll be happy to withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: I thought he was a parliamentarian so therefore I won't even ask why he's hedging, I won't even ask him to withdraw. I just declare that he doesn't know the parliamentary rules.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. While I realize the time for questions has expired, because some of the answers have been fairly lengthy I did allow the Honourable Member for Churchill a fair degree of latitude. I would now allow the Member for Churchill to ask one short question.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the degree of latitude and I'm sure if the House Leader on the government's side looks in the Hansard . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, will you call Bill No. 18, Mr. Speaker.

GOVERNMENT BILLS — SECOND READINGS

BILL NO. 18, AN ACT TO AMEND THE NATURAL PRODUCTS MARKETING ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 18, An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY presented Bill No. 18, An Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DONEY: r. Speaker, Bill No. 18, amendments to The Natural Products Marketing Act. One of the amendments being the change in name from the Manitoba Marketing Board. The name change is to the Manitoba Natural Products Marketing Council. This, Mr. Speaker, is to prevent some of the confusion that has been in the farm community over the past few years with the duplication of the word, "Board", being a part of the Producer Board and the Manitoba Appeal Board.

One of the other amendments, Mr. Speaker, allows what is now the Manitoba Marketing Board and is giving it the power to make a decision on an appeal heard by the Board. The Act presently allows the appeal to be taken to the Board but no decisions are able to be made by the Board at this time.

One of the other amendments, Mr. Speaker, is one that has been requested by the Producer Boards — that is to provide the power to implement production controls for layer poulets or laying hens only. There is no intention to provide power to determine the conditions of production but only to determine the amount that may be produced. Control of the number of laying hens a producer may keep gives the Egg Board control of the production of eggs as required by the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency. Mr. Speaker, we're the only province in Canada that had to have double production controls on it and we now are only on the one control system.

One of the other amendments, Mr. Speaker, is to allow the Producer Boards to control their quality and quantity of the regulated products and to impose penalties on the producers for over-production or for the production and marketing of contaminated products for allowing them to control their quality in their production of goods.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask for support by the members of the Legislative Assembly to allow these amendments to go forward.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

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

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 20 — THE PERSONAL INVESTIGATIONS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris) presented Bill No. 20, The Personal Investigations Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, honourable members will recall that in the latter part of the last session of the Legislature my colleague, the Minister of Crown Corporations, tabled a report dealing with the new Personal Investigations Act. In doing so, he made a statement outlining the purpose of the proposals in some of the areas in which it differs from the existing Act. And I want to draw to honourable members' attention that the proposals that are now being placed before the House are amendments to the original Act that was passed in this House in 1971.

The proposal was made available to any person upon request and suggestions and criticisms were invited. However it was suggested that these proposals be submitted by November, 1978 in order that a Bill may be prepared for introduction during the course of this session. Six business associations, two health associations, two personnel associations and one employee association submitted briefs and comments. Six companies and one private citizen also made submissions.

In many of the briefs objection was taken to the fact that some of the exemptions now provided in Section 2 of the existing Act have been removed. Other provisions in the proposal were also criticised. These were the provisions that required the disclosure of the source of investigative information, that is relating to opinion and life style comments, and the requirement that the supplier of a benefit must inform the applicant that the manner in which he handles his obligations in a transaction may be reported to others.

Members will find a new provision in this Bill that did not exist in the previous proposal. And that is a section that prohibits the supplier of a benefit from requiring an applicant for a benefit to submit to a lie detector test or to subject the applicant to a personal surveyance without the knowledge of the applicant.

Mr. Speaker, not all the recommendations for change have been accepted but they have been gratefully received and considered very carefully.

The tablings of a proposal for review purposes in this case has proven to be highly beneficial. In the course of the discussions several ambiguities and indeed actual errors have been pointed out. And, Sir, the proposal that is now before the House is a compendium of those suggestions that have been made along with many provisions of the original Act plus the input of the Uniform Law Conference, which is attempting to provide uniform legislation of this type across Canada. I would like to commend this Act to the House.

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

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 24 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE MUNICIPAL ACT

MR. MERCIER presented Bill No. 24, An Act to amend The Municipal Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I've provided the Member for Lac du Bonnet, the Municipal Affairs critic with a detailed explanation of the Bill, and perhaps I can just highlight a few sections of the Bill that involve some changes in principle.

Section 6 of the Bill — at present The Municipal Act does not provide the boundaries and area of any municipality.

MR. USKIW: Just on a point of order.

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

MR. USKIW: As I understand the rules, the minister is not able to deal with it in section form, he has to deal with it in general, so for whatever it's worth to the Honourable Minister, he was going to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the Bill deals with a number of matters that have been raised through municipal organizations or through resolutions from individual municipalities. I think one of the changes in principle contained in Section 2 of the Bill with respect to the boundaries of Indian reserves, which will exclude Indian reserves from municipalities and local government districts, is a significant change. Reserves have not been specifically excluded from boundaries of municipalities or local government districts in the past, therefore, residents of reserves have claimed all privileges from the municipalities — the right to vote in municipal elections, but at the same time, because they are considered to be under federal jurisdiction, they claim not to be subject to the control or the enforcement of municipal by-laws. Since the municipalities have no rights or jurisdiction on reserves this situation required clarification and the section of this Bill will do that.

The balance of the Bill deals in the main with expansions or clarifications of authority for municipalities with respect to off-street parking, levies for fire protection, levies for hospital grants and for areas of authority prohibiting certain activities.

Mr. Speaker, I have as I've said provided the Member for Lac du Bonnet with a copy of the detailed explanation and the details can be discussed in Committee.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL NO. 25 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE HUMAN TISSUE ACT

MR. MERCIER presented Bill No. 25, An Act to amend The Human Tissue Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the amendment to The Human Tissue Act permits the removal of the pituitary gland in the post-mortem examination of a body for use in the treatment of persons having a growth hormone deficiency. The information received by myself and supported by the Minister of Health and Community Services is that if the pituitary glands are badly deficient, there's a requirement for from four to five times the number of hormones presently available. Similar legislation was passed last fall in the province of Ontario.

Where the family of the deceased objects, Mr. Speaker, there's a section which forbids the removal of the gland. Further, where the doctor or pathologist has reason to believe that the deceased if living would have objected to the removal of the pituitary gland, removal of the gland is forbidden.

As a matter of interest, Mr. Speaker, I might point out that Dr. Friesen, the professor and head of the Department of Physiology of the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Manitoba receives virtually all glands collected under similar programs for processing across Canada, Mr. Speaker,

and I would request serious consideration of this Bill by members opposite and any detailed discussion, of course, would be in Committee.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: I wonder if the Minister would answer a question on this Bill, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the minister who it was or which organizations or persons were pressing the minister for the passage of this amendment?

MR. MERCIER: Dr. W. L. Parker, Chief Medical Examiner of the Province of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, has been consulted last fall. I might say at one point when I took the initiative and raised the subject with staff, there was an indication that the existing authority in The Fatality Inquiries Act on which pituitary glands have been removed in the past was sufficient authority. Subsequently, it was determined by Dr. Parker, that because of the publicity given to the legislation in Ontario, that a broader authority was required and Dr. Parker has therefore recommended to me the passage of this Bill.

MR. WALDING: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates on Second Reading — Bill No. 6, an Act to amend The Condominium Act. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: May we have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker? (Agreed)

BILL NO. 7 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE JURY ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a few general comments on this particular bill. I believe that it is correct to say, I think the Attorney-General confirmed this the other day, that the basis of payment for jurors is now \$18 per day, and I assume that that includes each time that a juror is called into the court, that they are paid that particular amount of money. My concern here, Mr. Speaker, is an old one, and that namely is the adequacy of that particular payment because I think there's quite a wide range of experience for people who serve on juries.

For example, there are I suppose, people who are at home, who are not employed outside of their homes — housewives, I suppose people who are, in fact, technically unemployed who are unable to find work for some purpose, and senior citizens, etc. — people who, I suppose, the reimbursement of \$18.00 a day is pocket money that is of some value in addition to the privilege and interesting experience, if it so be, of serving on a jury.

But other people are more fortunate and they have agreements, which I guess in some cases are Union agreements — in other cases coany agreements — whereby they are reimbursed for their standard day's wages, so that there is no loss or suffering as a result of being called for this civic duty. And still others are more fortunate indeed, namely, they are paid their entire normal wage during the time that they are called for jury duty, and receive in addition the \$18.00 a day payment from the Crown.

So you get a wide range of citizens serving, some of whom it's a few dollars or maybe a tiny windfall — others who I think can incur some serious loss of wages; if a person does not have an agreement, either through their union or through their company, so that they may be losing money from their job. And if a man is earning, say, \$50 a day and he has to suffer a \$32 a day loss to serve on the jury, then I think this is of some serious consequence. And I wanted to really ask the Minister if he has a solution for that problem? If the solution for the problem is to increase the payment to take up that discrepancy in normal wages because the minimum wage alone in Manitoba would call for approximately \$24 a day, so we assume that most people are earning considerably more than that.

So I wanted to ask the Minister that, whether he was giving consideration to two things: One is increasing that \$18 a day payment; and secondly, what solution he offers for the person who would take a financial beating by being called in to serve on the jury? And I would ask him in that regard, whether the sections in the present Jury Act, and any amendments which refer to the exemption, a person could apply for an exemption on the grounds that it may cause serious hardship,

whether one could come and plead that because of a loss of pay — \$10, \$20, \$30, \$40, \$50 a day or whatever — that they could then be eligible for exemption on those particular grounds?

I would also refer back to Section 4 in the proposed Bill, and ask him why they are repealing this particular section — it may be covered elsewhere, but previously anyone would be excluded from serving who had been summoned and served in the previous two years, and is there now going to be any change in that regard, or is this just a case of duplication and tidying up the Act, because that provision, of course, seems to make sense.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as a layman, I just wondered if the Minister could make a passing comment on the traditional right of the Crown and the defendant's lawyers to challenge without cause. I've been speaking to some people recently who have been asked to serve on the jury, and it just strikes me as peculiar that a person can be asked to rise, and on the basis of their appearance, accepted or rejected. I was just wondering what the historic logic there was. I can see that lawyers of the Crown may have certain things in mind as to who they want on a jury; I assume some of that might become evident in a process of questioning or cross-examination, but I find it peculiar, and I know people who serve on juries find it peculiar that they are asked to stand and that they are simply struck off on the basis of their appearance.

So with those few questions and comments, Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to allow this Bill to go forward.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Attorney-General will be closing debate. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Yes, just on that last point that my colleague, the Honourable Member for Elmwood raises the question of jurors, being stood down — it's considered a process of standing down jurors who are unacceptable. This brought to mind, Mr. Speaker, an area of concern I've had for some time, and I hadn't thought about it until he raised it in the course of the debate on this particular Bill, and this is the question of whether or not the Attorney-General has considered the possibility of introducing interrogation — questioning of jurors along the American style. The rationale behind the simple acceptance or exclusion of jurors in our Courts is that you're not entitled to go through the process of an examination or interrogation of individual jurors. You're not allowed to find out whether they have any predisposition; whether they have any committed position respecting the case at Bar. So as a result, what lawyers do, and I don't have any extensive practice in the Criminal Courts, but this is what I remember from law school and I've seen my colleagues do, they do research prior to the case in order to establish who the various juror applicants are; and then having researched their backgrounds, they make decisions relative to prejudice, possible prejudice or predisposition of jurors on the basis simply of their histories and their circumstances and their areas of interest.

So, in my opinion, that is a very unsatisfactory state of affairs when compared to the American system, which allows considerable latitude relative to examination of jurors by defence counsel. In those circumstances, jurors can simply be asked whether they have any predisposition, whether they have made up their mind, as a result of media exposure, in the case at Bar, and in so doing it simplifies the processes of the Court considerably.

So my question to the Attorney-General in this respect would be whether or not he has considered the implementation of the American system, and the enactment of legislation with respect to The Jurors Act that would enable that system to be utilized in our court processes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General will be closing debate. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Member for Elmwood and the Member for Wellington for their comments on this particular Bill.

I would inform the Member for Elmwood that I am in the process of reviewing the remuneration paid to jurors. He will recall that, at the last session of the Legislature, The Jury Act was amended to allow a change in remuneration by regulation rather than by legislation, and I am in the process of reviewing that area now.

I think what I would also indicate to the members, Mr. Speaker, that I will bring to the Law Amendments Committee, when we meet with respect to this matter, a recent publication of the department that goes out to prospective jurors when they are summoned to appear, which is a bit of an effort to explain to prospective jurors what they will get involved in as jurors. I will also undertake, Mr. Speaker, to review the comments of the Member for Elmwood and the Member for Wellington, and be in a position to discuss the matters raised by them, at Law Amendments

Committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 13 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this for my colleague from Ste. Rose.

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

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I advise the members of the Assembly that we have reviewed Bill No. 13, and we find that it's more or less a housekeeping bill, tidying up The Highway Traffic Act. There have been some questions, however, raised by some of our caucus members, in particular the section that would decrease the safety of treadwear — the allowable treadwear from 1.6 millimetres to .8 millimetres on mopeds and motorcycles. The question has been raised as to why we should be moving away from more safety practices? I expect that these questions may be raised in Law Amendments Committee.

The rest of the bill is more or less for clarification purposes, and adding to the antique vehicles, trucks and motorcycles — I'm not sure whether we shouldn't include antique tractors or not, in this category as well while we're amending this section — but we have no objection at this particular time to allow it to go to Committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I perhaps could ask leave of the House to withdraw Bill No. 16? By way of explanation, I would advise members of the Legislature that it would be our intention to proceed with the funding of Special Surveys through the Estimates of the department, and not through the establishment of a special fund, in the manner proposed by the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we on this side have no objection to withdrawal of that bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Is there unanimous consent to withdraw Bill No. 16? (Agreed.)
The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, it is my intention now to deal with that particular item in the Rules Committee that was raised the other day, so I would like to move, seconded by the Minister of Health, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House Resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the First Report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House received on March 22, 1979.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson): We are continuing debate on the report of the Rules Committee. The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, when we last dealt with the report of the Rules Committee, there were some questions raised with respect to Section 2 of the report, and in consultation with honourable gentlemen opposite, we decided that there would be some changes to be made.

I am now proposing to submit for the approval of the House, those changes which have been recommended, and I will read the motion. The Clerk will be distributing copies of the motion, so that honourable gentlemen will all have a copy of it.

The question that was raised was one regarding whether or not it would be advisable to have a rule that concluded a debate on a matter of urgent and public importance, and I think that there

is a general consensus amongst honourable members that that would not be advisable. In any case, the number of times that this would occur would be so rare as to make the motion pointless, and, secondly, since debate on a Motion of Urgency is limited to 10 minutes per member, it would appear highly unlikely that it would spill over into the next day, in any case.

The third point that was raised, which I think is a valid one, is that when the House starts considering a debate on an urgency motion, it does so with the concurrence of the House, and it would seem that if the House had concurrence, they would want to conclude that debate.

So we are going to remove the mandatory provision that concludes debate during the night, and it is one of those matters that can be taken up the next day if the House so desires. So with that explanation, Sir, I will read the motion: I move that the proposed Subrule 21(3) of the Rules of the House, as proposed in the First Report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House, be amended by adding thereto, immediately after the word "paper" in the first line thereof, the words and figures "or a discussion on a matter of urgent public importance, authorized under a motion made under Subrule 27(1)."

Now, Sir, having adopted that amendment to the Rule, it would then read like this: "Where business, other than a Motion on the Order Paper, or a discussion on a matter of urgent public importance, authorized under a motion made under Subrule 27(1) is under consideration when the House adjourns for the day that business is terminated when the House adjourns for the day and shall not be continued at any next or any subsequent sitting of the House". What that does is ensure that other matters on the Order Paper are discontinued at the end of the day, but a motion under subrule 27(1) is not. That continues on.

If my honourable friends are agreeable to have that motion adopted, then I will proceed to the next one but perhaps my honourable friend would like to make a comment.

MR. FOX: Well, just briefly, Mr. Chairman, having had some discussion on this matter with the Honourable House Leader and our own House Leader, I concur with his remarks, that in respect to the question of the Rule 27, on an emergency debate, it puts it into a totally different realm than the motion to go into Supply where a grievance procedure or sometimes other matters may come up. And so therefore I concur in the amendment as will be proposed by the Honourable House Leader. It does clarify the situation, and puts it at the will of the House whether we debate an emergency situation or problem at the particular time; /; and if there's consensus it wouldn't be correct to have the rule saying that you can have consensus and yet you terminate it at the instigation of the rule. So I concur with him that an amendment is necessary.

QUESTION put on the Amendment, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSON: The second motion, Sir, is, and I move:

THAT the proposed subrule 21(4) of the Rules of the House as proposed in the first report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House be amended by striking out the words and figures on a motion made under subrule 27(1) or any debate on a grievance raised in the first and second lines thereof.

The amended motion would then read:

21(4) Any debate on a motion to go into Committee of Supply or Committee of Ways and Means is terminated when the House adjourns on the day of the debate and shall not be continued or resumed in the next or any subsequent sitting of the House.

that simply says, Sir, is that when a grievance motion has been moved at the end of the day, even if the debate has not been concluded, or if all members that wish to speak have not spoken, the debate will conclude at the end of that day. And if that is agreeable, well then, we'll have that accepted as well.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

The Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Attorney-General, the report of the Standing Committee on the Rules of the House as amended in Committee of the Whole on April 4th, 1979, be concurred in.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before we go into Committee of Supply I would like to move one change on the committee. That would be the name of Mr. Wilson for the name of Mr. Sherman on Law Amendments. Wilson for Sherman.

MR. SPEAKER: You've heard the motion by the Honourable Member for Gladstone. Is that agreed? (Agreed)

The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

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

SUPPLY — HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson): I would like to draw the Honourable Members attention to Page 49 of the Main Estimates, Health and Community Services. We are on Clause 3 — Social Services and Community Health, item (q), Employment Services, (1) Salaries— pass. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL A. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Minister could advise whether there's been an underexpenditure in the amount voted last year, and where those underexpenditures are.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the underexpenditure is approximately \$300,000.00. While I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for St. Johns asked me the other night when we were considering the appropriation for dental services, which is 2.(j) — 3.(j), I'm sorry. Whether I would table the documentation or correspondence — it's in the form of correspondence — existing between my office and the Manitoba Dental Association with respect to the participation of the Dental Association in the Children's Dental Health Program and the methods by which we wanted to proceed in terms of reporting, from the point of view of utilization of the program in those school divisions where the MDA has taken over administration from the government, and the methods being considered for the evaluation process. I told him at that time that I would be prepared to do so, subject to the one caveat that there might have been another understanding, and I wanted to check that point. I've checked it and there's no difficulty in tabling it, in tabling the information, Mr. Chairman, so I'd like to do that now.

That documentation consists of two documents. One is a letter dated the 5th of October, 1978, from the past president of the Manitoba Dental Association, Dr. Ben Goldberg, addressed to me, the Honourable L. R. Sherman. The other is a letter dated March 22nd, 1979, addressed to the current president of the Manitoba Dental Association, Dr. W. W. Shorthill, from me, the Honourable L. R. Sherman. Those two represent the documentation as it exists up to the present time, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for tabling this correspondence. I gather then

there is no agreement per se or no memorandum of understanding with regard to the payments, the fees paid, or the method of payment. Is there anything beyond these two exchanges of letters?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, in addition to tabling what I've tabled, I can send copies of those over to the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. In fact, those questions are addressed in these letters, in this correspondence, so if I might, if one of the pages would take an extra copy of each over to the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, please? Thank you.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I guess we go back to (q). That's the one we're on. Work Activity projects — the Minister says that \$300,000 has been underspent, which means that there has been a decrease in the operations of the work activity projects to date. Am I correct? I'm not thinking in terms of the coming year, but in the last year. In other words, have programs been discontinued entirely, one of the programs, or has there been a thinning out of the number of enrollees, allowing the number of enrollees to drop, as others graduated from the program? Is that the reason for the decrease?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, probably the best way of answering that question is to advise the honourable member that the amount underspent in 1977-78, the previous year, was \$268,000, which was very close to being the underspent equivalent for '78-79. The votes were virtually the same for the two years, voted amounts for '77-78 and '78-79.

MR. MILLER: In other words, there has been really no decrease in the program, or no cutting down on the program during the 1978-79 year.

MR. SHERMAN: That's correct, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member will recall that the Amaranth Work Activity project was shifted in its base to Portage la Prairie. It was a matter of transferring the site of the program that's all.

MR. MILLER: All right, Mr. Chairman. What you're dealing with then is the coming year, '79-80, where it's indicated a substantial decrease is projected in the work activity projects. Last year, a total of \$3.5 million, this year \$2.2 million, which indicates that there's going to be a decrease in the programming, whether it's the elimination of one of the programs, and the Minister can advise me of that, or is this simply a decrease generally across the board in the five different — I think it's five different programs that now are operating.

MR. SHERMAN: It's a little bit of both, Mr. Chairman, but essentially a decrease generally across the board. What is scheduled to happen is that one of the projects which is the Pioneer Restaurant Services at 185 Smith Street is being transferred over to Manitoba Housing and Renewal and will no longer be a part of the employment services component of the Department of Health and Community Services. That leaves us looking essentially at four, with two satellite programs. Those four are the MANWOP component — that's the Northern work activity projects. Amaranth, which has been transferred to Portage and is now known as Central, West-Bran, which is located in Brandon; and the Winnipeg Work Activity projects, WHIP, essentially the Winnipeg Home Improvement project; and Dauphin. That's five — excuse me, Mr. Chairman: Brandon, , Central, Winnipeg, and Dauphin. Now, there were two satellite projects that operated in conjunction with the Dauphin program. They were at Pelican Rapids and Barrows. They are being phased out and what will remain after the Pioneer Restaurant operation goes over to MHRC is, Winnipeg; West-Bran; Dauphin and Portage la Prairie, which is central. Those four will remain in operation but at reduced levels.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: I was trying to keep up with this. West-Bran will remain; the WHIP program in Winnipeg will remain; Dauphin will remain; and what was the fourth one?

MR. SHERMAN: The fourth one is Central, at Portage, which the member might know as Amaranth.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, with regard to the Pioneer program which functions at 185 Smith Street, which is an MHRC facility, if the MHRC is taking it over, can they operate it as a Work Activity project? Can they operate it as a training facility? Will they get cost-sharing from the Federal

Government as a Work Activity project?

MR. SHERMAN: I'm not sure that I can answer that question, Mr. Chairman. I think that question was put by the honourable member to the Honourable the Minister responsible for Housing, or some member on the opposite side to the Minister of Housing during a recent Question Period, but I'm not sure of the answer. I'll have to obtain that from the Minister of Housing,

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would be very surprised if in fact the funding under the Work Activity projects would continue from Ottawa. They might conceivably keep that restaurant open as part of the overhead cost of 185 Smith Street and MHRC might try to get funding as part of the administrative cost of operating the facility, but I question that. In any case, the training components would certainly be gone and the loss in that regard is what bothers me.

Mr. Chairman, the Annual Report of the department, in talking about the Work Activity projects, speaks very highly of the programs that have been in existence. They say that work activities, although not primarily intended to create continued employment, have activated spin-off operations — and they name a few places where their spin-off operations are now successfully operating — in Camperville; in Crane River; in Duck Bay; and with regard to the clients themselves — in the 12-month period in 1978 from January to December 31st — the project provided services to 735 individuals. Now these are people who need, and what I would consider a sheltered work shop experience. These are people who are misfits in our society for whatever reason; whether cultural or social or emotional; they have problems. And these programs, the Work Activity projects, which were launched a few years ago, became a model across Canada because people were brought in to — what I consider, what I might call — a sheltered situation and were stimulated to improve their work habits and develop work habits that were non-existent.

Last year, for example, the 12-month period of the 735 individuals involved, of the 520 that were left in the program, 224 were placed in employment or were able to successfully enroll in training programs at community colleges. Which means about a 44 or 43 percent success ratio, which is exceedingly high, Mr. Chairman. This has been the pattern over the years. We have been able to take people who were, as I say, misfits, who could not fit into normal training; who could not hold a job; who simply couldn't make their way through the private sector or through any other sector, and by putting him into this kind of situation, we were able to achieve very very good results. I consider a 44 percent rate as a very high result with this type of client.

They go on to say that a substantial number of the remainder, that is, those who didn't go on to employment or to community college, a substantial number was referred to other resources for treatment or for personal development. So there was an ongoing working with these people to try to get them into the mainstream so they could become active and participating members in society.

Many of them, after the program, were able to write the grade equivalency determination tests which upgraded their educational standards to Grade 12, which is an important step in the development for these people.

Now last year when we were talking about this, at that time there was a very strong possibility, and it looked like a probability that in fact, federal cost-sharing in the social service field would be altered and changed, and that the Work Activity projects might be affected by this change in funding. Well, we now know that that is not the case, certainly not for this year. What will happen in the future, I don't know.

So I am wondering really why it is that the government, or why the Minister chose to discontinue a program which is targetted to reach a difficult group of people. By difficult, I mean that they cannot be reached in a normal way, through the normal training programs, the regular schooling programs, whether it be through adult education, or Manpower training programs; they just didn't fit in. And I am wondering why it is that this government decided to again pick on a group in our society which is the most vulnerable and which I don't doubt will not be able to fight back on this, because they have no muscle whatsoever, but that have been over the last number of years helped considerably in a sheltered work shop situation.

As a result many have moved on into regular employment and others, although they may not have moved on, at least feel that they are contributing and are in a sense, contributing, because the projects through the various activities, have produced revenues of the last twelve months in the amount of about \$270,000.00. So that obviously they are doing something fruitful, whether it be at the saw mill; or the upholstery shop; or the food service centre; they are doing something which is important to the clients, to the participants, and I can tell you that the Pioneer program at 185 Smith Street was important both for the residents of 185 Smith Street and equally as important, and perhaps more important, for those girls or men who were taken into the program and learned very simple rudimentary things like how to serve people in a restaurant, and many

did in fact go on and get jobs as a result of that.

So I am wondering why the government would choose, in its desire to retrench and cut back, picked on this group of people who are at least able to defend themselves, and yet who need as much and perhaps more concern and protection than most people in our society.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, first with respect to the question that the honourable member asked me about Pioneer Restaurant, or Pioneer Services, I am advised that there will be under the change that's taking place by having Pioneer go under the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, there is no eligibility for cost-sharing as there is when it is a specifically classified Work Activity project, but that the restaurant itself is virtually self-supporting now so that cost-sharing was limited, indeed minimal anyway, because the cost-sharing arrangement is based on net costs. The restaurant had reached a position of being virtually self-supporting and is expected to become fully self-supporting in the very near future. There will, however, continue to be work experience exposure available to those persons trained and employed there. There is a tie-in with Canada Manpower so that that exposure will be available to those clients.

In regard to the general program, I must point out, Mr. Chairman, that references of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks to the sheltered work shop concept, really strike right at the heart of this problem; come right to the nub of the question. The fact of the matter is that we have found that with respect to many of these Work Activity projects, they were taking on the cast of a sheltered work shop, which disqualifies them for federal cost-sharing. They are not supposed to be sheltered work shops; they are supposed to be training programs that produce personnel to go into meaningful work and employment opportunities in the community.

If they become sheltered work shops and if people continue to stay on there and stay on interminably, then they fall out of the qualification category for federal cost-sharing and that's one of the paramount considerations that entered into the government's decision.

That was one of the conditions and situations that had developed and had become very apparent with respect to a number of these programs. The key criteria as far as the success of a work activities project is concerned is participant turnover. The objective is to get people in, get them trained and related to a meaningful employment opportunity, and get them out and into that opportunity. If you don't have continual and high participant turnover, then the whole objective of the program and the concept is defeated and the eligibility for cost-sharing is threatened.

We have experienced a less than satisfactory participant turnover with respect to a number of these programs, and it was deemed advisable for the sake of strengthening those basic principles on which work activity projects are founded, to rationalize and tighten this particular program in a manner that's being proposed for this year.

It involves a reduction in funding and a reduction in the number of clients who will be processed through the program, and a reduction in the number of staff. But I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is justified in a period of economic restraint and tight fiscal management and it is justified on the track record of the projects themselves. I know that the Annual Report, as the Member for Seven Oaks has pointed out, refers to a placement percentage, a placement record, of 43 percent. I can only say, Mr. Chairman, that in permanent terms, in truly meaningful terms, that figure is incorrect. We have done a very careful examination that was part of the Estimates process in the latter part of calendar 1978 and early 1979 because of our determination to answer some questions about the Work Activities Project Program, and our discovery was that the success rate is only about 28 percent, 28 percent of persons who are placed meaningfully in employment. That means somebody who is there and is able to stay there, not somebody who is simply placed and then two weeks later is out of work, the more accurate figure is 28 percent, not 43 percent. That works out to a fairly high cost in terms of successful placement, Mr. Chairman, and we don't feel, with all the other demands on the revenues of the people of Manitoba in the Health and Community Services field, that that expenditure could be justified at that level.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying that the federal government advised him that they are no longer, or will no longer be willing to cost-share the programs as they existed in 1978 and in 1977? Is that what he's saying, that he received word from the federal government that they were not prepared to share?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: I received no such word that I know of, Mr. Chairman, but I'm not prepared to say that my officials didn't receive such word. I don't know that we received any such word. I was advised by my department officials as we were working our way through this particular subject that we had moved beyond the parameters of federal cost-sharing for work activity projects.

MR. MILLER: You know, Mr. Chairman, again this government is using terms like "tight fiscal management" and "hard-headed management" and again, who are they picking on? They're picking on an element in our society which is at the very bottom of the ladder as low as they can go. They're at the end of the line or they never got started. Of the 735 that were in the program in 1978, early in 1978, 215 remained at the end of the year. So, as I indicated before, some graduated — went into employment; others went off to enrol in training programs at community colleges. And he tells me that my figure of 43 percent is not correct, that it's only 28 percent that were successfully placed — that is, they were placed in jobs as a result of their training, and they stayed on the job.

I don't know whether that includes those who were also placed at community colleges through Manpower programs. But whether it's 28 percent dealing only with job placement and not the community colleges doesn't matter. Even 28 percent, Mr. Chairman — I'm suggesting to you that that 28 percent, is the only way they can ever get back into the mainstream. Otherwise, they're doomed to live on welfare forever or end up in a correctional institution.

And this is a cost-shared program. This is a program where 50 percent of the money comes from Ottawa, and I'm suggesting to the Minister that this is an important tool which was developed to reach a segment of our society which cannot fit into the standard placement procedures or the standard training procedures. Their education is very very low. Many of them haven't even got Grade Eight, or Grade Seven. Some of them even less.

And we know that some of them, as a result of this training, were able to take the Grade Twelve Equivalency Test, which is quite an achievement, quite an achievement. We know that 28 percent did, in fact, get out, were able to graduate out and go into jobs. Others were placed in some of the spinoff activities that were created as a result of these work activity projects, as I indicated, as in Camperville, or in Crane River, or in Amaranth.

So that it seems to me this is being penny-wise and dollar-foolish. You simply are saying to these people, "Sorry, you don't have the education, you don't have the background, you don't have the skills — well, you'll just have to live on welfare for the rest of your life, because that's all you're suited for." It's a tragedy to these people, it's a tragedy to society.

Surely it's our responsibility, and government's responsibility to try and reach as many people — if the success ratio is only 28 percent, it's unfortunate, but so be it. The Minister knows full well that the ratio of the percentage of the students entering university in First Year there's a very very high falloff, a very high falloff. And nobody's suggesting that somehow they be done away with.

These people have nowhere to turn. This is the only recourse that has yet been developed. If the Minister can tell us that he has a better idea, he has a new method, a new technique, well, maybe we'll look at it. But surely you don't scrap a program that has given and shown beneficial results. You don't do it simply so you can say "We are a government of tight fiscal management." You're dealing with people's lives. You're dealing with the quality of life in Manitoba, and for these people you are pretty well cutting off whatever hope they have.

The Minister indicated that Pioneer is operating now with very little cost-sharing because they're almost self-supporting, and he thinks that probably they will become self-supporting. That may be, but the likelihood is that in order to become self-supporting, and in order to make it easier for the management, they will not hire that type of person who needs the kind of protective hand-holding training that is provided at Pioneer. They'll hire waitresses at minimum wage, or whatever they pay them, and they may make a go of it. But the target population which is being served by the Work Activity Projects will probably lose out in that shuffle.

I deplore what has occurred. Again 50 percent of the program is paid by Ottawa. So it's 50-cent dollars when the Minister is looking at costs, and the cost benefit. I suppose he'll tell me that, well, federal money is still taxpayers' money. Nonetheless, these people are being hurt and there's no program that I know of that can take the place of these work activity projects. They have been successful, they have worked, they have achieved results. Sure, everyone would like to see a 90 percent or an 80 percent success ratio, but heck, we don't have that in our school system. And so even when the Minister says it's 28 percent; frankly, that's high.

You know, the rate of success in our correctional institutions doesn't even come close to that. And we spend millions there. So this is really a small program. The cost to Manitoba, last year, it was \$3,500,000, or, no, \$3.2 million spent, of which probably well over a million came from, probably half came from Ottawa. And people's lives were being saved. There was meaning being

given to people. A chance — this is the last chance that they had. They had no other chance. And now, to take it away from them, and to say, "Well, we're going to operate some, but we're going to scale it down." I can see the writing on the wall; that if, in fact, there is some changes in cost-sharing, then the government for sure will have justification to say, "Well, sorry, the cost benefit isn't there, there's too much cost involved".

In the long run, whatever success ratio you have, you're better off with a 28 percent success ratio, getting them off welfare, having them contribute to society, having them pay their taxes like any other citizen, having them participate like any other citizen. If they're family people, if they have families, the effect on the family is profound. And surely that is more important than to simply say "tight fiscal management dictates that we should eliminate this program."

Tight fiscal management, in my opinion, does not mean that you simply throw people on a scrap heap, Mr. Minister. And that is what's being done here. You're simply tossing these people aside and saying, "SOrry, there's nothing for you. If you have to go on welfare — live on welfare. If your family has to live on welfare, so be it, let them live on welfare too. And if your children grow up with the welfare syndrome — well, so be it, that's life."

It is this kind of short-sighted attitude that I deplore, and I plead with the Minister to reconsider and to replace this program to the level it was last year. You know, when we were in Estimates last year, he indicated that the program would continue, and he did say . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30 p.m. it is Private Members' Hour. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

DITThe Chairman reported upon the Committee's deliberations to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. KOVNATS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that report of Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: We are now under Private Members' Hour. The first item is the Resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. I have not had a chance as yet to read the Hansard.

RESOLUTION NO. 4 — SHELTER ALLOWANCE PROGRAM

MR. SPEAKER: The second item is the Resolution of the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge; the Amendment of the Honourable Member for Transcona. I believe the Honourable Member was going to take a chance and take a look. Is he prepared to do anything with it at this time?

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, I can give you a copy of it, Mr. Speaker. I've taken out those portions of the Amendment that you informed me yesterday in the House you found questionable, so I believe now it should be acceptable for debate.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe, perhaps, the proper way is for the honourable member to ask leave of the House to withdraw the first Amendment and propose this one. I think that's the way it should be done.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I will do that.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreeable? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIKK: Do I then move it again?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks, that the amended Motion of the Member for Fort Rouge be further amended by adding thereto the following.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government consider the advisability of an optional program which would consist of:

(1) Establishing a comprehensive program to increase the supply of affordable housing units through: public senior citizens' and low income housing projects' co-operative housing projects, community non-profit housing projects, renovations and upgrading of existing apartment stock, the provision of start-up funds for the province's non-profit housing corporation and the continued provision of shelter allowances to utilize needed reasonably priced dwelling units that are privately owned.

(2) improving the incomes of impoverished Manitobans who cannot afford proper housing by a variety of means so that they may be in a better position to afford proper housing.

(3) And ensuring that the Government White Paper on Tax Credits maintains and expands the present tax credit programs.

MR. SPEAKER: I want to thank the honourable member for giving me an advanced copy Of his proposed amendments. It's my opinion that this sub-amendment probably does need all the criteria that are necessary fOr an amendment and therefore I would think the proper thing now is to open the floor for debate on it.

The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I move, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks

THAT the amended motion of the Member for Fort Rouge be further amended by adding thereto the following:

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government consider the advisability of an optional program which would consist of:

(1) Establishing a comprehensive program to increase the supply of affordable housing units through: public senior citizens' and low income housing projects, co-operative housing projects, community non-profit housing projects, renovations and upgrading of existing apartment stock, the provision of start-up funds for the province's non-profit housing corporation and the continued provision of shelter allowances to utilize needed reasonably priced dwelling units that are privately owned.

(2) improving the incomes of impoverished Manitobans who cannot afford proper housing by a variety of means so that they may be in a better position to afford proper housing.

(3) And ensuring that the Government White Paper on Tax Credits maintains and expands the present tax credit programs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to provide a few comments in respect to the Resolution. Mr. Speaker, it seems to us that there is unquestionably a need for a more comprehensive housing program throughout Manitoba. It is a clear and developing impression, certainly on members on this side, that there is presently lacking a direction, that there is lacking in a stimulus or any planned development program insofar as a housing thrust.

I can say, Mr. Speaker, that in the last few months alone I sense that there increasing concern throughout various parts of this province about the fact that for instance there has been very little by way of family housing development. Only two weeks ago we were provided with copies of the report from the Social Planning Council, in which that report described that the housing situation in the City of Winnipeg insofar as single parent families were concerned, was one which was deplorable. And they described the situation as one which was reaching critical proportions in the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to have a society that we can be proud of, a society which respects some of the basic elements of human decency, then surely housing is first and foremost and fundamental. And, Mr. Speaker, I was proud to be associated with a government that during the period from 1969 - 1977 was not in the rear but was in the forefront of a housing thrust in Manitoba — a government which shared with I believe the vast majority of Manitobans, the conviction that housing was a paramount requirement of any advanced civilized community in the 1970s.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have the report of the Family Planning Council describing the deplorable housing conditions insofar as principally those of single parent families in the City of Winnipeg. You know, Mr. Speaker, it must be the most difficult problem for a single parent to raise a family . . . one that has lost one's husband either through reasons of health or through problems of marital difficulty — with a family of youngsters, to have to raise that family and on top of it, Mr. Speaker, to find that there is no availability to that family — decent housing within the community.

And then to be expected, Mr. Speaker, on top of it in most cases to live on a minimum wage which has been frozen in this province for the past 30 months, despite the fact that during those 30 months the cost of living has increased by 22 per cent and then t — to do not a thing on housing. Mr. Speaker, I charge this government across the way of commission of sins which are the result of their icy indifference to the social concerns in this province. And the people of Manitoba will judge them accordingly as to their approach, as to their attitude and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that is well demonstrated in the field of housing.

Mr. Speaker, we find in many communities outside the City of Winnipeg that the lists of those that are awaiting housing are increasing day by day. Who are benefiting by from this situation, Mr. Speaker? Those that are benefitting from the fact that we have a slowdown in public housing in this province are those that basically thrive as a result of the maintenance of substandard housing, some refer to them as slum landlords.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, any government regardless of political strife, but a government that is based upon some human concern would want to ensure that it has an aggressive and imaginative policy to attempt as rapidly as is possible to provide decent housing alternatives for our poor and to our single parent families and to others within our community.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we also have the plight of the senior citizens. And we are witnessing a slow down insofar as senior citizen housing is concerned in the Province of Manitoba.

And oh how the members across the way, how the party across the way in the past election boasted that they would only get rid of so-called New Democratic Party waste and mismanagement. But oh, they would keep all those good New Democratic Party progress: the personal care homes, they said — the hospital construction, the good standard of health care and above all, family housing and senior citizen housing in Manitoba. We heard that, Mr. Speaker, we all heard that. We heard that 17, 18 months ago.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba have been betrayed by idle falsehoods, by a political party that was only aiming, whose only interest was the securing of political power — political power without any commitment to undertake any social or economic advancement in this province. A party that was committed only to securing political power so that they could secure a position of power so that their party membership could wallow, but without any commitment to the advancement of the social programs which had been so well stimulated and initiated during that period of 1969 - 1977.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us a Resolution which calls for the establishment of a comprehensive program to increase the supply of affordable homes to public senior citizens housing, low income housing projects, co-operative housing projects. And, Mr. Speaker, we witnessed the very fine imagination and thrust by so many of our co-operative organizations in this province that started co-operative housing programs, co-operative housing programs, in some way provide housing for families that would be beyond the limits of income, that would permit them to inhabit public housing. Co-operative housing has provided much to this province.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is my humble opinion that there is now a sharp decrease in the development of co-operative housing in Manitoba. And why? Because there is no housing leadership from the government across the way. Mr. Speaker, community non-profit housing projects again, a lack of leadership from the government across the way — total lack of leadership. Then we have renovations and upgrading of existing apartment stock, the provision of start-up funds for the province's non-profit housing corporation, the continued provision of shelter allowances to utilize needed reasonably priced dwelling units that are privately owned. Mr. Speaker, search that we may, examine as we desire, monitor, hope, we see very little by contribution in these fields from the government across the way.

Then also, Mr. Speaker, what we have before us is the proposal that we consider the advisability of an optional program. I want to commend the Member for Transcona for providing leadership in this field, for providing a Resolution which is constructive and positive to this house, a Resolution which squarely places the government, a notice as to the position of the opposition in this House, a Resolution that calls for the government to commit itself to a non- doctrinaire position towards housing, to recognize the contribution that the co-operative sector can make, the public sector and the private sector to improving housing in this province.

This Resolution is one that I believe ought to commend itself to all members of this House and we challenge members across the way to speak, particularly those members, the Member for Wolseley, the Member for St. Matthews, the Member for Crescentwood, the Member for Radisson, members that have within their constituencies some degree, one extent or the other, of deplorable housing conditions. What are they saying to their Treasury benches, are they speaking up, are they bringing it to the attention of the Minister responsible for housing? That there's need for a thrust in housing in this province. Are they prepared to support this Resolution, are they prepared to call upon the Minister responsible for housing to demonstrate some leadership in housing and to rise

to his feet and support this Resolution in the House? We'll be watching those members closely, we'll be watching for what they have to say and we'll be scrutinizing their vote, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE: I want to be brief on this very important issue because I think it should go to a vote. But I would like to draw attention to the fact that in my immediate area over the past year there have been 823 demolitions. And one specific demolition involved two small apartment blocks — on the corner of the street that I used to live on — of 35 units and it was demolished to make room for a parking lot for the Health Sciences Centre. Now, doubtless, Mr. Speaker, the Health Sciences Centre over the years will need more parking space. But the question is, how are the people who had been living in this area and in these units, to be accommodated in the community.

I don't fault the hospital for demolishing the units because the cost of upgrading them to present day standards wasn't in the immediate interest of the hospital. But nevertheless, the planning for that area over the next 25 years or so, doesn't make it of an immediate necessity that this land be folded into their parking needs. It seemed at the time, Mr. Speaker, that if MHRC had the flexibility to enter into a contractual arrangement with the hospital, that they would make available a modest sum, modest in the sense that when compared to new construction costs, the upgrading of these two facilities could have been amortized over a period of 20-25, which could have been recovered through MHRC and have been to a benefit to the people who have to live in this area without adding a burden to the hospital. But nevertheless, because of the inflexibility of the the government and their lack of policy as pointed by the Leader of the Opposition, these blocks came down.

The cost of new construction. . . you know, a person could go on and on and fill in details on the point that I'm making. But, Mr. Speaker, here again is a manifestation of the government's lack of concern for people on the lower end of the scale as far as being able to afford housing. Those of us who are fortunate enough to be able to live in comfortable homes, forget what it is like in some of these areas. I recall a couple of years ago, that the Member for St. Johns and a couple of others. . . I took them on a tour of the area and they hadn't been in that particular area for quite some time so they had forgotten what it was like. When we're talking people in this group financially, there's oftentimes the tendency to talk about them as welfare bums and the rest of it and my colleague was appreciative of having it drawn to his attention that many of these people — many of these people are people who have contributed to society over the years, have retired and have the most modest of pensions.

In one particular block that we took them into, was on the corner — well, I'm not going to identify it — it was a three-storey structure and the place — you could see that it was old; it had the old-fashioned brown linoleum on the stairtreads and in the halls. And, Mr. Speaker, it was as clean as a whistle, it was as clean as a whistle. And we knocked on some of the doors and the people cautiously opened and peered out; and when we told them who we were, they invited us in for a cup of tea and they are living in what people would call two-room apartments for all intents and purposes. They have a kind of bed-sitting room with a modest little kitchen and a bathroom of sorts. And they have been living in these places — I know one particular individual who has been living in this particular place since 1949. And the landlord who owns this particular place is a most reasonable man; his rents are to this day very reasonable with these people who have been living in this apartment block. It wasn't built as an apartment block; in the first instance, it was built as a warehouse, but nevertheless, he, years ago, just shortly after the war made it into an apartment block when the freeze of building materials came off, and doubtless he has recouped his investment which nobody would fault him for.

But there is example after example of such places in my area. Blocks which were built — some at the turn of the century and these blocks because of the economic conditions, and because of settlements of estates, because of land speculation, because of many reasons are being put out in the market and are being torn down. Now, I don't pretend to know the answer and there's no panacea, but nevertheless, the former government had a policy of trying to use different approaches to this problem. The private sector is important; nobody denies that, but nevertheless, anybody who knows anything about investment, where people can take their money and put it in a nice, safe government bond or some other type of safe security trust certificate with one of the larger institutions with the bank, with the Royal — admirable institution, I'll have to put in a plug for the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, but nevertheless, with money being what it is worth today, who can fault the private sector for not wanting to invest in an uncertain market, even if inflation will take care of some of their apprehensions?

So, what is the answer, Mr. Speaker, as far as these people are concerned — these people who are independent, have looked after themselves and in my view are entitled to respect and

help? Where are they going to go?

Let me go back to the 35 units that came down on the corner of my street. The Member for Fort Rouge raised it as a question last year, after I was well aware of it — in fact, I had talked to some of the people in the blocks. But these are nice people; the hospital said that they had to tear this place down, they didn't storm the Legislature, they didn't come and badger the MLAs, they just took it in their stride. But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, who is going to help them? There are literally thousands of them in the old part of Winnipeg. One of the answers to this, of course, has been addressed and I see that the government is finally starting to move on some of the plans that they were left as far as the senior citizens' housing is concerned. But nevertheless, there are many more people who really don't need senior citizens' housing or nursing care or anything else and they would like to have the independence of their own place, they would like to have some assistance in living in the communities where they have spent the last 10, 15 years of their retirement or sunset years, whatever nice term a person wants to use.

So that when we're talking about, you know, making affordable housing, we're not talking about people who want to rip off the system or want to take advantage of the system, who really don't want to strive to look after themselves — we're talking about literally thousands of people who have looked after themselves and we're talking about thousands of people who really haven't got the skills to produce enough income to get into what some of us would consider affordable housing.

Earlier in our deliberations today in Committee of Supply, we were talking about a program in Health and Social Development which last year they allocated \$3.5 million to try and help people who traditionally haven't developed the skills to produce incomes which can get them into the affordable housing or market in which they can afford a house. The government has cut this from 3.5 to 2.2 million. Now, it's a complex question and I bring this into a juxtaposition in this particular debate, because the thrust has to be across the whole area. We have to provide housing for those people who through no fault of their own, Mr. Speaker, no fault of their own, can't buy a house or can't afford the rents that are being demanded and when I say demanded, I don't mean in the sense to make an ogre out of the private sector that they're asking for rents which are higher than a reasonable return on their investment if they invested their money elsewhere, as I had suggested earlier. But people who for no fault of their own, can't afford the \$200, \$300, \$400, \$500 rents which are being charged in many of the rental units.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, we have to try and help those people who possibly could develop the skills necessary to live in that kind of a house or acquire that kind of a house. And, when the minister was responding to my colleague from Seven Oaks, I think of one particular project which over the past four and five years has helped many people get into affordable housing. It was the Winnipeg Home Improvement Project and the thing was started off as a work activity project which we had federal and provincial assistance to help them get going. As a spinoff from that, they started a corporation — they called it Kinew, and under Kinew Corporation they expanded and they started to buy older houses in the area and they'd renovate these houses and the people would move into them and it was kind of a roll over situation, in that the capital was made available as seed money, and these people, Mr. Speaker, and I want to give public credit to a man named Stan Fulham, who I think has done a fantastic job in working with these people in the area. They have taken people who didn't have the skills, to go out on the market and get a job as a carpenter or a plumber or an electrician. They got them together and they started to develop work habits. They went on and some of them have gone through apprenticeships and have gone on into the trades; they have developed a business out of developing these houses and selling them back to the memberships. This is one type of an approach.

The Co-op Housing was another, but Mr. Speaker, I think the amendment — I would ask my colleagues in the House to support this amendment in that it asks and draws to our attention the necessity of having a multi-facet approach to solving this problem. It includes the the private sector, it includes senior citizens, it includes nursing homes, it includes the co-ops and I think that we should expand it even further to make some kind of contractual arrangements with those older blocks in the core area, where they could enter a contractual arrangement that the moneys necessary to upgrade some of those blocks could be amortized in co-operation with the government and the property would still remain in private hands. But Mr. Speaker, I think it is a good amendment, I think it is a broad enough approach to the problem that all members of the House should support the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. WARREN STEEN: Mr. Speaker, we've heard from the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Winnipeg Centre while I've been present and they have talked about housing and

housing in the centre core areas of Winnipeg, and I would agree with them to some degree that we have a problem in the centre core area of the city of Winnipeg and one of the problems that comes to light, particularly to me is the vacancies that we have in our schools, the vacant classrooms.

It's been reported that in the city of Winnipeg School Division that we have in excess of 100 vacant classrooms. The city of Calgary is closing down some 30 schools in the next five years because the centre core area is being stripped of the young families and the children of school age. This particular resolution is a fairly widespread and wide-ranging one. It talks about senior citizen housing, co-operative housing and so on. It also goes on to talk about affordable proper housing by a variety of means and asking the government to ensure a white paper on tax credits and so on.

I think, Mr. Speaker, what the Opposition and the member that has proposed this resolution is trying to do is use housing as a vehicle to again slip in an argument for the minimum wage and to see if the government would spend some more money and increase the minimum wage and increase subsidized housing. I'm sure that every member of this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, is in favour of senior citizen housing and in Manitoba over the years we've improved the senior citizen housing lot immensely.

Today the vacancy or the numbers of persons on the lists trying to get into senior citizens homes are nowhere what they were some 20 years ago. Improvement has been made by both the former government, which I congratulate them for their efforts during their eight years in government in the area of senior citizen housing, by the former Weir and Roblin administrations. They improved the senior citizen housing lot considerably.

But as I say, we were sort of challenged by the Leader of the Opposition that perhaps the Member for Crescentwood should comment on the resolution. Well, I say that the problem in the inner portion of the city of Winnipeg is that we do have a problem of trying to get young families back into these areas of the city so that we can get children back into the areas, get the schools back to the populations that they once were some years ago. Unfortunately, today, young couples, far too many of them, when they're both working and bringing in paycheques in the neighbourhood of — and it's not uncommon for young couples today to be making \$2,500 a month between the two of them — and with their great desires they want to move into the suburbs and they get themselves locked into homes that range in the area of \$75,000 to \$125,000.00. And then the problem occurs when the Mrs. no longer has a paycheque and she's in the family way, and the husband and the father in that case can no longer carry the mortgage and the interest payments on such a home.

What happens is that these people have moved into a neighbourhood that is a little too rich for their blood and they can't afford to stay there and this is one of the greatest causes of marriage breakdown today. People, instead of spending what used to be the rule of thumb of some 30 percent of the take-home pay on lodging, they get themselves up into the area of 50 percent or greater and this is where we're having a problem today with young couples that are in over their head in housing and in shelter. What we have to do, both in government, is try and get people to move back into the good, nice residential districts of what I call the inner city, the former city of Winnipeg. There is all kinds of good housing accommodation in the Crescentwood area, St. Matthews and other inner city constituencies.

What we've got to do is encourage young families to move back into these areas, help them perhaps with home improvement loans, whether the government themselves are the lending agency. I personally would prefer the government not to be the lending agency. I would rather see the regular lending agencies perform in that particular facet, and perhaps government go hand in hand with the young couples and help them with the high interest charges that the normal conventional lending agencies do charge for loans.

Another area that I would think that we should try to encourage is that the municipalities or, in this particular case, the city of Winnipeg, that we freeze the assessment on these homes so that during the period that they're paying off the home improvement loan that the home assessment is not being increased, so that the person is not being penalized with higher taxes while they are paying (a) for their mortgage and (b) for their home improvement loan. This is the area that we in the city of Winnipeg and the city members, particularly those of us that represent constituencies that have been in existence for fifty years or longer, should try and get some of that good housing stock that's in there improved and make it more desirable for our young people to move back in and therefore increase the student population in these areas and help out in maintaining the schools at a respectable level as to numbers of students in relation to the classrooms.

Also we've got a problem in the inner city area with the community clubs. The community clubs just don't have enough kids and young people to draw on to form decent hockey teams any more, or decent sports teams. They're having to band together with two and three community clubs now in order to get enough boys or girls of a certain age group in order to put together a reasonable

team to participate in sports. Yet you go out into the suburbs and particularly Charleswood — because of my City Council days, I had a lot to do with the Charleswood area — the demand for recreational space in the suburbs is so great that the soccer fields, for example, they can't even grow grass on them because they've got teams practising or playing games for each and every daylight hour there is. And the indoor rinks or the outdoor rinks in the wintertime in these suburbs, you just can't get ice time, because of the number of children that are wanting to participate. Yet the problem is reversed in the inner city area. And how do we change the inner city area?

Well, I think the only way we can change it is by encouraging younger families to move back into older neighbourhoods and live in those particular areas. How do we encourage younger families to move back into older homes? Well, with maybe some good home improvement loans, through the conventional lending agencies, preferably, as far as I'm concerned and get people to want to live in these areas that are good areas, desirable areas; get them off this kick that they all have to live in a home that has a family room with an open fireplace and a two-car garage and so on, because the day will come when most young couples can't afford to pay the payments on these new homes.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that what the member who proposed this resolution has done is, he's brought forward a motherhood motion that 80 percent of it could be supported by every member of this House, but on the other turn, I believe that he's also trying to slip in a means where he can get government to have a white paper on tax credits, so what they're doing is they're asking government to spend some money.

In this year's Estimates, the Department of Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, the Estimates are \$21,857,000.00. The Department of Agriculture, and many members on this side of the House feel that agriculture is the main industry in this province, their Estimates are \$28 million. So there's only a difference of 7. Economic development, and members on this side of the House always have felt that economic development or industry and commerce as the department was known before, is a key major department in government. And their total expenditures are only \$31 million. So I think that this government is continuing on with the housing program that it inherited from the former government. We're not cutting back. Perhaps we're not increasing the expenditures in that area as much as the former government might have, but I think that we're doing a worthwhile job in that particular area, and as I said, most people could support most of that resolution, but there are parts of it that I think it's like throwing a hooker when you're out fishing and what they're trying to do is get the government to commit themselves to greater expenditures.

So I would have to, Mr. Speaker, have a second look at this resolution before I could support it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona with a question.

MR. PARASIUK: Is the member aware that the government, in the Throne Speech, has indicated that there will be a government white paper on tax credits?

MR. STEEN: Yes, I certainly am aware of it.

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

MR. ARNOLD BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have not seen the amendment to the resolution, so it makes us a little uneasy talking on something that we really haven't seen yet. But it's a topic I would say that is rather an important one. Housing is certainly something that everybody in Canada needs, especially this last winter, which has been a very severe one and when you have snow on the ground for 6 months of the year, then of course the roof over your head gets to be a very important item.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering just exactly where the large concern comes from as far as housing is concerned, because I know from my own home town that there is any number of houses that are up for sale. There is quite a bit of apartment space available and this pretty well goes for every rural town, I would say, that there is quite a bit of housing available. And you may have a problem in the inner core area of the city, but I don't really see where this can be all as severe as what the Leader of the Opposition certainly was claiming to be. He was talking about senior citizens housing and personal care homes. There is no doubt about it, that we do need more personal care homes and we're very pleased to see that the government as one of their priorities was to build more personal care homes.

So we are moving in that particular direction. But I think that when we talk about senior citizens housing and personal care homes, that we should think of the condominium type of housing for senior citizens. I've been advocating this before. I would like to see us go in that particular direction,

where senior citizens could purchase their own condominiums, those that can afford it. I would say that a very high percentage of senior citizens certainly can afford this if they would sell their own home that they are in. They could certainly afford to purchase a condominium. Later on when when they would require personal care home treatment, light care or medium care, they could be looked after in their own premises, which certainly would be much better for the senior citizens and they would enjoy this much more, being allowed to stay within their own premises longer.

So I would certainly like to see us take a very close look at that concept and I would like to see the Minister of Housing and the Minister of Health get together on that proposal and see what can be done. This certainly would alleviate a lot of the demand for personal care homes. There is no doubt about that.

One of the problems that we have as far as affordable housing is concerned, and I am in that particular business of building affordable homes, is financing. That the product that we're building at the present time, most of it's going to Alberta or Saskatchewan, where they do have long-term financing available for mobile homes and affordable housing, manufactured housing. So I think that this is one area that we could possibly be looking at in Manitoba, and with these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to study the amendment before I could say which way I'm going to support or not support it.

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

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question on his remarks? Would the honourable member care to speculate why there are so many empty houses in his town and other rural areas? Could this be caused by the exodus last year of some 10,000 Manitobans?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: I'm very happy to answer that particular question to the Honourable Member for St. Vital. There were 36 new businesses opened in Winkler last year. It's the fastest growing town that we have in Manitoba, and there's no doubt about that, so it certainly is not for that reason, it's a very healthy economic climate in the area that I come from.

MR. WALDING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I didn't make that question too clear. I wasn't asking the honourable member about new businesses, I was asking him for an explanation of his opening remarks, when he mentioned so many houses in his area standing vacant, I wonder if he had an explanation for that?

MR. BROWN: Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of construction going on all over the province as far as housing is concerned, and the member should be aware of this. Unfortunately, I don't have — oh, the Minister is here, and he probably has statistics on this but you can see by the amount of money that we're spending — \$21 million for this next year that there is going to be a continuance of housing being built. This is not only a problem in Manitoba, it's a problem all over. I was talking with a friend of mine from Kelowna, who said there were 600 new homes available in Kelowna, B.C., empty — brand new homes and this is the situation in about every town right across Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we have been going through a debate on this particular Resolution now for quite awhile and the unfortunate part of it is that the honourable members on the other side really don't have to many of their facts about them, or don't have facts at all, in many cases.

I just read the copy here of this Amendment. The first thing says that it's start up funds for the province's Non-Profit Housing Corporation. Yes, there's a Non-Profit Housing Corporation, Mr. Speaker, but there's no need to put any funds into it or to start it up, because the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation has the capability, and the changes that were just previously made on regulations with the federal government allows the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation to borrow money, and they would guarantee the money to the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, because we are a government agency and they allowed government agencies across the country to become part of that. So the honourable member has a recommendation here that is not necessary. We have a Non-Profit Housing Corporation; we never have had too much money put into it, if any, but we don't need it — we don't need it — the Manitoba Housing and Renewal

Corporation has the capacity to do that at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, there is no shortage of housing in the province of Manitoba. There is no shortage at all. The honourable member gets up and he quotes figures that were last November, and I can tell him right now the core area is higher than he quoted. He said 2.9 for the whole core area; we're looking at about 3.5; he said 1.1 in one particular section, that one is going to go up and has gone up another half or three-quarters percent since he quoted the figures.

Mr. Speaker, at no time, it's almost been 15 years or so, that we had anywhere near the 4 percent vacancy rate, and now we're up to about 4.9 in the city. We have a vacancy rate that's higher than it's been in the last 15 years or so in the province of Manitoba and in the city of Winnipeg.

You know, Mr. Speaker, but we do have an affordability problem. Now, let me tell you what this government has been doing about the affordability problem. We have built in the core area of Winnipeg more units in two years than the previous NDP government did in eight. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks smiles about that; I will produce the list of the places, the number of suites, and when they were built and when they were started.

The Honourable Member — yes, and I'm going to get to when they were started — they were started during our time. And the Honourable Member over there for Transcona makes the accusation that it was all there, sitting in front of us, when we came to office. I will tell him that a lot of those units are built in scattered areas on property that we purchased from the city of Winnipeg, and we have built it scattered throughout the core area. They were not — were not — yours. I will tell you that quite frankly, and they are being built at the present time.

The province of Manitoba, when we took office in October of 1977 . . .

A MEMBER: Was a shambles.

MR. JOHNSTON: You're right. But, do you know that this \$56 million or \$70 million program, and I told them this last year in Estimates, had not even gone to their Management Committee? —(Interjection)— Did you know that there was \$6 million only had gone to their Management Committee. They talk about a \$70 million program that they had in front of them, Mr. Speaker, and do you know what? The federal government had only allotted \$34 million to the province of Manitoba in 1977.

But what they did, you know, and we have even found a situation in the Rural and Native Housing Program, you know, it will be absolutely amazing, Mr. Speaker, in the Estimates, when all of a sudden the projection and the figures that they had in their reports, we went out and counted the houses and they weren't there. Do you know their report was made up of what they were projecting to build, but I'll tell you, the report you will receive under this government will be what is there.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about the Non-Profit Housing Corporation and the program of the federal government, and I am saying right here and now, Mr. Speaker, that it is a bit of a disappointment to us on this side, that we haven't got that program in place with the federal government at the present time. We are working very hard to get it into place, because the Non-Profit Program is something that we believe in. I might say that I am a little disappointed that it is not in place at the present time, but I would like to assure the honourable member I agree with the program as much as he does, and we're working very hard to get it done. As a matter of fact, we even stepped out and went a little in front of ourselves in Carman, Manitoba, where they came forward and said, "We are just in a bind. We have to have an answer," so we did, as the MHRC Board recommended, that we move on that one, and it's working very well.

We hope to be in a position — let me tell the honourable member about his non-profit. The federal government has allotted 540 non-profit units to the province of Manitoba in 1979. That's not a lot, but I'll you what, with the amount of stock out there, Mr. Speaker, we are going to be emptying apartment blocks. We don't have a problem, we don't have a problem with stock out there, we have an affordability problem, and that's why the province has been working very very hard.

In the past while, and it's been referred to in the White Paper as to what we want to do as far as senior citizens' subsidies are concerned, and I tell you it's working in other provinces. We've been out and looked at them, and it does work in other provinces. I can assure you, again, that it's very disappointing to this side of the House that it's not in place at the present time but it has to be tied in with a couple of other programs.

Mr. Speaker, we have been accused continually, they would say, "Well, you didn't build." We took over in '77 and before the end of the year put \$22 million worth of housing in place. I'll admit that a lot of the specs and everything were there, but we had to take it through management; we had to take it through the whole process; it had not been done. And do you know when it was submitted to management? In that two-week period, you know, when there was no government

around. It wasn't even signed by the Minister, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, we went ahead, and there's one that we did not go forward with, and that was Garry Street, and I have a letter on file from the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, who was the Minister of Health, recommending to the Minister of Housing at that time, we do not recommend building Garry Street. We will not, as a Department of Health, participate with you. That's on file.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 5:30 p.m., when this item next comes up, the honourable member will have 12 minutes.

The hour being 5:30, the House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon (Thursday).