

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Thursday, 8 May, 1980

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

At this time, I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my right where we have 40 students of Grade 11 standing from the Neelin High School. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brandon East. On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister, to respond in the absence of the Minister of Finance. Can the First Minister confirm that the increase in federal sales tax pertaining to liquor in the mini-budget will reap in a greater return for the provincial treasury in Manitoba than moneys that will flow from Manitoba to the federal treasury.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to take that as notice for the Minister of Finance and get my honourable friend the correct information on that topic.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, based upon information that the tax in fact will reap in some additional millions of dollars to the provincial Treasury by way of increased markup by the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission, and by way of additional sales tax, does the First Minister still concur with the statement that was issued by his Minister of Finance at the time of the introduction of this tax and the mini-budget, that in fact it was regrettable and that it was an intrusion into provincial taxing powers?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, again, I would be happy to have the Minister of Finance respond to my honourable friend's question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed to the First Minister, in the absence of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources. In view of the report to the effect that the Manitoba Action Committee on the Garrison Diversion, in their visit to Washington, found that

there was a considerable lack of knowledge on the part of congressmen about Canada's concerns on the diversion, will Manitoba become more actively involved in the lobbying in Washington, and specifically, will they be sending a strong contingent to the summer hearings on the Garrison Diversion?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that as notice for the Minister of Resources, who is attending a Ministerial meeting out of the province. I could only say by way of partial answer to the Member for Fort Rouge, Mr. Speaker, that the traditional method by which governments, plural, of Manitoba have dealt in the most effective way with Garrison — and I'm sure there is universal accord in the House on the firm position of the previous administration and of this administration that none of the waste paper from Garrison should enter the water systems of Manitoba — we have found that the most effective means of getting that message through has been to work in close consultation and co-operation with the Government of Canada, particularly through the Department of External Affairs who, in turn, are working with the State Department of the United States, the executive branch of government in turn being in touch with the elected branch.

But that would not, of course, preclude in any way the Government of Manitoba, in concert with the federal government, taking action of the kind that has been suggested by the Member for Fort Rouge, or any other action that would be deemed to be helpful in assuring that the decision and the determination that was made by the International Joint Commission, namely that water from that development should not enter into the water drainage systems in Canada, to ensure that is carried out and given full effect by the Congress of the United States.

We will take, in concert with the federal government, whatever action is deemed to be appropriate to further that cause.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: I thank the First Minister for his reply.

My next question is addressed to the Honourable Minister of Government Services. I want to thank him for the Return to Order of the House Number 2. However, the answer leads to one further question. It was stated in the reply that the tendering was advertised in two local papers. Would the Honourable Minister advise us which two local papers?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, the Winnipeg Free Press and the Winnipeg Tribune.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I would like to further answer, if you would, the question posed to me by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday as to the number of layoffs and if I had had appropriate notification. The situation has changed somewhat and we now have some of our department people involved with the company because there appears to be some consideration of them thinking of putting another product in line, in lieu of what they have been doing. That, of course, would affect the number of employees involved, which of course would back up and affect the appropriate notification. I would like to give assurances to the Leader of the Opposition that once we have all that in place, that appropriate notification will be given to the at that time determined number of people, which is unknown to myself at this moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Minister responsible for Manpower. I would ask the Minister of Manpower if, indeed, in the discussions between his department officials and the company in question, whether reasons were given as to the basis for the layoffs. If so, could the Minister indicate those reasons?

MR. MacMASTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we understand that there is an excess of 2 million worth of inventory that is not moving. I understand also that the industry itself, this is travel trailers and that type of thing, that that industry is at a bit of a slow point in moving the product at this time. The company, I also understand, is certainly hopeful that business will pick up, but they do have a large amount of inventory in hand that is not moving and it's felt that they should lay off some people at this time.

I also understand other producers of similar products in Manitoba have laid off in the last several months, going back approximately a year. It's because of a slowdown in the sales of the product.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, then a further supplementary to the Minister. As a result of his response, it gives rise to a question leading from a report today by the President of the Recreation Vehicles Association, Dealers Association, one Mr. Glen Sampson, to the effect that recreation vehicle dealers expected sales of conventional trailers to drop, but Mr. Sampson indicated that sales have been maintained and in fact, in some instances, have been increased, not as the Minister just indicated, that there has been a slump in the industry. Can the Minister then advise the source of his information, in view of the fact that his information is four-square in opposition to the report from the President of the Motor Vehicle Recreation Association of the province of Manitoba?

MR. MacMASTER: I'm pleased that we have a head of an association saying that sales are up, but

the facts of the matter are, this particular industry and the company that we're dealing with here is producing what I understand to be quite an elaborate type of trailer, and the facts are that they have over 2 million worth of inventory on the lot that is not moving. I'm not going to dig into their businesses, why their particular product is not being sold. Maybe the less elaborate ones are moving, in fact, but this one quite obviously isn't, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAWLEY: By way of supplementary, is the Minister indicating that the situation pertaining to Edson is indeed an isolated situation and not one that is applicable to the industry as a whole, as implied by the statement of Mr. Glen Sampson?

MR. MacMASTER: This is the only major concern industry in that field that has been brought to my attention. It's been heresay that others have not had the sales that they expected, but this one, very obviously, from the facts that I have gathered, has had very little sales. So I guess maybe that's isolated as far as the type of specific product this company is producing is concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, would like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour, who I know is very concerned about the welfare of the working man, and the wages the working people earn. Statistics Canada has now issued information on average weekly earnings by industries and by provinces, and it indicates that while there has been some increase in wages in Manitoba, the past year, February 1980 over February 1979, it shows that Manitoba's wage increase is falling behind that of the rest of Canada, and certainly behind Saskatchewan and Alberta. My question is, if our economic situation is so favourable in Manitoba at the present time, why is our wage rate increase falling behind that of most of Canada?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, I have belonged to trade labour movements in several provinces in this country, and I think some of the leadership — if other members want to ask questions, maybe they should get up, I'll attempt to be courteous enough to answer the question that was posed to me. After belonging to unions across this country, I can honestly say that the labour leaders in the province of Manitoba are as good as, if not better than some others that I've witnessed across this country at negotiating contracts. I think that it's probably best to be left to them and the industries at the negotiating table, the types of contracts and the fringe benefits and the conditions of employment that they negotiate. I don't intend to impose my will as an individual, or the Department of Labour's into the negotiating table as to the types of settlements that are reached in the province of Manitoba.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I do not share the Honourable Minister's views in pointing a finger at the unions, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Whether or not the member shares the views of the Minister really isn't of significance in the question period.

The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a question?

MR. EVANS: While not accepting the analysis and conclusions of the Honourable Minister, I would ask him then, inasmuch as probably less than one-third of the labour force is organized and whereas these figures apply to the total labour force, including that two-thirds which is not organized, and inasmuch as the average wage rate now in Manitoba is only 89 percent of the Canadian average, the average weekly wage for all industries, 83 percent of Alberta and only 94 percent of Saskatchewan, can the Minister explain now, inasmuch as most of the workers are not in the union sector, can he offer any explanation why our wage rate increases continue to fall behind those of the rest of Canada?

MR. MacMASTER: Mr. Speaker, it's not a secret that wage rates in unorganized areas of our society tend to follow the organized rates. It's been said many times, and I've said it myself, when in fact I was in the business of being a union organizer, that it sort of disturbed us sometimes that there was a large number of companies around that we were having difficulty organizing, because lo and behold, they paid similar rates and gave similar benefits, and in some cases, better, just to keep the unions out. So the unions in fact, are the ones in Manitoba that are setting the rate. And again, I go back to what I said before, we have some pretty good ones, pretty good union negotiators on the labour side in Manitoba, and I leave it to them to negotiate the contracts.

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

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Minister then, why is it that we happen to have the lowest average weekly wage in Canada west of Nova Scotia. I believe only Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia have lower average weekly wages than we do in the province of Manitoba. Does the Minister have any explanation for this particular unfavourable phenomenon? I would like to suggest that it's the lack of economic opportunities in this province, but the Honourable Minister said that there are a lot of economic opportunities. I wonder if the Honourable Minister could comment on why we have the lowest average weekly wage for industries in Canada outside of Nova Scotia and, I believe, Prince Edward Island, and this is for the latest period available, February 1980?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: I'm not sure whether the Member for Brandon East should go to the convention that's being held in Winnipeg here and

tell them in fact that the union negotiators in Manitoba are doing a poor job. I don't happen to believe that they are doing a good job, and for his information when union negotiators go to the table they are armed with the facts as it relates to their particular situation and what they feel is desirable for themselves and their memberships. Again, Mr. Speaker, I leave that to them to arm themselves with the appropriate information and to the best they can at the negotiating table, which they are capable of doing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Government Services. As the Minister is well aware, TV satellite broadcasting is coming in strong in the north and my question — he is also aware that it's quite controversial who owns what. But my question to the Minister is this, is this type of broadcasting legal or illegal, satellite broadcasting.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I don't think it's quite proper for a member to ask another member on the legal opinion of what is legal and what is not legal.

MR. BARROW: Another question, Mr. Speaker, has the Minister received a legal opinion on this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I can only indicate to the Honourable Member for Flin Flon that there are currently hearings under way in Ottawa. The CRTC that are dealing with this very issue, the installation of earth receiving stations, satellites, and the picking up of signals from American satellites or the two Canadian satellites that are up there are, I am told, technically in breach of the regulations as they now stand. However, I'm also advised that the number of these types of receiving stations are increasing rapidly, that there are over some 3 - 400 of them in place, particularly throughout northern Manitoba, and the federal officials in concert with provincial officials are addressing themselves to this growing problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Highways or Transport, if he would just listen to me for a moment. My question to the Minister of Transport — I don't know if he knows or doesn't know that the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting have done away with all CNR travel concerning their ore. It's now being trucked from as far north or east as Flin Flon. What is happening, Mr. Speaker, is it's really making a mess of our government road system. My question to the Minister is, would he consider a special tax on these trucks to help maintain these roads? Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

HON. DON ORCHARD (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, that's an interesting concept and quite a presentation, because the firms undergoing the hauling of that commodity will be paying full licencing costs to the province of Manitoba and they will be paying full fuel taxes to the province of Manitoba, and what the Member for Flin Flon is suggesting that we add additional taxes to them when they are operating on the highways with all the rights and privileges that they have paid for.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education. In view of the fact that the Seine School Division unanimously voted in favor of construction of a French School in the area, and in view of the fact that it's certainly with the intent of the legislation on French education, could the Minister meet with the parents' committee, with this group, once and for all to try to settle this situation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I can tell the member that I'm quite prepared to meet with any interested group from that area.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, then I've been requested to try to arrange this meeting with the Minister so that the Minister can give me a date once he's checked his calendar, and would he extend me the courtesy of an invitation to that meeting also.

MR. COSENS: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture, and ask him if he can give to this House whatever information he has on what contingency plans he and his department have, in view of the possible serious outbreak of grasshoppers within the province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, the question the member raises is one of importance to the farm community, and I would say that the department have identified the stocks of chemical that would be necessary to help control the grasshoppers that may be of some threat, but at this particular time it's too early to estimate the danger which they may incur to the crops that haven't started to grow yet.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope that there will be adequate stocks of the appropriate chemical available, as the Minister has given us that assurance. I would ask the Minister as well, could he advise this House on the amount of money that

Manitoba farmers have lost as a result of selling their feed grains on the open market system for use within Canada? Could he give us the amount of money that Manitoba producers have lost over the last several years?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be unfair for me to try and make an estimate at this particular time, how much farmers would have gained by marketing through the open system or through the Wheat Board system. I guess the point that has to be made is, that the fact of the matter is that farmers have sold their grain, they have created a cash flow, and are not faced in a lot of cases with high interest rates on operating loans that they'd have to otherwise face without having sold that grain. There are many elements that have to be brought into light to totally get an estimate of whether they're ahead or behind the normal situation.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could confirm that the farmers within Manitoba alone within the last three years have lost in excess of 30 million by selling their feed grains on the open market rather than through the Canadian Wheat Board on the corn competitive price that was set by the federal government out of Chicago?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, as the member has indicated, it is a federal policy that ties the price of domestic feed grain to the corn competitive price in eastern Canada. However, being a man who feeds grain himself, I guess he has the freedom to either feed livestock in Manitoba or in any part of Canada, and the more alternatives that he has, I think the better position that he is in as a producer in Manitoba, so I think that we have to retain that opportunity of multiple system of markets for the producers in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. My question pertains to the Port of Churchill and I would like to ask the Minister if he can indicate how much grain and what type of grain are in storage in the elevators at the Port of Churchill at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Member for Rock Lake, the information that I have at this particular time is that there are few stocks of grain, both barley or wheat, at the shipping point of Churchill at this particular time, however. I have been assured, as we as a government have been assured, that the grain transportation coordinator has given us the assurance that they will put sufficient stocks in Churchill to fully utilize that particular port. I think we all have to be aware that the shipping season doesn't start until July and will be encouraging the workers and the people

responsible for moving grain into that port, that they do so, so that we can use the facilities to the best of their ability.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question and the Minister may have given a partial answer, but I would like to ask the Minister if he could indicate who has in the past year and is now responsible for seeing to it that grains are delivered to the elevators in Churchill?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Wheat Board have had the responsibility of allocating the stocks to the Port of Churchill for the past several years.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the Minister of Agriculture, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture can indicate that there has been excessive profit-taking in terms of feed grain sales within this country as a result of not having the feed grain prices set on the corn competitive system as it has been for the Wheat Board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, the member asks about profit for feed grain and I think that the main concern that I have is that profit goes to the farmers of this province.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then if the Minister is concerned that the profits be given to the farmers, and I share his concern, what actions does the Minister propose to take in view of the fact that excessive profit taking has been in effect in the feed grain sales in terms of — by the grain trade that will purchase the feed grain sales.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I sense a debate taking place on Agriculture and I then would advise that Agriculture is before the Committee at the present time, and I think if the honourable member wants to wait for 20 minutes he could probably carry on his debate there.

The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Honourable Member for The Pas raised the matter of the construction at the Correctional Institute at The Pas and the Court House, and suggested that there were some serious problems encountered, particularly with the concrete and foundation work.

My office contacted the consulting engineers immediately upon the matter being raised in the House and I want to assure the honourable members that construction is proceeding as scheduled, indeed ahead of schedule at The Pas, with no problems being encountered at all. I am sure that nothing other than the normal and usual shrinkage cracks are appearing in some of the foundation work. The consulting engineers assured me that this is to be expected. There was a small area that suffered some frost damage during the laying of the concrete; that has been planed down and remedied. Again, it is a

normal problem that is encountered, particularly when construction is undertaken in the winter time in this province.

I can assure the honourable members of the House and particularly the Member for The Pas that construction of these two facilities are on schedule and proceeding well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Attorney-General. Mr. Speaker, now that the city of Winnipeg Council has renewed its call for a clear-cut conflict of interest guidelines in legislation, we were wondering whether or not the Attorney-General, in his capacity as a Minister responsible for Urban Affairs for the province, will be giving heed to that request, and whether or not he will now be implementing the recommendations made in the Rhodes-Smith Conflict of Interest Commission Report tabled with his office in 1978?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I understand the resolution passed by city of Winnipeg Council last night refers to The Ontario Municipal Conflict of Interest Act, which I understand from my officials has some problems and amendments are being contemplated in the province of Ontario to that particular piece of legislation.

In view of the further facts, Mr. Speaker, that council does refer to a Conflict of Interest Act that would apply to all municipal councillors in the province of Manitoba, both rural and urban, and that there are different problems at those two levels, and further, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that legislative counsel at the present time have a very heavy workload and would be unable to attend to this matter for some period of time. Further, in view of the additional fact, Mr. Speaker, that the previous government at one point introduced a Conflict of Interest Act into this Legislature and withdrew that Bill, I decided that I will refer this matter to the Law Reform Commission to review not only the proposal from the City of Winnipeg, but legislation that exists in other provinces and deals with this matter in a variety of ways, with the hope, Mr. Speaker, that they will consult with, not only the city of Winnipeg Council, but with municipal councillors throughout the province and in reviewing other legislation will make recommendations to us for consideration by this Legislature.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the same Minister, and is with respect to rail relocation. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the fact that the federal government has now indicated that they may be able to channel DREE funds in the approximate sum of 25 million for the purposes of rail relocation in Winnipeg, and given that the City of Winnipeg has committed a like amount of funding towards the project, we would ask whether the members opposite in the government can indicate if they will be providing a like sum of money, minimally a like sum of money to the two other jurisdictions?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, if in fact that offer has been made, I indicated yesterday to the news media who asked me, I believe Mayor Norrie has also indicated that 25 million, while it certainly is a large amount of money, does not meet the test of a significant federal financial contribution towards rail relocation.

I have no official word from Mr. Pepin, who undertook to advise myself and the Mayor when he had completed his task of enquiring into other possible areas of funding. I believe that he has indicated to the Mayor that he hopes to respond to him and give him a formal reply by the end of May. I think, Mr. Speaker, we'll simply have to await some official response from Mr. Pepin before we're able to proceed any further with respect to this matter.

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

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Speaker, in noting that the honourable members opposite are now the only party who have not made a representation or commitment in this regard, and it's an important matter, I would once again, Mr. Speaker, and I don't wish to be repetitive or redundant, I would once again ask the Honourable Minister whether he can indicate, whether he will indeed match the commitment of the city of Winnipeg; and if it is forthcoming, the seemingly equivalent contribution of the federal government, is he willing to give us the assurance that he will, in fairness, minimally match those other two commitments? Because, Mr. Speaker, if he is unwilling to do that, I would suggest respectfully to you that there is no purpose to this matter being further negotiated and our federal friend, foe to some, but friend to others, Mr. Axworthy, may indeed be right, that there can be no proceeding on rail relocation in the absence of this government's commitment and willingness to negotiate.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the only commitment by the city of Winnipeg is to share one-third of the total cost with the province of Manitoba, with two-thirds of the cost being paid for by the federal government. The only indication of any financing is apparently, as I read in the media, a statement from Mr. DeBane, the DREE Minister, that 25 million may be available over a period of five years. So there simply has not been any significant federal commitment towards this project, as was indicated by the federal Minister from Manitoba and the now Prime Minister of Canada, when they were campaigning during the federal election.

Mr. Speaker, on another matter, I undertook to respond to a question from the Member for St. Johns with respect to two publications which recently were on the book shelves in Manitoba, *The Joy of Gay Sex* and *The Joy of Lesbian Sex*. Mr. Speaker, as a result of a public complaint, the Crown office at the Public Safety Building reviewed these books and concluded that on the basis of their content and the provisions of the Criminal Code prohibiting the publication of obscene matter and court decisions,

that the publications were probably obscene and could be the subject of prosecution. As Classic Books Shops and Coles, the book people, were not previously the subject of complaint in respect to publications sold by them, it was decided that the Winnipeg police should advise these commercial outlets of the Crown's opinion to determine whether they were prepared to voluntarily withdraw the books from publication.

It is emphasized, Mr. Speaker, that contrary to some statements in this matter, the Crown was not attempting to act as censors of publications for sale. These outlets were given the opportunity to decide whether to discontinue the sales or continue publication and distribution in face of prosecution. These commercial outlets decided to voluntarily withdraw the books from circulation.

Apparently, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Walter Stein, a professor at the University of Winnipeg, decided to purchase surreptitiously, copies of each book from Classic Book Shops on May 2, 1980, from a clerk, without apparently, the knowledge or consent of the management. He thereupon attended at the Public Safety Building, advised that he had purchased the books from Classic Book Shops, and registered his complaint. As in the case of complaints made by any citizen, the city of Winnipeg police conducted a further investigation into this alleged sale to Professor Stein. At this time, there were no copies of either book found available for sale at Classic Book Shops, and attempts by police investigators to purchase the books were unsuccessful.

The police reaffirmed from the book store that the books were no longer available for sale. Accordingly, except for the obtaining of the books from an employee by Professor Stein, it appears that the books are not being sold by Classic Book Shops, and there remains no basis for a prosecution of the proprietor or occupier, except the particular sale made to Professor Stein by an employee, which was neither approved nor authorized by the proprietor.

It is apparent from public statements of the professor that his action was contrived to bring about a prosecution against Classic Book Shops, a company which had elected to withdraw the publication rather than deal with a prosecution. There is no evidence that the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hope the honourable member is very close to the end of his statement. It is a rather lengthy explanation of a question.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: I'm very close, Mr. Speaker. There is no evidence, Mr. Speaker, that Professor Stein has a genuine concern as a complainant that these publications offend him. It would appear that he seeks a prosecution against a third party which could lead to costs and possibly conviction, but a third party has clearly indicated it's not to be the desire of the third party, who had been prepared to remove the books from the shelves. It would appear that in many respects, Professor Stein has interfered because of his disagreement with the decision made by Classic Book Shops and would not, of course, have any responsibility for the costs or result of the prosecution of a third party.

In the circumstances, the Crown has decided that Professor Stein's complaint does not afford a proper basis for prosecution of Classic Book Shops. It is, Mr. Speaker, made clear, however, that in appropriate circumstances, the Crown is still prepared to consider prosecution of any further publication.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX: On a point of order, in view of the fact that the Honourable Attorney-General had six pages he was reading from, I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition can have equal time to reply to that statement?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I find the point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, while it is a genuine concern that we have lengthy detailed answers given during question period, it is a concern to me. I would hope that members, in answering questions, are short and to the point, and I hope that the questions are also short and to the point.

The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, the questions, I note, are at least a full page long from the Member for St. Johns. They were detailed questions and there were only two pages of an answer that I read to the House, and I suggest under the circumstances of the question, it had to be dealt with in that detail.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I was asked a question earlier this week from the Leader of the Opposition with regard to the timing of the Budget. I'd like to advise the House that barring unforeseen circumstances, that the Budget is now scheduled for next Tuesday evening at 8:00 p.m., May 13th.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for that information. It's an unlucky day, May 13th, for the government. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Finance, the First Minister accepted a question as notice for the Minister, probably the Minister now could respond. Can the Minister confirm that the federal tax which he criticized as having been levied by the federal government pertaining to liquor, wine and imported beer, in fact will result in a greater return to his Treasury in the province of Manitoba, than by way of tax flow from Manitoba to the federal Treasury?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs concerning rail relocation, and ask him whether in previous years, given his experience on council and to the present, whether it was the sum of money necessary for rail relocation that prevented the federal government from supporting the concept.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It is highly improper for a member to ask a Minister to make a comment on an office that he is not presently holding. I have to rule the question out of order.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, maybe I can re-word it, and simply ask the Minister whether the federal government's refusal in previous years, and I am thinking particularly of February, 1979, was based on a particular figure set for rail relocation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the decision by the federal government in February of 1979 was with respect to the application by the city of Winnipeg and the province of Manitoba to proceed with construction of the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass, and the decision by the federal Minister not to allow that to proceed was not, to my knowledge, in any way based on lack of funds.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Question Period having expired, we will proceed with Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ORDER FOR RETURN

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return of the following information:

Payments to provincial employees for use of private or leased automobiles in the performance of duties tabulated by the department for the following periods:

April 1, 1976 - March 31, 1977

April 1, 1977 - March 31, 1978

April 1, 1978 - March 31, 1979

April 1, 1979 - March 31, 1980

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, we have no difficulty in accepting this Order.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that an Order for

the House do issue for a Return of the following information:

The number of flights within Manitoba by (a) Cabinet Ministers and (b) provincial employees tabulated by the department for fiscal years ending March 31, 1977, 1978, 1979 and 1980 shown by (1) chartered or for hire aircraft (2) Manitoba Government Air Division.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ORCHARD: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — COMMITTEES

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, firstly, I might advise members that the Public Utilities Committee will continue to meet next Tuesday at 10:00 a.m., and Thursday at 10:00 a.m., if necessary. If they do conclude, as I expect they will on Tuesday, we will attempt to make arrangements for the Committee on Economic Development to meet on Thursday, but I will have to confirm that later, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister for Government Services, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - AGRICULTURE

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, Albert Driedger (Emerson): Committee come to order. Resolution 6.(1)(b) — the Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: I don't have too much more to say on this particular item. I know that the Member for St. George will be in in a few minutes. When we broke off yesterday, the Minister made comments in regard to a meeting that we had at Glenella with producers in that area. There were producers from pretty all the Parkland area, right up to Meadow Portage, Waterhen, and so on. The meeting, of course, was a delayed meeting, it came probably a month or two after the ranchers had been in touch with the Minister's office to try and meet with him on the cost formula. I think the main problem that the ranchers were expressing was that they didn't fully understand the formula and there was some question as to whether it was high enough and so on. That was the main concern at the meeting.

The Minister says that I did not have the intestinal fortitude to get up at the meeting. First of all I want to say that I was not invited to the meeting by the Minister. I came as an observer and as a representative for that area, and as a rancher, myself, and I sat with the ranchers and I was invited to sit at the front. I didn't feel that it was my meeting and that I should be involved. We're not in government, it's the government of the day that has to administer the affairs of government, so it wasn't my meeting and I didn't feel that I should be interfering with the Minister's meeting. — (Interjection)— Well, the thing was, we could have gone up there and had a good confrontation, that's probably what would have happened. I think it turned out to be a fairly good meeting. I know that the ranchers wanted to speak of other matters besides the beef program, but the meeting was cut down pretty short. They wanted to start asking other questions on leases and so on, and the meeting was cut short.

One of the major problems facing the beef industry at the present time is really what came out in the question period today, and that is the feed grain policy in Canada, which is really assisting eastern Canada beef producers rather than the west, and I think that's something that the Minister should be looking at in regard to the problems that our feed grain policy is causing, not only to grain producers, but also the beef industry in western Canada. We are being shafted by that program, and we have information now available to us that is quite startling, and I know that some of the members, the Member for Gladstone was saying, the quotas are too small, where are the quotas, what are the farmers going to do? But the fact of the matter is that the Ontario producers are now, barley producers are now exporting barley, and they're selling their barley on the export market and getting a good price for it and western Canada farmers are sending their non-board barley at depressed prices down east, and they're buying our barley and reselling over there. They are exporting their barley, and they're buying our barley at depressed prices. That is the problem, Mr. Chairman, with the feed grain policy that we have in place in Canada at the present time.

I know that getting back to the beef income assurance program, I know that one of the ag reps, I think he was an ag rep at that time, although I don't think he is now, and that was Ken Waddell, he was at the meeting, and he thought that the formula that is being used to arrive at a cost of production, the formula was satisfactory, but he did not think the way it's figured out, the formula was okay but each individual cost wasn't accurate, and somehow it had gone out of whack over the years. It might have been all right in the beginning.

For instance, there's been some information, I don't have that information, but I know the Member for St. George has some of that information that has been coming out on the cost of productions, costs that are not really taken in as far as the formula is concerned, so maybe there should be some adjustments in there, because I know that myself, my own operation, I figure that I have to receive 85 cents a pound for finished beef to break even. That is what it costs me now, and I'm sure it costs any rancher the same thing. Mr. Chairman, that was my

cost this year for producing beef. You can't get that for them. We got a good price, to be quite frank with you, we got 78 cents a pound for our beef, which was good. —(Interjection)— Well, it's off the finished beef, and the best you can get. Top beef, top price. Probably we got a cent or two above the market price and to break even, we would have had to have about 85 cents a pound.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: . . . pass — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. SAM USKIW: Mr. Chairman, yesterday, we were into a fair amount of discussion on the beef income assurance plan, and I was trying to complete that discussion with a request for some information from the Minister. What I would like to know is, what were the total dollars that were spent on that program over the years to date, and then what were the total dollars recovered from those who have volunteered a payback, and then what is the amount that is outstanding in the Minister's mind, pursuant to his policy, as to the payback that is still to be received by his department?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the total paid out since the introduction of the program was 41,213,823, that was the total payout under the Beef Income Assurance Program.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Pass — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I asked the Minister three questions, he answered one. The second question is, how much money did he receive pursuant to his policy of asking for some of that money to be repaid, based on the guaranteed formula?

MR. DOWNEY: The amount that has been collected to this particular date, Mr. Chairman, is 1,311,248 — these are approximate figures, Mr. Chairman — and the balance that is still owing, that is being billed for, is 1,214,996.00. The numbers of contract payers that have paid back, on a percentage basis, there is over 60 percent of the farmers have accepted the payback or have paid back their contracts with the dollar amount being just over 50 percent of the dollars recovered.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, what was the figure last year or at the end of 1979 as far as the payback is concerned? How much money came in in 1980?

MR. DOWNEY: These would be the total numbers, Mr. Chairman, on a payback basis. I don't know what else the member is asking. I indicated, I believe, the last time I was questioned on this, I suggested that the position we have taken, as it has been released in the press releases, is that they would be requested or required to pay back their 1978 billings, which were billed in 1979, and those are the totals that I have provided for.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, when did the Minister first request a payback for 1978?

MR. DOWNEY: The payback on the funds was made in July of 1979, was the first . . .

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, what I want to really know is how much of that money, of the 1.3 million, came in prior to the later policy statement of the government outlining a position where the government is prepared to allow people to opt out of the plan if they pay up their accounts? What part of that 1.3 million was already paid up before that policy announcement, which is up to April 3 of this year?

MR. DOWNEY: If I understand the question correctly, he is asking the question, how much money was paid up to that particular point, which would be July of 1979 . . .

MR. USKIW: No, up to April of 1980.

MR. DOWNEY: It would be in appropriately the same range, I would believe, as the figure I had given him, somewhat a little bit less, but I would at this particular time think it is in excess of 1 million, but not the 1.3 million that I indicated was paid to this particular time. So, in excess of 1 million.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, what the Minister is telling the committee is that most of the money that he has collected, he collected before his new policy of allowing people to opt out so, therefore, is he suggesting that his new policy is really not being accepted?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman, what I am suggesting is that the policy that we have introduced as of the earlier part of 1979 is consistent and still is. What the recent announcement has been, that the producers have the option to opt out of the program or stay with the program, and if they have paid their funds, that then in fact we had no more obligation to them, or they had no more obligation to us. I don't have those numbers with me right now, but I might be able to get them.

At this particular time, or since the early part of April, 935 have agreed to terminate their contracts with the province, of which 892 of those had already made payment to the province. So that should maybe clarify the particular point that he is referring to.

MR. USKIW: Eight hundred and . . .

MR. DOWNEY: Eight hundred and ninety-two, to be specific, had already paid their balance. The additional people that owe money to the province, we haven't got any indication from those numbers which . . . I said the amount still owing was 1.2. It's too early at this particular time to make an estimation of what percentage of those will accept the option to opt out by paying that money up, or in fact stay in the program. As I say, it is too early to estimate at this particular time. As soon as we have that indication, I can let members know.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, what the Minister is telling us is that those people who have voluntarily paid back, up to April, were the ones that have said, yes, thanks, for letting us off the hook. But those that have not paid back, of that group only 43 people have agreed to his new policy, which so far indicates that the program is not working.

MR. DOWNEY: That's quite correct, Mr. Chairman. I think that the member is saying that there are 43 that have in fact paid back their funds. I guess the other thing that we should note at this particular time is that they in fact have, until the 31st of May to make that decision, whether in fact they want to pay their funds to the province and opt out, or whether they don't. And I think it would be unfair to the farm community or those people involved in contracts to suggest that they aren't going to accept that option.

The other choice that they have is to remain within the program, and they have the ability to do that, and if they don't accept it, then the contract will continue on.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, am I to understand then that somewhere over 2,000 people have yet to respond, one way or the other, on that policy change?

MR. DOWNEY: That would be correct, in the neighbour of 2,000 people would have the — one-third have responded, an approximate figure of 1,000, or almost 1,000, and there would be just over 2,000 that would have to respond in one way or the other. But as I say, they have until the end of May to be able to.

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Chairman. With respect to those contracts that the Minister has placed in default to date, could the Minister indicate to us what procedures he is embarking on with respect to collections of those accounts?

MR. DOWNEY: If the member could be more clear on what he is referring to as a contract that's in default.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has, through his department, billed certain numbers of these contract holders over the last year or two, for whatever reason, the people have gone out of production, or whatever the reason was, there may be a number of reasons. But there are a number that he has not been able to collect from. What is his intention with respect to those contracts, where the people are not responding to his demands for payment?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I think to be fair with the farm community again, that decision on the individuals who do not respond in any way to the policy will be dealt with following the 31st of May. To be more specific, I would consider the money owed to the province the same as money owed to anyone else, that normal procedures would be followed on collection of funds.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister interpret normal collection procedures as involving

court actions should people refuse to pay these accounts?

MR. DOWNEY: Well, I guess Mr. Chairman, what the member is saying is, would these people be tested in court, or would the contracts be tested in court, and that would be the route that we would have to go. I guess we also have to point out that the contracts that we would be testing would be contracts that were drawn up by the previous administration, and the strength of those contracts would have to be tested in court.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would be prepared to table, for the benefit of this committee, a contract entered into by the previous administration wherein there is a stipulation requiring a payback at any given time, because that's essentially what we're talking about, and I would like to see a copy of such a contract. Would the Minister agree to table with this committee, a copy of such a contract?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the member is referring to the fact, would there be a cash payback, or whether there in fact would be a payback to the province in livestock that the farmer has? Under the advice of legal counsel, and people interpreting the contract as contracts because there were three of them, I believe, that was the most suitable way, and the recommended way to proceed. If the member suggests that we should have put the department's efforts towards the collecting and gathering of livestock, that we were to actually impose that kind of work on the employees to force farmers to hold the livestock on the farms until the province could get around and accept or not accept the cattle that he suggests may have been able to be delivered to the yards, or to a point of sale, I think would have placed extreme difficulties on the agriculture community.

We have considered the farmers as our marketing agents, and have requested payment to the province in place of the actual livestock, so it's been done with the recommendation or the support of legal counsel, and that is how we have proceeded. That's basically how we have had to proceed.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I wish to pursue again, the question, whether the Minister is prepared to table for the benefit of this committee, a contract which provides for a payback provision on the part of the producers, where the market price is higher than the guaranteed price. Could the Minister table with this committee, such a document?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I could table the three contracts that were available to the farmers starting 1975, if that's what he is requesting. Yes, I can table the contract.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I have a 1976 contract which I want to pass over to the Minister. I would ask him whether he would be willing to have his staff mark for me on that contract wherein there is a provision for a payback.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I would again say to the Member for Lac du Bonnet that we're dealing with not only the 1976 contract, but two 1975 contracts which we would also have to deal with. It is not one specific contract he's dealing with.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I wish to table the 1975 contract, and I would ask the Minister whether he would indicate where there is a provision for a payback?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, seeing as the member is so obliging, maybe he could table the other 1975 contract.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is talking about contracts and he doesn't know whether or not they will stand up in a court action if they are challenged. And you know, it's very difficult for me to understand how a contract could stand up in a court action with respect to a failure to pay back if that reference is not in the contract in the first place. And that's why I put the question to the Minister. I would wish to have those contracts returned, Mr. Chairman, I merely want the Minister to refer them to his department to have his expertise point out to us what section of that agreement requires a producer to pay any money back to the Crown on the basis that they have realized a price in the marketplace higher than the contract provided for.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, as I said, I will also make a copy of the third contract which is in the farm community someplace, and I'll get it out of my department, too. I'll let my department go over these contracts and provide a further explanation of the positions that were taken and the recommendations that we are taking, on a legal ground, and proceed on that basis.

I want to indicate to the member again that I think it has been a matter of looking at the future of the cattle industry, that the contracts that were entered into I am sure were entered into by the producers who needed financial assistance, that the province entered into the contracts with the intention of providing funds to help that particular industry, and now it is a matter of proceeding to deal with those particular contracts. If he is suggesting that there is no obligation to the province, then I would be unable to act on that recommendation because of the legal advice that I have received.

Without elaborating on the specifics of the items that he is referring to, I am unable to do so until I have the three contracts looked at and refer to each one specifically.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has all the documentation in his department. He has his staff here. He had them here a year ago when the same questions were posed and he was unable to provide any information to those questions. He again is suggesting that he needs to refer these back to his department for comment or opinion. Mr. Chairman, his staff are here. He has his Deputy Minister here; he has his accountant here. There are others from the department that are here who are able to point out — that's why they are here, Mr. Chairman, to assist the Minister with his estimates presentation.

The Minister is sitting here telling us that he can't ask them to point out, on a two-page contract, where such an obligation arises on the part of the producers who have a contract with the province of Manitoba.

We will not rush him, Mr. Chairman. We will give his staff some time to come up with it while we can discuss other things. But they are here.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the member wants to suggest that there is no provision in the contracts for payback to the province. I am suggesting that there is a provision in those contracts . . .

MR. USKIW: I would like to see it.

MR. DOWNEY: . . . for either cattle numbers, or a certain number of cattle to be provided to the department. He is suggesting that that is not the case; I am suggesting that it is. First of all, let me say that as far as the stock calves are concerned, that there is no provision for them to market or to provide stock calves to the province, but in fact they have agreed to supply an X-number of slaughter animals, or we have accepted that and had the farmers acting as the marketing agency for the province, that they market those animals and pay the province the difference between the average price and the support price, which is now a ceiling price.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister whether he can show us, give an example of a precedent where the debtor is in fact obligated to act as a collection agent for the party to whom he owes his debt. I have not heard of such a procedure in all of my years, Mr. Chairman. Usually if there is a collection procedure involved, it involves a third party. The Minister is asking the farmer, who owes him the money, allegedly, to be the Minister's collection agent; that is what he is saying. I don't know where there is a precedent for that, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps the Minister might enlighten this committee.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I guess when he talks about precedents and he talks about the contracts, I do not know where the MLA for Lac du Bonnet, when he was the Minister, had the authority or the right to make any changes without having a signed agreement with the producers at the same time. When he allowed them to opt out of the program, there were no signed documents or amendments to the contract. If he wants me to go back and provide all the information and the changes that took place during his time, as well as ours, I am quite prepared to do that. As I said, the formula has remained consistent; the way in which it has been administered has remained consistent, except the fact that there was a turnaround in the cattle price, and thank goodness there was, that in fact the price increased and the province was in a position of having to have funds or livestock required to be paid back by the producers.

I think it is just a matter of going through the total program, if that is what he wants, and pointing out the total thing. That, as he is well aware, could take a considerable amount of time because of the documentation that was in place, or things that had

happened during his time of administration, the same as our time of administration. Quite a lot of time has lapsed.

To get back to the point that he raises, whether in fact we have the ability to collect funds, yes, the advice that I have been given is that we do have and we have been administering it consistent with that advice.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is completely absurd on his suggestion that if there is a contract between two people placing certain obligations on each party, that one party may not be in a position to waive an obligation on the part of the other without having to amend an agreement. If the Minister owed me 1,000.00 and I wrote him a letter and said to him, You don't have to repay your 1,000, I don't think we have to enter into an amended agreement. The letter is sufficient to indicate that he no longer owes me the 1,000.00.

That's essentially what took place during the course of these agreements, Mr. Chairman. The province, which from time to time chose not to collect on the obligations of the farmers, did so by informing them by a letter. For example, there was a letter that went out that indicated that the reporting was suspended at a period of time. There were obvious reasons for that, because it entailed a tremendous amount of book work which was totally unnecessary since the province was not interested in purchasing those cattle anyway. So the reporting procedures were suspended. That doesn't mean that they could not have been reinstated subsequently. All the letter said was that they no longer have to give two weeks' notice when they wish to market their cattle. At a further date, it could have been just the opposite that, yes, the province now wants to opt to purchase those cattle and that the reporting system would have to be reinstated.

These are all areas of flexibility, Mr. Chairman, where the province is yielding its ground to the farm community. The only time you can't alter an agreement is where you are placing new demands on the other party. Of course, that is logical. I don't think anyone would argue that one can do so without a mutual agreement to alter those contracts. But where one party is giving away or yielding to the other or providing an added benefit voluntarily, for the Minister to sit here and say that, well, the contracts weren't amended to provide for that, and the Minister has fudged the contract because he has yielded to the producers on a number of areas, that is nonsense, Mr. Chairman, the kind of window dressing that isn't going to do the Minister any justice or support his arguments.

For two years now, the Minister has not been able to supply this committee with an indication of where in those contracts there is a requirement for payback. We asked that last year. He has had 12 months since then to table such a document and he has not done so. I asked him again, and he again says that he has to refer this to his department for advice. I suspect he wants to complete his committee considerations here, Mr. Chairman, without having tabled those documents and without having to respond, and to sit on that question for another 12 months. That's essentially what is being suggested here, Mr. Chairman.

Certainly it's not what I would consider to be a responsible approach on the part of the Minister. If he has a legal opinion that says that he can collect sums of money, the basis of that program, that's fine. I simply want him to show this committee under what section that legal opinion is derived from and that shouldn't be very difficult, Mr. Chairman. I don't know why this Minister can't refer the matter to his legal advisor. He's got advisors around him now, but he may need a legal opinion. He has it, he says he has a legal opinion. All we are asking in this committee is that that legal opinion be given to this committee. Under what section is it that the farmers required to pay back; under what section of what contract? That's all.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the member again suggests that they were not acting with the proper way in which we should be. I agree and if I have led the committee to believe that anything, that one partner when it was in the favor of the other partner could not do something, then I did not mean to do so.

I guess then in fact if he's using examples of changes that he had made that were or were not in the favor of the producer and could not do so without an amendment to the agreement, and he was somewhat reluctant to and suggests that the cost to production that was used by his administration, I'm suggesting the same formula is being used by our particular government and our administration, that in fact there were changes made that affected the producer and not in the best interests of the producer when he continually lowered the cost of production figure without explaining it to them. At one time, when the initial program was introduced they were using a figure of 51 cents a pound for slaughter cattle and under his administration dropped that cost of production to 49. That, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest was a change in the contract without probably mutual agreement.

Now it's a technical thing and I might not be correct in suggesting that that would have to be totally the case. I would suggest that we have administered it with the same administrator as he had been involved with. The legal counsel within the government is the same legal counsel as when the contracts were drawn up, that in fact the administration of the program has been kept as consistent as possible. The interpretation of the payback on slaughter cattle has been taken from the contracts that are available. As far as any of the technical questions on the technical administration of the contract, and I have indicated that if there isn't a payback and it is challenged, it would have to be challenged in a court of law and if the contract stands up in a court of law then the producers, which again say legal advice or legal counsel has told us that they are sound and would hold up, that we are acting on a responsible basis which, no other reason to believe that we're not, then in fact the only way that it can be tested whether we are proceeding in the way in which it is consistent would be to test it in a court of law. I am prepared to do that.

But to sit here and let's just look at what . . . we're not requesting any funds for this particular year, and we're talking of the past administration of the program, not the fact that we aren't requesting

funds for this coming year, and I think it's a matter of trying to answer questions here that would have to be answered by a court of law, instead of us sitting here trying to interpret and suggest one side is right and the other side is wrong. We are dealing with a contract; we are dealing with a program; we are dealing with three different types of contracts. And as I have said since Day One, that we have tried to work with producers who have been involved in the program. We've been trying to make it so that it has provided them with some reasonable ability to operate within and in fact the cost to production has increased. The figures used have increased to help them, not inconsistent with the formula that was used by the last government.

The fact that people getting out of the business, leaving the cattle business were allowed to opt out without payback hasn't changed any. The criteria for that, whether it be health or humanitarian reasons, hasn't changed. And I guess this is the answer to the Member from Ste. Rose in asking yesterday one of the questions he asked, do we consider that — or would I estimate whether there would be a payout this particular year. No, Mr. Chairman, at this particular time the support level and the actual price of beef at this particular time, we would not anticipate a payback to the — or a payout from the province to the producers; that in fact where the support level is and where the beef market is today, we would be looking at no payout. And that's just an estimate of mine without looking at it in more detail or projecting what the end of 1980 livestock prices would be, but all indications are that they will be somewhat above the particular level.

So to sit here and debate the actual validness of the contract, I think, is not in the best interests of the time of the committee; that we are not requesting funds to spend this year. It has been administered consistent with the last administration, and those are about all the comments I have, and as I say I think in the best interests of the total agricultural industry, it would be just as well to proceed on to the next items.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rock Lake on a point of order.

MR. EINARSON: I am taking note of the estimates here, and I fully agree and appreciate the members of the opposition, when they are dealing with taxpayers' money that they have a right and should question as to what is happening to it. But in this particular case, as the Minister has just indicated, Mr. Chairman, there is no money allocated here and hopefully there will not have to be.

MR. USKIW: We don't know that.

MR. EINARSON: The Minister has given an indication, Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order, that when there is no money involved here, I don't see why the members opposite have to pursue this matter, because we are not dealing with any money here and I suggest that we get on with the estimates, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rock Lake does not have a point of order. Using previous precedents if there is an item on one side or the

other side, it's always been allowed to debate as to why or why not it should not be there.

The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister suggests that it may be one way to find out whether or not he has the right to collect money on these accounts is to have it referred to the courts. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that's essentially what the Minister wants to have happen. In his own mind he does believe that a court action would result in a decision against the department. He would then want to be in a position to say that's because we had such a sloppy contract which was drawn up by the previous administration. That's the scenario that he is playing up, Mr. Chairman. The fact is that it isn't the contract that will be up for adjudication. It will be the Minister's policy in which case there is no reference to in the contract, the policy of asking farmers to pay back. That is what a court would have to decide upon, not on whether the contract demands it, and whether the policy of the government is consistent with the contract is the question before the court, if we have to have a court case on it.

I expect that if we had a challenge that the court would rule that the Minister's policy is not consistent with the agreement, and that therefore he should have not been collecting those funds. If that is the case, Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that is a possibility, then what is he intending to do with respect to those people who have voluntarily paid in their money. If a court case results in a decision that indicates that the Minister had not the legal right to collect these moneys in the manner that he is doing it, or whatever, then what is the Minister's position with respect to those that have voluntarily paid in? It becomes a conundrum doesn't it, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DOWNEY: It is an assumption.

MR. USKIW: The Minister says it is an assumption, but I think it is a fairly reasonable assumption, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: It is still an assumption.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister gave a couple of statements, one contradicting the other. He kept repeating that the department is the same, the staff is the same, and they are administering this program consistent with the way it was administered by the previous government, and that he said two or three times in the course of his remarks. Then he went on to say, but they violated the contract because they reduced the guaranteed price from 51 cents to 49 cents. To him that was a change in the contract that was imposed unilaterally by the department. Mr. Chairman, the Minister knows that the formula for establishing the price has never been altered, at least not by the government prior, I don't know if it has by this government, he says that it hasn't, that the only reason and logic for the change in a guaranteed price is based on the formula, and that is that if you have fluctuations in costs of production, your price will either go up or go down, depending which way the input costs are going.

I do recall, Mr. Chairman, that there were times when barley was very expensive, feed grains were

very expensive, and there were times during the course of this agreement where feed grains were depressed, the price of feed grains were depressed. Therefore that in itself gives logic to a change in the guaranteed price basis the formula that was part of the contract, Mr. Chairman. And that is the only way in which those prices were able to fluctuate, is on the basis of changes in cost and production.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister either doesn't know the program or he wants to intentionally mislead the public. It is one of the two, there is no in between. I would prefer to assume that he doesn't know the program, at least that is credible; but if he wants to mislead the public, that is his choice, Mr. Chairman, I don't consider that a credible position. He can choose which one of those is the correct one, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, what I indicated to the Committee, and the member well knows it, that I did not particularly refer to the total staff as being the same administration, that the administrator of the program is the same as when he was the Minister, the same individual, so if he is saying that I misled the public, really there was no intent or certainly no need to take that; the individual, who is in charge of this particular program is the same individual. Now as far as the —(Interjection)— The Member for St. George can laugh if he likes, I have certainly no intention to talk about misleading the public. There was certainly no misleading of the public in suggesting the person who is responsible for the program, the administrator of it, is the same.

To further discuss the point on whether or not he or the last government had the right to reduce the cost of production, if that is what the formula indicated, then that in fact is the way in which the price should have gone, was lower. I really haven't got into the specifics of that particular period of time, but would be quite prepared to if I felt that it was in the best interests of the time of our producers to do so. I take the last administration's way in which they handled it as one in the best interests of the producers, and if they felt that in lowering the cost of production was in the best interests using the formula, then I take it and leave it at that.

We get into again the question of what is the future of the cattle business, the price of calves and the slaughter cattle this fall. All indications are that using the current support price level, not the current support price level, that in fact there wouldn't be a payout this coming year. Now we all know that to predict to the end of the coming year would be somewhat a little more difficult to portray, but the best information we have has indicated that we haven't required funds to pay out, and that is all I can indicate at this particular time. If that had of been the case, if we would have been able to portray and see a need, then we would have had to provide funds in this particular allocation.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated to this committee that the department over the period of, since 1975, has paid out subsidies to

beef producers in Manitoba amounting to some 41,213,823.00. The Minister has indicated that he has received from those same producers 1,311,248.00. So that in essence, Mr. Chairman, to date there has been an infusion of capital, or a transfer of wealth from one group of Manitoba citizens to another amounting to 39,902,575.00.

I would like to ask the Minister whether, in his opinion, he can make the argument that a subsidy of 39,902,575 was an unnecessary subsidy over that period of years?

MR. DOWNEY: I didn't say that.

MR. USKIW: I would like to ask the Minister whether, in his opinion, that was an unnecessary and undesirable subsidy to the beef producers of Manitoba?

MR. DOWNEY: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: Then, Mr. Chairman, I would then like to determine from the Minister wherein lies his logic, and it is his words and they were the words of his colleagues, that the program was a disaster to the beef producers of this province? You can't have it both ways. I mean it is either beneficial or it isn't beneficial, and I would like the Minister to explain how he can tell this Committee that this was not a bad program, that it was a need that was met, and at the same time try to tell the world that it was a disastrous program. I can't understand the Minister's conflict here within himself.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I can't understand the member's conflict within himself when I read back some of the Hansards that he has talked. I don't think that we have to get into some of the statements that he made. He's referring to some of my colleagues that made statements, that it didn't help the beef industry. I think what my colleagues had indicated were the fact that it wasn't the actual money that wasn't needed. It was the way in which the program had in fact been administered and zeroed in on particular individuals that wanted to sign up into that contract or into the program for five years, that a program covering a broader group may have been more effective. I have indicated this at the beginning of my opening remarks on this particular item on the estimates, that in fact the funds that had gone into rural Manitoba had helped the rural economy. The beef industry was in need, the government of the day introduced a program in which they intended to help the beef industry. I think it's a matter of just going back to some of the comments, and I'll quote from Hansard in February of 1976, I'll quote the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet at that particular time: Now let me illustrate for my friend's edification that this is indeed a socialistic program. I don't know whether they realize that, because it has a floor below which the price should not fall but it also has a ceiling above which the participant does not realize any benefits. The extra amounts of money that happen to come through the marketplace when the market is on the other side of the ledger will flow back into the fund to repay, to some degree at least, the taxpayers who have a propped up the industry in the first place.

I read that back, because his intent was to, I'm sure, recover some of the moneys which in fact is consistent with what we're doing. I don't think we should sit here and debate whether or not it's been handled rightly or wrongly; that it has been administered as consistent as with what the intent of the program was. That's basically the point I'm trying to make, is that we're trying to work our way through the program so that the producers of this province are able to carry on the business of producing beef. Again, in reference to the Member for St. George, when he suggested in fact the program did help retain the cattle numbers. In fact, what I had said earlier, it did not maintain our cow numbers. I'll use those figures - I'd just like to get back to the figures that he referred to the other day, that's Stats Canada, that in fact our total numbers were down in the province for that particular period . . .

MR. USKIW: What period?

MR. DOWNEY: For the period of 1976, I believe it was — 1975 to January 1st, of 1980.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister recap the dates again?

MR. DOWNEY: The period as of January 1st, 1975 to January 1st, 1980.

MR. USKIW: Could the Minister give us the figures?

MR. DOWNEY: These are Stats Canada figures, the total reduction in Manitoba's total cattle population, we were down something like 15 percent. Oh, I'm sorry, pardon me, 11 percent.

MR. USKIW: That's better.

MR. DOWNEY: I'm talking total cattle population. Now these cattle could come from any other province. They could transport in to be fed here in the province or whatever. They are cattle numbers. They could be transported in, they didn't have to necessarily be produced here in the province, but we're talking total cattle numbers on farms.

MR. USKIW: On farms?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, but how do they get on farms? Either they're born on that farm or they come in on a truck, or they're trailed in, as the Member for Ste. Rose might be able to tell you.

MR. USKIW: Give us the cow numbers.

MR. DOWNEY: We look at the cow numbers for that same period - okay, we're dealing with the period from 1975 to the first - we're down over 13 percent in beef cow numbers. The cow numbers, the figures I have here, were down some 13 percent in beef cow numbers, which for that same period is a little bit below Alberta.

MR. USKIW: By how much, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DOWNEY: By about one percent.

MR. USKIW: Okay.

MR. DOWNEY: And about three percent below Saskatchewan, as an average. So in fact the program that I suggested . . .

MR. USKIW: What about Ontario?

MR. DOWNEY: It was down 29 percent.

MR. USKIW: Right. That's right. Okay.

MR. DOWNEY: So you agree with the figures. Mr. Chairman, the figures that we were referring to in my announcement, Mr. Chairman, were 1977 figures.

MR. USKIW: Oh, sure.

MR. DOWNEY: Okay, now, just let me finish my statement; 1977 to 1980 . . .

MR. USKIW: The second year of the contract.

MR. DOWNEY: No, 1977 to 1980, part of the period, when in fact producers should have been encouraged to keep their number of cows in place to take advantage of the increased cattle prices . . . — (Interjections)—

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. The Honourable Minister.

MR. DOWNEY: I believe I have the floor; that we are talking the period when the cattle prices had recovered; the calf prices were strong; there should have been an encouragement to keep the cows to produce the calves; the period from 1977 to 1980, where Manitoba's cow population had reduced by 19 to 20 percent. Okay, and those are the figures that I used, where our total cattle numbers for that period were down 15 percent. I want to make sure that the members of the committee understand the figures that were being used by both the Member for St. George and that we had used ourselves. So in fact the period of 1977 to 1980, when in fact the program should have shown that it was helping the producers, or had helped them keep their cow numbers, we lost the greatest amount of cows here in the province, compared to the other provinces, except Ontario which dropped, again, some 21 percent for that period.

Mr. Chairman, just to get back, the initial question was, why were we carrying on with having to pay back. I read out of the Hansard, and what the Member for Lac du Bonnet had indicated what were his intentions, that there would be a payback of funds.

MR. USKIW: No.

MR. DOWNEY: Well I read it, Mr. Chairman, in Hansard, that he had suggested that's what . . .

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I suggested . . .

MR. DOWNEY: Well, just a minute. I believe he said it was a socialistic program, that when it came to the other side of the ledger, will flow back into the fund to repay to some degree to the taxpayers of the province. It was his intention that moneys would flow back to the province . . .

MR. USKIW: That's different.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, he says that's different. I don't know how he can have it both ways.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to suggest, that in carrying out with the program, it's a matter of looking at the cow numbers that we have in the province; by looking at the industry - and there's nobody that raises a bigger ruckus when it comes to trying to deal with the farmers in the best way possible than the members opposite, that if they could suggest that there were other ways in which they would see this particular program operated - they've had the chance over the last two and a half to three years to suggest but they really haven't come up with anything constructive, but mostly critical.

We have suggested the reason for making the move is to allow the province and the producers to work out a new program with the federal government, and I think the Member for Lac du Bonnet agrees that it should be a federal government responsibility. I haven't heard from the Member for St. George, what his comments are in that particular area, but it's a nationally produced commodity. It should be funded by the federal government and then we don't have the distortions created between the producers, or distortions in the production patterns, where people have the natural advantage that we have here in the province of Manitoba; that on a program such as this nature, the federal government is the best body to administer it. We support that, and now if we can clear the way by allowing the producers to opt out of this particular program, then in fact that is what the intent is.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that anybody on this side is arguing against the Minister allowing the producers to opt out of the plan. I have no problem with that. If he feels that is a prudent course of action to take at this time, I have no quarrel with that. All we are questioning, is the methodology of collections that he is employing, because that was never envisaged by our government. I don't believe that it can be justified in a court of law, although I may be wrong, I'm certainly not a lawyer. I just don't believe that if it was challenged that it would be upheld. But that's my opinion, Mr. Chairman. The Minister has his own opinions.

There is no doubt about it, that when we introduced the program, we talked about five years. Maybe it should have been more than five years, I don't know, Mr. Chairman. If you're talking about stabilization, where the public is putting in some money to fill in the valleys, then you have to take off the peaks, Mr. Chairman, if you're talking about stabilization. If you are talking about total subsidy or welfare, then that's another dimension, Mr. Chairman. We were not talking about a welfare program when we introduced this program. We were saying there was potential for some recovery to the Crown, and that potential could be realized by the Crown through the exercise of an option to purchase those cattle if it chose to do so at any given time, if the marketing situation was such that it warranted that kind of action and there was a desire to do so.

So yes, there was potential for recovery. Our only point is, that I think that the Minister is going to end up with a recovery from some people who are volunteering a payback and he's not going to have a recovery from others who insist that it is not part of the agreement, and so we will have what I consider to be an unfair and untenable situation, where the Minister will not be able to legally extract from those people refusing to pay back any sums of money, while others have volunteered in good spirit and all conscience to pay some money back into this program.

That is the problem that we are posing, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure the Minister recognizes it. Could the Minister give us the figures using his 1977 calculation year, the figures for Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Manitoba, in terms of cow numbers, and of 1977 to 1980, which he was alluding to but he didn't give us those figures, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe I did, but if I didn't I'll restate them. The period of 1977-80, Ontario was 21 percent down in their cow numbers; Alberta 6 percent; I'm sorry, the numbers I have here are - 13 percent . . .

MR. USKIW: In Alberta?

MR. DOWNEY: Yes, I'm sorry, I'll restate that again, I had the wrong figures before me; Alberta 13 percent; Saskatchewan 15 percent; and Manitoba 19 percent.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, you see what the Minister is trying to suggest here is, that he wants to - in his example he's using the peak year of production and cow numbers and then showing that between that year and 1980 there was a reduction, which is true, and it was true right across Canada. What he fails to recognize, simply because it doesn't suit his argument, Mr. Chairman, is that, why did the peak arise in 1977, because the depression was in 1975 and 1976, and by all standard measure, without any program, there should have been a mass exodus, a mass reduction of cow numbers in 1975-76, and 1977, Mr. Chairman, until the market turned around.

But in fact what took place was, we were still building up our herds right into 1977, despite a depression in the cattle industry, and that is the measure of the program, Mr. Chairman. It's the period of crisis that measures your program, not the period of recovery and post-recovery, which is what he is alluding to, from 1977 to 1980, Mr. Chairman. 1977 to 1980 is a post-recovery period, 1975 to 1977 is the depression period, and we have an increase in cattle numbers, cow numbers, all numbers, from 1975, Mr. Chairman, to 1977.

So, Mr. Chairman, the credibility of my honourable friend leaves much to be desired. Window dressing is fine, providing you have a bunch of dummies on this side, Mr. Chairman, that can't see through him. Mr. Chairman, the Minister is not going to be allowed to get away with that kind of nonsense. Using his own figures, the Minister defeats his argument.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask the Minister, how many farmers have notified the department that they were selling their cattle under the terms of the contract?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, when the member asks, how many people have notified the department they were going to sell their cattle, or actually have sold, that have been a part of the contract?

MR. URUSKI: No, Mr. Chairman, I think if the Minister reads the contract, one of the stipulations in the contract is that, I believe it's two weeks prior to the shipping date, the individual who is under contract should notify the department of his intention to sell. How many producers have notified the department that they intend to sell?

MR. DOWNEY: I guess the member is referring to the fact that within the contract that he's saying that they had to notify the province. That was waived by the last administration. The way in which it has been administered by our department, they have been told that they have owed X number of dollars on the sale of those particular cattle.

MR. URUSKI: Maybe I didn't hear the Minister right. The Minister said, the provision was waived by the last administration?

MR. DOWNEY: The notification of marketing intentions was, in fact, waived prior to our coming into government.

MR. URUSKI: Completely waived.

MR. DOWNEY: That is correct. I would have to get the documentation to see, Mr. Chairman, just whether it was waived, suspended, or what the terminology was, but in fact they were told that they didn't have to report their marketings.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Minister, in his discussions last year and this year again, seems to suggest that the cost of production formula that was arrived at, that there is some suspicion that the formula is out of whack, that he somehow, is the champion of farmers, that the price should be increased, but somehow he can't do it because it was set down by the previous administration, at least leaving the impression in my mind, that somehow the cost of production formula is out of line. I distinctly received the impression from the Minister today that he is saying, look, you guys, you remember you knocked the formula down, and I don't think it's accurate, but that's the impression he's leaving, has left with me. Can he tell me whether he's done an analysis since he is certainly leaving that impression with myself, and I'm sure he's left it with farmers in the province, that although he is sympathetic to their wishes, he can't change the formula because it was put into stone by the previous administration and he's not prepared to change it.

Can the Minister tell me, has he done an analysis, and where does he think the formula is out, because I think there are producers, and I know there are producers who have done an analysis on the cost of production, and their figures vary greatly with that of

the provinces. In fact, to the point where their producers have indicated that the cost of production, in their figures, of beef, is roughly 1.00 a pound, in terms of producing beef, a substantial difference from that in the department.

I know the Minister leaves the impression that he is very sympathetic to that. Can he tell me whether he's looked at the formula, is it out of whack anywhere?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the member makes reference to the actual changing of the formula. I have said from Day One that the formula is the same that was put in place when they entered into the contract. Again, if we were to change the actual ground rules or the formula base, I would think we would have to make an amendment to the agreement. Inputs to that formula change, and we haven't changed that base formula. The inputs put into the formula have been changed, and I guess this is what the member is referring to. I haven't meant to leave the impression that the formula is wrong. It was put in place by agricultural economists, the same ones that were involved when you were in government, and the same ones as when I'm in government. Sure, we have reviewed it, but felt that it was in the best interests of both parties to leave it where it is.

Now, the changing of the inputs to that formula have been changed, and the end result has indicated a higher cost of production value after changing the input. So if I have left the impression that the formula is wrong, it hasn't been by intent, but has in fact, tried to keep the program as consistent as possible. As I say, the inputs to that formula can be changed, have been changed, and I haven't reviewed it. The Member for Lac du Bonnet mentioned that in reducing the cost of production formula when it was done under him as Minister, if that was the case, then there's no need to review it, but if we were to go back and review that particular time element, and the old figures were consistent with the way it should have been done, then it was done in the proper manner. And I haven't inferred that that was done for any particular reason. I've said the formula is the same one that has been used, is being used as when the farmers entered the program.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Minister really hasn't answered my question. I wanted to know whether he agrees that a formula is, as far as he is concerned, adequate and accurate in terms of reflecting a true cost of production, because certainly, whether he's meant to or hasn't meant to, whether it's deliberate, I will give him the benefit of the doubt that it wasn't deliberate that he has left that impression with producers and media people that somehow he'd like to change the formula, but look, it's been established in stone and we're not prepared to change it, because that's the way the previous administration brought it in.

We aren't in agreement with the program, the Member for Emerson, yesterday, I gather, said that the program was a disaster. Now, being a disaster and seeing how this government has deliberately attempted to discredit the program through its actions or lack of actions, then I suspect, and I want to know from the Minister, he has said that he's

sympathetic to the costs of production, and let's have him have a look. Has he had a look? Has he investigated some of the farmers' concerns that have been raised that the formula is out of whack? Is the formula out of line with today's costs of production, and does he agree with farmers' concerns that it is out of line, or is the formula in line?

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I have indicated that I have no reason to change the formula at this particular time. I answered that. —(Interjection)— We have adjusted it, Mr. Chairman. When I say, adjusted the formula, we have adjusted the inputs. —(Interjection)— Well, an adjustment to the formula then I would think would require some — if I were to change it, in any other way other than in favour of the producer, then it would mean a complete amendment and agreement with the producers to do that.

It operated for about three years under the — yes, we could enter into changing the program, but it has operated for three years under the last administration, which had indicated the cost of production was going down. The inputs and the turnaround and the input costs have indicated that the cost of production is going up, which is not very nice, but it's what happened, and it has reflected the actual happenings in production of agriculture goods.

Now, the Member for Ste. Rose says that it cost him 85 cents to produce beef. You have indicated, some producers have indicated that it cost them 1.00 a pound.

MR. URUSKI: Based on their formula, not on your formula.

MR. DOWNEY: Okay, some producers have indicated that 81 cents is their cost of production. It's something that changes to some degree with the different costs of inputs and we're all familiar with that. I guess if the members are recommending that we should do a review of the formula, well, the Member for Lac du Bonnet says it's too late. We're in the position of, and I've said it many times over, we're trying to administer it so it's in the best interests of the producers and keeping them in business and giving them some form of protection.

In looking at, and I'll say this in a more general term, on stabilization, and I believe this is what we have to do at this particular time, and the Member for Lac du Bonnet yesterday alluded to some of the things that probably should happen, and I have said this, and have been working in this direction. I believe now we have seen a series of stabilization programs throughout Canada on beef, hogs, the uncontrolled commodities, that in fact we have to look at all those programs and have a committee to take out the best points in them all. We've seen a federal program in place, I think we have to work together with the objective of providing a stable income. I disagree with the Member for Lac du Bonnet that we should be in a position of taking the peaks out of the marketplace for the producers. I believe that the producers, that is the incentive that they have to get a little bit extra at certain times of the year. —(Interjection)— No, I'm talking about a stabilization program, Mr. Chairman, where in fact, if you put a stabilization program in place that takes

the severe declines out of the marketplace, where in fact there's a stability for those particular periods of year, well, the Member for Lac du Bonnet says it's welfare. I do not call it welfare; I do not want to refer to any farmer as being a recipient of welfare. I think it's very much the opposite.

We've had, too long in this country, a cheap food policy, put in place and kept in place by the federal government, a cheap food policy. That didn't change any under the last administration in Manitoba. It was just a matter of trying to pacify the particular segment of the industry at that particular time to keep them away from the Minister that was in place of the day, with the intent of helping those producers but still not getting away from the cheap food policy.

So I think it's a matter of taking the stabilization programs that are in place from one side of this country to the other, for the beef industry, bringing out the positive points, and encouraging and working with the federal government to implement them on a national basis. I think that's the point we're at in Canadian agriculture production, that the producers, if they're going to be expected to stay in business, that they have to be afforded that form of stability. They have to still be given the opportunity to go out and produce for an international market, that in fact we don't want to try and take the tops off their production peaks, or the prices which they may receive, but in fact, take the severe lows out of it.

With those thoughts in mind, I think that we can and we will, over the next period of a few years, have a program that will be a long term stabilization program, not one, as the member said, maybe it should have been a different length of time, the program that was introduced by him, the five-year program. I think we have to have it so that, No. 1, the producer can be a voluntary participant, and I use the example of the grain stabilization program; it may not be as good as some people would like to see it, it's a subsidized program by the federal government. Where else is it going to come from? If that government expects you to produce food for less than what it costs to produce, then there has to be a subsidy come from the taxpayer. —(Interjection)— No, they shouldn't expect it. They shouldn't expect that people produce for less than the cost of production. Farmers will produce quantities of food if they are paid fairly and equitably for that and a reasonable return. There is no question about it and that shouldn't be taken away from them, the right to produce and to produce the quantities which they want or see as their target goals. —(Interjection)— The member says, like in hogs. At this particular time we have seen somewhat of an increase in the numbers of hogs in North America, but I think it is a very short-lived period of time that we are going to see the depressed prices in hogs that we are seeing today, because the numbers of beef were down, the numbers of the pounds of cattle that are being fed. He says it's a cycle. 1971 was the last particular period of time that we saw the hog prices where they in fact were creating problems for the hog producers. We have seen some levelling out periods in that particular time but in fact the hog surplus that I think we are in now will be very short-lived.

To get back to the principle of stabilization, I believe very firmly that the producers of the province

should be allowed to participate totally on a voluntary basis.

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

MR. URUSKI: The Minister still didn't answer my question that I raised with respect . . . I would like to know whether he considers the formula accurate in terms of the cattle prices. Does the Minister consider the formula adequate in terms of the Stabilization Program as it exists today? That's all I want to know.

MR. DOWNEY: I guess, Mr. Chairman, what we would have to do is have an update of all the inputs that go into the formula so we could make that judgement. Because of the fact that it is operating figuring on the last formula that is in place now, the cost of production that we are using, 61 cents, that is being calculated for the year 1979. We are into a new production year, 1980, and if we put some new input figures into it and it doesn't come up with some of the figures that the agricultural community, the beef producers are saying they should have, then I think it would be a matter of reviewing that whole formula. If the producers, and we won't know until after May 31 the numbers of producers that are left in the program — we may be in the position of not having to do that.

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister to table before this committee every change in the cost of production and the basis for the change since this Minister has had the responsibility of this program.

MR. DOWNEY: Just since I've been . . .

MR. USKIW: Yes.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, the member is asking for every change in the formula from . . .

MR. USKIW: No, not in the formula.

MR. DOWNEY: In the actual inputs.

MR. USKIW: In the cost of production.

MR. DOWNEY: Since when?

MR. USKIW: Since October of 1977.

MR. DOWNEY: Would he not want to see it tabled prior to that particular period?

MR. USKIW: No. I have no problem with that; I know those.

MR. DOWNEY: I just wondered if he wants the total thing.

MR. USKIW: Sure, it doesn't matter.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I would give consideration to that.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the matter has never been a secret. The formula is a public formula. I am merely asking the Minister whether he would table with this committee each change that took place since October of 1977 and how it flows from the original formula; in other words, every input cost that went up, by how much, and how that changed the formula, whether it is feed grain or whether it is twine or whether it is hay. I mean, there is a formula, and it's a base figure.

I would like to know, or get a copy of each change since that time, on every input cost that has taken place.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I can see no problem with that, from the time that the program was introduced, I . . .

MR. USKIW: It doesn't matter; I want it from 1977.

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

MR. ADAM: Mr. Chairman, on the same point, I recall that when we were at this Glenella meeting, there were a lot of questions from the floor in this regard about the formula and the costs. I asked the Minister at that meeting whether he would consider sending a copy to every rancher, and the Minister undertook to do that; he said he would. I am just wondering whether he has or not, because it was obvious from the questions that came from the floor that that's where the big hang-up was. Nobody understood the program or the formula and they wanted to know just how the inputs were arrived at.

The Minister undertook that night to provide that. That was one of the only things I asked him and he said he would do it. Since the Minister agreed to do it at Glenella, that's the same thing that is being requested now, and I'm just wondering why there would be any difficulty.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: (b)—pass; (c)(1) — the Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: I didn't want it to run away in terms of the Beef Income Assurance Program. Mr. Chairman, the members of the government side indicated in the last 1976-76 that the cattle prices in Manitoba and across this country declined because there was — at least they alleged — government inefficiencies, government programs, and as a result, there was an oversupply of cattle in this country, an overproduction of cattle and that caused the decline in prices in those years and that caused the depression. It was government programs. The Member for Emerson was one of those; the Member for Rock Lake; the Member for Neepawa — all these members continued their statements that the decline in beef prices was a direct result of governmental programs which led to an overproduction of beef in Manitoba and in western Canada; this was the direct cause.

Can the Minister indicate to me what the consumption and the production of beef in this country is. Has the department got those statistics as to what Canada or Manitoba — I know Manitoba has always been a net exporter of beef — but what

the net production of beef in this country has been? Let's take the five-year average, the same five or six years of 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, or even 10 years if the Minister has those figures, but whatever is more readily available to him, and if he has those figures handy, in terms of production of pounds of beef and consumption of pounds of beef. Or what kinds of figures are available in that area?

MR. DOWNEY: I can provide that information on a table if it will be available from the statistics. But as far as an update, the information that I have available, to this particular point in Canada — and the Member for Lac du Bonnet asked me in the House the other day — to this particular point, from January 1, 1980 to now, we are actually a net exporter of red meat. I think that's correct, the information that I have available to me, I've checked it out, that we are in a position of export at this particular time. Probably the year or two years prior to this, we have been importers of red meat, but for the last period of time, from 1980 to now, we are in a position of export out of Canada.

MR. URUSKI: That's three months.

MR. DOWNEY: For this particular year. It may reverse and we may become a net importer by the end of the year, but to this particular point in time, we have been an exporter of red meat.

MR. URUSKI: Has the Minister got — does he have those figures that I have asked him for or can he tell me, say, if he's got statistics in the last . . . When has Canada been a net exporter of beef?

MR. DOWNEY: I would have to have that information provided. I just indicated that for the last two years, we have been net importers. Now, how far back that goes, I would have to check it out. We could have been for the last period, for years, but the information I have available to me right now is that we have been an exporter to this time of this year and that for the past two years we have been importers. I'll provide all that information for him.

MR. URUSKI: The Minister has had statistics on cattle numbers going back to 1975. Would he have statistics of imports and exports of beef to 1965 in his records available to him?

MR. DOWNEY: Pardon me, 1975? Is that what you are . . .

MR. URUSKI: Yes, let's take it from 1975. If you want to go back further, it's fine with me. Let's go to 1965.

MR. DOWNEY: Well, 1975, I'll provide that information.

MR. USKIW: Let's go back 20 years and we'll see the whole picture.

MR. DOWNEY: No problem at all. Canadian information is available to anyone; I'll make that information available. It will be the indications of where we are at.

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

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I question the Minister on a number of statements of his. Does the Minister agree — can he indicate his position with respect to certain statements that have been made within the beef industry and Members of the Legislature that it has been government programs that have caused beef prices in this province and in this country to go down as a result of a surplus of production of beef in this country. Does he agree with those statements?

MR. DOWNEY: I don't know who he is referring to that made the statements, but I think in certain cases, yes. There have been certain government programs that have influenced the production of beef cattle, that have in fact probably encouraged production where in fact it has hurt those individuals. I would like to qualify this. I think that there is room for government to work, to support production and encourage it, but they have to be very careful in introducing programs that it is not false encouragement. That's, I think, the area where they get into problems, is when they have either price incentives or inputs put into their returns that aren't of natural nature or, in fact, can be removed by government and you have people built up on false props.

I think it is a matter of not having an agricultural industry that responds to false price incentives where, in fact, if those incentives were removed, then the producers get into problems.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30, I am leaving the Chair for Private Members' Hour and will return at 8:00 p.m. Committee rise.

SUPPLY — COMMUNITY SERVICES AND CORRECTIONS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 18 of the Main Estimates, Department of Community Services and Corrections. Resolution No. 27.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Sir. Did the Minister get the information on the agencies, the list of the agencies and the grants that they were receiving? I had hoped that we would have a chance to look at this outside the House before we . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that list will be ready for tomorrow morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 27, Item 1. Executive Function (a)(2) Salaries—pass - the Honourable Minister.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, if I might just take a few moments at this time. I was keeping track of the number of points that were raised by the Honourable

Members for St. Boniface, Elmwood and Fort Rouge, in their opening remarks and some of their statements and concerns that I would like to reply to at this time.

In particular, with regard to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, I appreciate his comments with regard to reserving comment at this time with regards to some of the divisions in our department, and with regards to whether or not the splitting of the two departments would provide better services to our people in Manitoba.

What I would like to comment on in particular is that the honourable member did mention something with regards to family day care that it hadn't been used in . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable for St. Boniface on a point of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of order and in the spirit of co-operation in trying to help a new Minister who is just starting, the format, I guess, it has been for the Minister to make opening remarks, and as I said when I answered him, he covered the waterfront so we did touch on some of the areas. We reply to this. Now we are going line by line, I have no objection, but it would be a lot easier for the Minister when we come to day care we'll have that, because right now we are strictly on Salaries. We could talk — I didn't interrupt him immediately, because the division of the departments certainly could be taken there, but we are talking about the Deputy Minister and Salaries now. It is immaterial to me, Mr. Chairman. I was just trying to be helpful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Member for St. Boniface and to all of the members, I was just about to make the same remarks, and I would hope that the Honourable Minister would take them in the way that they are extended. This item really is not a debatable item unless the members want it to be debated. I think that the things that were brought up in the opening remarks and the reply to opening remarks could be covered when we go line to line.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: If I am correct, we are now on 1.(a)(2) Salaries and that itself is a debatable subject, not the statement of the Minister, that is gone, but we on a debatable . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Absolutely. I will call out the item under discussion once again. It is Item (2) Salaries—pass; Item (3) Other Expenditures—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: We have gone from a zero expenditure in 1980 to 43,000, there was Salaries, 106,000 last year, what are the other expenditures for? Is that because of the . . . Department?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, as it was indicated, I believe, by one of his colleagues, it is a new office that has been established and it primarily covers — the main categories would include printing,

stationery, telephones, travelling for federal-provincial conferences and negotiations, are basically the main components of that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (3)—pass; Item (b) Social Services Advisory Committee, Item (1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: I notice there has been a decline in the amounts of dollars over the last number of years, and I believe there is one staff less than there has been in the past years. I am wondering, can the Minister advise us whether in fact this Committee is meeting less often or whether it is because there are less appeals presented to them? What is the reason for slowdown in the activity of this particular body? Because as I recall it this Committee is available to anyone who feels that they haven't been fairly dealt with, either through the province or the municipality. As I recall when we first developed it, it was to make it possible for people to appeal just rulings that very often wouldn't even hold up under an appeal, and I am wondering what the reason is for the decline in funds available and in the staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, to the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, I would like to inform — (Interjection)— I have always known him as the Mayor of West Kildonan. There actually isn't a reduction in staff man years, they are the same as they were last year. What has happened is that there has been a new incumbent who has a lower salary, that was hired at a lower salary than what the one that had the position before was earning.

With regards to the number of appeals, they are approximately about the same number as they were back in 1976, and the projected for 1980 is 350; in 1976 there was 360 appeals; 1977, 388; 1978 was 424; in 1979 was 332. I would presume the reason that there has been a reduction in the number of appeals is one that the caseload has been going down during the past few years, so I guess there is a relation of the percentage that appeal when you are dealing with cases. And also I would think it might too — and I believe it to be correct — is that we have a pretty good department that is dealing with the Social Assistance Program at the present time, and would presume that there are less people that are requiring appeal methods.

MR. MILLER: Of course, it isn't just the appeals from the department, it is the appeals also from municipal bodies as well, and if my memory serves me correctly, that is, I think, some of the greatest problems came from those appeals, but the Minister is indicating that it has pretty well held constant, some fluctuations from year to year with the peak being in 1978 — 424 in 1978, I believe it what he said, if I heard correctly.

The Minister is assuring us that, in fact, this Committee is still operating effectively, and it is available, and that people still have the right and the privilege to launch an appeal and to get an adequate hearing to assure themselves that, in fact, they are being fairly treated by a municipality or the provincial

service, and that the only reason for the decline is therefore because of a new staff man year.

Mr. Chairman, does this Committee issue an annual report? Is that distributed in the Legislature? I am wondering whether we could get an Annual Report showing the number of hearings and how many successful appeals, how many rejected, because just the number of appeals doesn't necessarily tell us a story. I am curious to know how many appeals have been rejected. Is there a pattern of rejection developing which will discourage others from appealing and will somehow tend to skew and in a sense to destroy the whole purpose of the Appeal Committee? I am wondering if the Minister could make that available.

MR. MINAKER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I can supply the official critic of the New Democratic Party with a copy of the year end report of the Committee. I think the honourable member also asked if I would assure that the people are getting fair appeals. I can assure that to the honourable member, that the Committee is working and working diligently, and will continue to do so.

In addition, I might say that it will be this Committee that will deal with appeals on the licensing of guest homes, so that it could be their workload will increase as the year goes on and might require additional staff man years at a later date, but it's pretty hard to predict at this point and we didn't want to put in a staff man year if it wasn't required and build up the department costs, when in fact it might not be that high.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister just opened up a whole new bag. Perhaps I would be out of order in pursuing it, but did I hear him correctly that this committee would be charged with the responsibility of hearing appeals from refusal for licensing, or for granting licences, either/or, or both, and in his opinion, is this really the kind of group that should be dealing with technical things such as licensing?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, it is in the bill that's before the House at the present time and I believe now it's before Law Amendments, or will be before Law Amendments, and this committee, Mr. Chairman, also deals now at the present time with licensing refusals, I believe on group homes, as well as day care centres.

I'm sorry, a correction, Mr. Chairman, they deal just with appeals on day care, where there's a refusal to issue a licence to, say, a group or actually refusal to pay a subsidy.

MR. MILLER: In that case, Mr. Chairman, then the figures we have, going back to 1976 to 1979 and projecting to 1980, I'm not sure they're comparable then because this group has therefore taken on an additional workload; or is this the appeal that you're talking about now on whether the subsidy will be paid on day care, is that a responsibility that held since the day care program came into effect? Then this would not yet affect these figures that you gave me then, perhaps in the future, yes.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, as far as I am aware, this committee has looked at the day care appeals since, I think it was 1974, when the former administration introduced day care programs. And to give the complete coverage then from that date, I have the figures if you wanted to write them down. In 1970, there were 253 appeals; 1971, 731 appeals; 1972, which peaked at 933; in 1973 it was 630 appeals; 1974 was 447 appeals; 1975, 383 appeals; and 1976, I believe you have, which was 360 appeals. And then you have the remainder to 1980. — (Interjection)— Oh, I'm sorry, 1976 is 360; 1977 is 388; 1978 was 424; 1979 was 332; and the projected for 1980 is 350.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Advisory Committee, at the time that they did look at the appeals on day care, but there were very few; in fact this was something that they pretty well started on their own and it was debatable in the department at that time if this was right. And I know that it placed the government and the committee in a very difficult situation if they were going to make appeals. It was all right when they were appealing the case with the municipalities, but when they're appealing to this board and this board answers to the Minister, and when they appeal for refusal of licensing, when the licensing is going to be done by the government, and where they're going to appeal the day care subsidy, when the government is responsible for the subsidy, it places everybody in a very difficult situation.

Mr. Chairman, when the Minister was asked by my colleague, are you guaranteed that they will have a fair appeal, a fair decision, the Minister said, they're very diligent, they work very hard. That wasn't the question as far as I'm concerned. And it is the Minister, not the committee; I am sure that the committee will try to be fair. But there is a concern now. There was a concern by some of the Conservative members before during the discussion of the estimates that felt that the people that were there were pretty soft, and now what I hear, it's the other way around, that the government changed that committee very radically, and now it is very, very difficult to get an appeal. Let's remember, Mr. Chairman, we don't need anything if the government wants to say no. They can bring proper legislation or stop certain programs. This is an appeal for the people, and these are the people that are really suffering.

So I think that what we are asking the Minister, and we can promise that we'll come back to this next year to make sure what direction do they receive. What kind of people do you have? Are they people that never had any problems at all? What is the makeup? Maybe we should have an idea of the makeup of that Advisory Committee. Because certainly, I've had some complaints; I can't say if they're right or not, but there was no point appealing because the new members on the board would turn you down, Mr. Chairman. I remember very vividly, in the discussion of previous years, when I occupied that bench there, Mr. Chairman, and I was criticized that we had a bunch of bleeding hearts on that

committee. That might be a difference between the two different parties, I don't know. But I think it is very, very important to have the type of people that will have some sympathy while being fair.

Mr. Chairman, may I also ask the Minister, I know that we were wrestling with this, we didn't come to a decision, we didn't solve it, and I wonder if the Minister has the same problem or is he in the process of solving it. I'm referring to now the welfare rates given by different municipalities, and it wasn't uniform at all, and that certainly caused problems. You had certain municipalities who used to brag that they had nobody on welfare, because they chased them away. They were so low and they made it so difficult; they'd have to appear either in front of the whole council or they didn't have much facilities during the week-end and sometimes there were emergencies, and the rates were so low. I know that we were looking at the situation. It was the same department in those days, Health and Social Development, and we were looking at the possibility of maybe taking over the welfare, the province taking over the welfare for everybody, although the administration, I think the main recommendation was that the administration would still be done by the municipalities, but pay all the cost, and then, well, Health is something else.

So I know that it was a concern. And then it wasn't really fair to the city of Winnipeg, because the city of Winnipeg was paying more, higher rates than most of the rural municipalities, and therefore these people would be chased away from the rural municipalities and come in Winnipeg, and they were part of the ghettos and so on, so I am quite concerned. We would ask the Minister to make sure himself, not necessarily, and this is not necessarily criticism of the Advisory Committee, but make sure that he has the type of people that would understand and that they always keep in mind that this is an appeal committee for these people, and that they should be human in their dealings with these people. As I say, the Minister said that it was always the same staff; no it wasn't, in our last year there were four, and now there's three. The Minister probably meant that last year, or the years since this government has been in, they've had three, but we've had four. In 1977-78, four were approved by the Legislature, by the committee, Mr. Chairman, and by the Legislature. These are the few remarks that I had on this subject.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass — the Honourable Minister.

MR. MINAKER: Just to answer the questions, Mr. Chairman, not to delay the progress. I can assure the honourable members that the board operates completely on its own, independent, and that there is no government imposition on the board at all. They report to the Minister and that's the way it stands. I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the former administration chose them as well, because that's the way the Act is written.

I would like to advise the honourable members that I have a list of the board members. I can read them out if they like or I can send them a copy of them. They are selected from throughout the province of Manitoba. At the present time there is

one space, or one member that just recently resigned because he applied for a Civil Service job and was successful, and so he resigned just this past week.

With regard to the comments on the taking over of municipal welfare assistance, at the present time it operates in the same manner as it did when the honourable member was the Minister. I have asked our department to report to me on the present administration costs that we share and to review the cost-sharing on administration costs with the municipalities but at the present time there is no intention to take over the municipal welfare at this point in time, so we still are operating in that way. — (Interjection)— Well, the cost.

I believe those were all the questions that the honourable member raised.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: The Minister forgot the main question — that was just an observation. The main question was: Are the rates uniform around the province? That was the problem that we had to deal with that was never solved, and I wonder if this has been solved at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I can't let the remarks of the Minister go. The Minister said on the one hand that the board acts very independently. From my seat I said, yes, but you name them, and he said, I believe that this is what was done before. Absolutely. That is exactly the case that I have been making. Maybe there will be a difference, then the policies will be reflected by the board. Why I am a little concerned is because I have followed them very closely and I know that some of the people sitting on this side at the time were talking about a bunch of bleeding hearts and we had some pretty tough speeches made on this. We have had some speeches, in fact, I remember a certain Member for Pembina, I think he wanted to put all the people on welfare against the wall and shoot them — it was pretty rough anyway, Mr. Chairman.

The concern that I have is that whoever is named will reflect the policy of the government. That is why I said I am holding the Minister responsible.

My question that was forgotten was: Are the rates uniform across? If not, what is being contemplated?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, the rates are presently the same as they were before but it is under review.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)—pass; (b)—pass; (c) Program Review and Evaluation, (1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of areas that this question could be discussed under. I just want to initiate it with the Minister and ask him whether he has ever given any attention or whether there has been any attention given in the department to the specific problems and needs of single parent families, whether that has been looked at from that particular angle. I don't want to deal with the dimension of day care, which is still to come, but I

was listening to some of the remarks from Tim Sale of the Social Planning Council and he enumerated a whole score of problems that are unique to the children of single parent families. I suppose these include, among other things — he threw our figures, if I can recall them — that these children would spend 80 percent of their childhood below the poverty level, or line; that they had higher rates of juvenile delinquency, I suppose they obviously would have less contact with their parents where those parents were working; that they would have special needs in regard to day care and, if I didn't mention it already, they might have greater problems in terms of problems at the school, problems of truancy and problems of delinquency. They would also have, Mr. Chairman, housing needs and housing requirements and problems.

I am simply saying to the Minister, given that this is a phenomenon of our time that there are greater and greater numbers of divorces, greater numbers of separations, that there are more working parents today than ever before, you then have a situation where you have a greater number of children being raised by a single parent as opposed to the classic nuclear family that I suppose most of us grew up in.

Given this contemporary problem and given the special needs of the children — now I am emphasizing of single parent families — has the Minister delved into this problem or does he have some portion of his department trying to tackle these special needs?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, with regard to a study, precisely on the single parent family and their special needs, we at the present time have not got a hard core study on that itself. There are ongoing reviews with regard to the mother of a family, a single parent family, in the Day Care Program, as well as in our Income Security or Social Allowance benefits. There is an ongoing review there as well as in our Children's Aid or Child Welfare Section. These all tie together.

I can assure the honourable members that the government is reviewing and is concerned with regard to single parent families, people with children, and their housing problems, and are working on that at this present time.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, specifically, and I am quoting from newspaper articles, although I am expecting to get the report this afternoon which has only been released to the media up until now and is apparently before the printers. The Social Planning Council has a statistical report on Winnipeg neighbourhoods and particularly with the problems of the core area. I am just asking as information whether this particular report, like other reports that would be turned out by these agencies which I suppose are basically funded by the province. Is this particular report in the department now or is it expected and forthcoming, and if it has been already delivered to the Minister or his senior staff, is it now being analysed with a view to action or to formulating policy to deal with the problems that it outlines and studies?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that our Deputy Minister has inquired

about the report with Tim Sale of the Social Planning Council and I understand that it is at the printers at the present and we are waiting for a copy of it and when it is received that we will review it very carefully and seriously.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, one final question here and that is these various agencies of government, I should say private agencies, who are undertaking a variety of studies and of course there are obviously a whole host of internal studies, is there some mechanism by which duplication is avoided? For example, do these agencies simply do whatever sort of studies they want and then, as a matter of routine, send them into the provincial department, or is there some mechanism by which people in your department touch base with an organization like the Social Planning Council to make sure that they are not, say, doing something that the department has undertaken by another agency? Is there some mechanism to avoid duplication or to possibly avoid studies that may not be productive?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, we work very closely with the Social Planning Council; in fact I believe they are doing a study now for the Minister of Health, or involved with the Minister of Health on maternal care and child care, infant care. With regards to other agencies that may be doing studies and reports, it's sometimes difficult to try and influence and we wouldn't want to influence an agency if they were doing a report, if we are not involved in the funding of that particular report. Quite often what will happen is a local agency, a provincial member of a national agency might receive funds from the national agency to do a specific report in our area and where that has occurred, we have indicated to them that we are maybe doing a similar report and that's about all that we can advise them on. I think we would be wrong to say, why are you doing that and stop doing it. So when that occurs that we are aware of a report that might be duplicating, we advise them that we are in fact doing a similar report.

MR. DOERN: One final question, is it a well established policy that independent agencies inform the department of studies that they are undertaking to avoid duplication at the provincial level?

MR. MINAKER: My experience to date, Mr. Chairman, is that they normally only notify us if in fact they would be gathering data from some of our departments, to get permission to talk to some of our staff or go into some of our institutions say, to gather data, then they will advise us that they are doing a report and a request for permission, then we are informed. But up till now my own experience is that's primarily the only time that we have been informed of, say, an outside agency carrying on a report that I'm aware of at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (c)—pass; (d) Offices of Residential Care and External Agencies, (1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I ran from here to here, while you were saying pass, pass, pass, trying to get your attention, and I was just wondering, do we yell out to try and capture your attention or what? I can't speak from there, unlike other committees, and I just wanted to check on one thing. Given that, I had a couple of questions on Program Review and Evaluation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the honourable member, if I see you endeavouring to get to your seat — and sometimes I don't — I will give you the courtesy of allowing you to get to your seat and hold back on passing a particular item. There is no hurry on my part to pass these items after everybody has had their just say. Would you care to speak on this other item?

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, I'd like to speak on (1)(c) Program Review and Evaluation, that was the couple of questions I had there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Fair enough, then we are on Item (c)(1) Salaries.

The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. The questions I had here, is that I looked through the entire department and I really can't determine where the planning for the department is done and it would appear that maybe Program Review and Evaluation does some of it but I see Operational Support Services, which is number (2)(c); I see something in Vital Statistics which is (2)(d). I just think it's somewhat fragmented within the department and since this is a new department, since it covers a whole range of activities, since the Minister of Health indicated that there was a concern that the Social Services and the Medical Services be linked together and there'd be a system of accountability to insure that the programs which are critical to both departments were implemented smoothly, I then look around to see where is this planning thrust? We've got the Minister's and Deputy's Salary, and there's really a small item there for a department this size, and I'm just wondering if the Minister could explain where is the planning being done.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, unlike the former government, we don't have a central planning department, as such, in this department. We have taken the policy that each directorate responsible, say for Income Security, Child Welfare or the Social Services Department, each one of these departments can develop a policy and program and present it to the Minister for consideration and this is basically where the planning is done, with those people who are dealing with the day to day problems and see right there what's happening and can come forward with policy recommendations.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson, I'm concerned with that approach, especially given the statements of the Minister of Health. He talked about the need to insure that various components on the delivery, especially when it comes to regional personal services —(Interjection)— Yes, he talked about single unit delivery, that's the phrase he talked

about. He talked about single unit delivery, that we have this means of assessing the needs or the various needs of disadvantaged people; that there is a way in which the government resources can be mobilized to deal with that individual's needs. That was the theory that we were getting from the Minister of Health when we were asking about the split in the department, where they split up the Department of Health and Social Development into two departments, the Department of Health and the Department of Community Services and Corrections. The other Minister gave us this statement that there was this general approach being taken.

An approach like that, in order to work, requires some type of overview planning position being done within the department, and it isn't. Therefore the concerns that we expressed in our review of the previous department, which in a sense were downplayed by the Minister who said these things are being done, we have this single unit delivery system in the field, those concerns become magnified when we ask the Minister well what's happening here, where's the overview planning being done? And the Minister says, well we don't really have overview planning; we just have a system whereby the deliverer of one particular program has some planning done and comes forward to the Minister in an ad hoc manner and asks for more funds or asks for some program development, or asks for some reallocation of staff.

That's the way in which things are happening in this department and it's going to happen in a very very ad hoc manner. If you have that type of uncoordinated approach and if you have a delivery system which really isn't single unit delivery, which is what the Minister of Health told us, but rather fragmented ad hoc delivery, then we fear that the costs of problems in mental health, mental retardation; the problems of people who require counselling; the problems of people who require some type of maintenance payments, that those problems rather than being dealt with will in fact magnify.

That is true when we talk about something which is just being highlighted on the CBC morning program right now, namely the whole area of child welfare and the fact that there is no way of comprehensively dealing with young juveniles who have problems and have become prostitutes, young girls who have become prostitutes —(Interjection) and boys as well. I thank the member for that correction. And to me that's a tragic situation. Obviously, the home environment isn't providing guidance. Obviously, these are lost souls at this particular stage in their life and one would hope and expect that somewhere along the line there is the government taking a look at what types of programs need to be developed to mesh together to solve the problems of those people or to at least ameliorate the problems, because unfortunately a government doesn't operate particularly well in solving problems. People are faced with problems that tend to go over one particular program and that's why you need someone in the department who'll take a problem-solving approach and see whether the four or five programs that may or may not relate to that individual's needs do so in a manner that meshes sufficiently, without gaps, so that person's needs can be met.

The individuals or the constituents, the people, the taxpayers out there, they get very frustrated when they phone government with a problem and the civil service tells them: Sorry, my program doesn't deal with your problem, phone someone else. So they phone somebody else who's administering a program and that person says: I'm sorry, my program doesn't deal with your problem, phone someone else. And that's when these people get incredibly frustrated and they say, well, I'm phoning government with a problem. Everyone agrees I have a problem but no one has a program to deal with my problem. Therefore, somehow my problem is supposed to go away.

That's why you need a group within a department as broad ranging as Community Services and Corrections to start developing an overview to determine where gaps are in the range of programs so that people with problems, be they young people who end up on the street and end up on the street again and again because there may be no long-term facility for them to stay in while they receive treatment, for example, and that's been pointed out today. So that these people don't in fact get into the correction system; don't in fact cost us a lot more in the long run while, at the same time, costing themselves any type of potential that they might be able to realize. So the cost is both to the individual, to the lost souls, and the cost is also to the taxpayers who have to try and deal with situations and problems that possibly are past the point of solution by the time these people have gone out on the streets four or five times.

I point out to the Minister that I think this is a wrong approach; that I'm sorry that they've disbanded the planning group that existed in the department under the previous administration. I think it was a very useful place in bringing together the various problems that existed within the department, for determining what the needs of the population were, and to try and come up with ways and means to try and solve those problems in an efficient, inexpensive manner. But if you have a whole set of programs, some of which were possibly developed to deal with problems that existed 30 years ago in a different context, then I think you have a fragmented system which will end up being very expensive and at the same time won't be dealing with the problems that exist right now.

Who is dealing with the problems of the young people on Portage Avenue, not to mention the young people with problems on Main Street? We know what the approach of the Minister of Health is with respect to people with those types of social problems. He says we shouldn't do anything and we should take a Spartan approach to it. We hope that somewhere within the government, and we have to then turn to the Department of Community Services, that there is a preventative approach. You know, we're talking about Community Services and Corrections, and once you reach the stage of corrections you can't do that much. Surely, within Community Services, that's the place where one has to try and develop some preventative programs. That means that you can't do it by just looking at this pigeon hole or that pigeon hole; you need some people to develop the overview. I would have hoped, for example, that the Minister would have been

receiving reports from his Social Services Advisory Committee on matters relating to social and economic needs. It's just not an appeal body.

We don't have the Minister mentioning any of these. We have these problems that are intensifying and deepening and if people want to, in a sense, put their heads in the sand and not realize that the problems in the inner part of the city are getting worse and worse and worse, then we are fooling ourselves.

I think the previous administration wasn't providing all the solutions; the solutions are very complex and difficult to provide. But, you know, we surely have problems of unemployment, and a report for the city of Winnipeg School Board indicated that there is up to 55 percent unemployment amongst parents of children in Winnipeg School District No. 1. If you have 55 percent unemployment you have low levels of income; you have alienation; you have an increase in alcoholism and other social disorders; you have a breakdown in the family. Who is supposed to start looking at that? Who is supposed to take that overview? Who looks at the employment picture in terms of its impact on this department? Who looks at some of the transportation problems? Who gets involved with groups that are trying to get together through the Community Schools Program to try and deal with these problems?

The broadest-based department is this one, Community Services. It provides a broad range of services. Surely the approach will not be to do so in a fragmented manner. I am hoping the Minister will be able to at least indicate that, if he hasn't established some type of vehicle within his department to date, that he should acknowledge that approach is too fragmented and that surely now is the time, since this is a new department, somewhat of an embryonic department, to follow the lead that was established by the previous administration and even to follow the lead of the other department, the Department of Health, which has a planning group within the Manitoba Health Services Commission; which has, as the Minister indicated, a group within the Community Health Directorate that supposedly was developing some plans to deal with some of these comprehensive problems.

We don't have that here in this department. I think if it's good for Health, which is a somewhat narrower field, then surely for something as broad as Community Services, a broader approach, an overview, is needed within the department.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the honourable member that I said we did not have a central planning group in our department. I did not ever indicate that we didn't have a co-ordinated planning approach to proposed programs, new programs, etc. There is that co-ordination between departments within our responsibility as Community Services minister. We believe that the people in the field, who are involved in each department in delivering the services are more knowledgeable in contributing to the recommendation of planning and policy than, say, central experts are. This is our belief. Obviously the honourable member doesn't agree with that and that's where we differ.

I want to confirm to the honourable member that we do have co-ordinated planning. There is close co-

ordination between the two departments through the Assistant Deputy Minister, Don McLean, and other members in the Health Department, as well our Deputy Minister and the Acting Deputy Minister of Health work very closely together on different programs and recommendations. In addition to that, when a program or planning recommendation comes forward to myself this is discussed and reviewed with our department Deputy Minister before we go to the Community Services Committee of Cabinet to deal with the situation at that committee. This is basically the development that does occur in some of our programs.

I just wanted to indicate to the honourable member, and I am wondering whether or not the honourable member is possibly mixing up planning with delivery of programs or the operational programs, because in one of his comments he started talking about the single delivery system and how it is uncoordinated and so forth. I would remind the honourable member that it was the former administration that set up the single delivery system, which is our regional delivery system, which we believe is a good one. They obviously believed it was a good one as well when they were the administration.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just one moment, please. If I could just have the honourable members' attention. I would like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery on my right where we have 27 students of Grade 9 standing from Ethelbert Collegiate, under the direction of Mr. Travis McCullough. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Roblin. I would ask the honourable members to join me in welcoming them here this afternoon.

The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is less than candid in his answers to my colleague, the Member for Transcona. We have a new Minister and we want to co-operate but we will not accept anybody trying to bluff their way through. At certain time a new Minister certainly hasn't got all the answers, but the Minister should have said, and I don't want to be too hard on him, I think he inherited this situation from somebody that felt cost first and then need second.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister should have said, We have no planning. Obviously he wasn't going to say that and I'll say it for him. The Minister doesn't understand planning at all when he says, It's people in the field, and he's talking about the single unit delivery. That is something else altogether. The delivery of programs is something that occupies these people full time. He is talking about a Committee of Cabinet. They did away and they were proud to announce that they were doing away with the HESP Committee where you had permanent staff who were doing research and planning.

The Minister is saying that professional planners are no good, that you have to have people in the field. People in the field come in with ideas, but they don't develop, they don't plan; they participate in the

planning, Mr. Chairman. You know, there is quite a difference in the system. We had the HESP Committee, which were different Ministers, then we had permanent staff within the Department of Health and Social Development; we had the Minister's Advisory Committee that was comprised of all these people, the Deputy Minister and the Assistant Deputy Ministers, and the directors of different services. Then the program was given to planners who would do some research. Ideas are a great thing, but that is not planning. The Minister has no idea, obviously, of what planning is all about.

For instance, he says that, Child Family Services, we had 21 people in that staff and they have 18. We know how many problems there are in there and it occupies these people full time, more than full time if you talk about all the extra hours that they put it. Where else can you find — I challenge the Minister to tell us where. He is talking about directors. Who, Joe Cels? I don't know if he is still there, but the agencies, he was snowed under, he had so much work to do. He was always months behind. That was a problem that we had. Where else?

This is where they said that they were going to cut extra staff. Now we know why. There is no planning. Of course, this department has tried to lower the standards of these departments. They inherited certain programs that politically they can't do anything about, so they pay lipservice to home care and day care. You know, day care, I understand that there's not even a full time — I'm not too sure, maybe one has been appointed — but a full-time director of day care. Day care is another responsibility and the delivery is something else.

Mr. Chairman, if that is the case, we have a unit, No. 2, a category there, Financial Administration Services, to the department. There is Financial Service to the department; Personnel Management, just for the department; Operational Support, all for the department. Why isn't that done by the directors?

When you come to the most important thing, the *raison d'être* of this department, you have no planning at all, and there is no planning. The Minister can stand up and bluff his way. Well, I didn't say that there's no co-ordinated planning. I am not saying that there's no ideas. People in the field come in and they see certain things and, definitely, we have always regarded them as part of the planning group that come in and tell us what is wrong with a certain program so it can be changed. But somebody has to do the office work, the research, the comparing with other provinces and the cost. The people in the field have no idea what the new programs will cost, Mr. Chairman.

We have less people there. The Minister is very very vague. He has talked about planning and he has talked about Committee of Cabinet; how often do they meet? I know how difficult it is for Ministers to meet and when they meet it is an hour or a couple of hours at the most. They are not planning; they are reviewing some of the suggestions that are made.

Where do the ideas come from, when there is a program that is suggested? I suggest that this government has these programs — this is just a thing they don't like, a political reality and they have to at least pretend to deal with them and that's what they are doing, Mr. Chairman. There are no ideas. Of

course you can have an idea that you are going to include under Medicare, for instance, you are going to have free hearing aids, or those ideas, if that's what he means, if that's what he calls planning. But programs need planning.

This is a department that is so busy; they deal with so many people. He is talking about the people delivering the service, the programs, taking care of the programs that are already in place, and they are the people that will plan. It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, they have cut down to the bone in this department. I blame the Minister collectively, as part of the government. I want to make sure that I am not attacking him personally at this time, when he inherited this mess, but it is going on all the time.

Some of the things you can see and some of the staff that they have, they have cut down, they have had to, and now in certain areas they are at the same level or even more staff than we had. But the first year they cut down and they issued a press release, you know, 1,000 employees less, without any explanation. The important thing, were they necessary or were they extra baggage. Extra baggage, fine, we'll take our lumps, but certainly this is not one of the areas, Mr. Chairman. There has got to be some kind of planning done, to work with the Ministers, to do the research. Where are people in the field going to do their research? They will find out if a program should be improved and they will make their recommendations, of course, but that is not planning as anybody that knows anything about planning knows it.

I suggest that the Minister then couldn't find this and he'll bluff his way through by saying, well, we have changed the system. You didn't change the system, you have abandoned it. You have abandoned planning because you are not interested in this. You are just doing what you are stuck with and if you can reduce it, you are doing it and, you know, we'll have quite a debate. I'm not going to start talking about home care and day care and some of these programs at this time, but we will see there who does the planning, Mr. Chairman.

I kind of resent the fact, and we're not going to let this thing go and say, yes, it's just a new kind, a different kind of administration, because this is not the case at all, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MINAKER: First off, Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the honourable member that I did not accept a mess when I took over the portfolio. The department was in fine shape and it still is in good shape.

What I might elaborate on for the Member for St. Boniface with regard to when I said people in the field, what I was describing was people such as the Director of Welfare or Income Security, Director of Child Welfare, Director of Rehabilitation, Commissioner of Corrections, and their central staff. These are the people that I was referring to, not to probation officers or not to social workers out in the delivery system. That is who I was referring to with regards to the planning input into our particular department. I recognize that when the honourable member was the Minister that he did not have a planning staff in his department, but they had their central planning authority that the government of the day had; but I would still prefer to have the input into

the planning of my department and I believe this is the way that it can be achieved.

MR. DESJARDINS: I want to say to the Minister that the Minister of the day certainly had an input, more so than now, because of the Advisory Committee, so I am not going to accept that, if that is what the Minister meant, that the Minister of the day then wasn't concerned with the planning because he had a different planning unit. He did mention the people in the field and now he is saying the directors. Can you see some of the directors that the Minister named, that they are going to sit down and have a time to plan with the administration that they have, with the full-time job that they have. They can come up with ideas, they can be part of a planning team, but they are not trained for it; they are not the people that will do the research and get the statistics, if needed, and do the comparison with the other provinces. That is just not being done under this setup.

I can tell the Minister that these people were not forgotten and I am not trying to minimize their role, but they can't do it alone, they are administrators; they are people that provide the services; they are delivering a service and, of course, through that they will see areas where they could make a suggestion that will improve. There is no doubt about it, they will see the need, there is no doubt about it.

I am not talking about the ideas. The Minister is now talking about where the ideas come from. I don't remember any of the people in our planning field that had the ideas. You know, if they were busy, they were given a certain program and they had to develop a program with the help of these people. The Minister also said that everything is talked over with the Deputy Minister. Well, anybody that has been the Minister of a department knows the work that a Deputy Minister has. It is a full-time job to keep his Ministers from getting in trouble; that is the full-time of a Deputy Minister, I would say.

Mr. Chairman, we don't accept this, we are not going to prolong this any, but we are certainly not pleased with the planning. It has made quite obvious to us that they are not interested in new programs; that they have inherited certain programs that politically they don't dare discontinue at this time. They are just lowering the staff, lowering the standard, making it more difficult to take advantage of these programs but they are certainly not developing any programs. If in their eyes that is the way it should be done and if in their eyes they are not interested in these people, well, they have the mandate, but they will certainly be called and challenged on, for instance, this lack of planning that we have.

MR. MINAKER: I will be very brief, Mr. Chairman. It is obvious that the honourable member ran his department different than I run our department, in that I feel the main responsibility of the directors are to administrate and to bring forward programs and recommendations to the Deputy Minister and to the Minister, and it is up to the Regional Directors to be out there making sure that the programs are being properly delivered to the people in Manitoba. That obviously is where we differ, with the way and the

responsibilities of the Directors of the different departments should operate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I was wondering if this is the area under which the Minister could answer my question of yesterday, in which I referred to the 1979 Speech from the Throne, in which the government promised a review of all agencies and services in the core area. We hear about the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba Review, which is under way. The Executive Director of the Social Planning Council is quoted as saying that he is not aware of any overall government study of core area agencies. When is that Review to be started or is it started; is it completed; where is it; when can we expect a copy of it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MINAKER: I believe what the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge is referring to is a review of the different services, and so forth, in the core area of the city and it is in its draft stages at the present time.

With regards to AFM, I believe I indicated to the honourable member after yesterday's debate that that falls under the Minister of Health.

MRS. WESTBURY: If this is in its draft stage, this means that all of the agencies presumably were consulted, were examined and so on, or is it an internal, an in-house review, without any consultation of the agencies that are being reviewed? Can the Minister please explain to us what sort of a review has been conducted? If, in fact, just last week the statement was made to the effect that no overall review has been conducted, what is in its draft stage, please?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, it is an inter-department report and it is a primarily a cataloguing of all the different agencies and services throughout the different departments that are provided to the inner core area, and it is an inventory to see where there is duplication or where there is lack of service, and so forth. But it is inter-departmental, it is not just specifically in this department and would be reviewed by the Community Services Committee of Cabinet when it is finally completed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (c)—pass. (d) Offices of Residential Care and External Agencies, (1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could tell us who the Director is. Is that where Joe Cels is or was and what about Dewalt also, are they both in there?

MR. MINAKER: Yes, that is the department with Joe Cels and Lloyd Dewalt in it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could make a suggestion to the Minister. I think that now that the Office of Residential Care has been

established, that was something new at the time, I wonder if it wouldn't be advisable to separate them. They have a full load. I think the Offices of Residential Care looks at the standards, develop the standards, and the rates and so on given to the group homes, and they are also doing the licensing now of these homes, and now they will be responsible for the licencing of guest homes; whereas, the other part of that department was working with the agencies, the different agencies, to try to look at their budgets and also make recommendations as to the amount of funding that could be done.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that it should be two departments or at least in two different lines. There is two directors in this office. There is one of External Agencies and one of the Residential Care. As I say, with the added work that certainly will be given them, I wonder if we could not have next year, if the Minister can take that into consideration, to see if we could have two lines for that, because everything is mixed up and it is very difficult to know what the staff is doing. For instance, maybe the Minister can tell us now what the — there was a staff of 22 last year with one vacancy, now there is 23 with 4 vacancies. There is less people with an added load. Could the Minister tell us how many of those work for the office of Residential Care and those that are working under Joe Cels for the External Agencies?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to advise the honourable member that the offices are separated, they are just coupled here together. They are divided.

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I understand that; that is the point I was trying to make. My suggestion was, would the Minister consider dividing this on paper also when we look at the assessment, because they are two different things and there is different staff and a different role altogether. This was at the time where the Officer of Residential Care was just starting and there was the same people doing the work; we created the Office of Residential Care, and we had all the added responsibility. It is a suggestion that I make to the Minister.

MR. MINAKER: Yes, we will gladly accept that suggestion, Mr. Chairman, and have it divided next year.

For the information of the honourable member, the External Agencies Branch has 11 SMYs of the 23, and the Office of Residential Care has 12. — (Interjection)— Yes, 11 for External Agencies Branch and 12 for the Residential Care.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I notice there is a difference in the description which is printed in the Estimates Book this year compared to last year. Last year they also had to do accounting for Use of Public Funds by External Agencies, that has been dropped this year. Does that signify anything; am I reading something into it that I shouldn't be? The fact that it

was deleted from the wording, I am wondering whether, in fact, the same body isn't doing the accounting for public funds, or is there another group that is doing it as well?

While I am on my feet, I notice they are going to be developing the standards of licensing in residential care facilities. Does that mean they are going to licence and inspect as well, or are they just going to be developing the standards, writing the standards, or are they going to be also involved with inspecting them?

MR. MINAKER: Primarily, Mr. Chairman, firstly, to answer the honourable member, if he notes in the Estimates Book that, I guess it is the second last line there, it says, and accounting for the use of public funds. That applies to both.

With regard to his last question, it deals primarily with the co-ordination of the inspection and the licensing. As the honourable member knows, in the case of inspections in the city of Winnipeg, the city of Winnipeg's Health and Fire Department does some of the inspections, but we don't physically do them, we co-ordinate them. So it is primarily dealing with the co-ordination of the licencing and the inspection.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: I wonder if this is an oversight. Under the explanation in the book that we have, it has manages departmental relationship with External Health and Social Services Agencies. Is that a mistake, should the word Health be struck out? Are the agencies now the responsibility of this Minister, all the agencies that are receiving grants in the field of Health?

MR. MINAKER: I guess it is an oversight; I guess that should come out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (d)—pass. We will not be passing Resolution 27 because Minister's Salary is still to come.

Resolution 28, Clause (2) Financial and Administrative Services, (a)(1) Salaries—pass; (2)—pass; (a)—pass; (b) Personal Management Services, (1) Salaries—pass; (2)—pass; (b)—pass; (c) Operational Support Services, (1) Salaries—pass; (2)—pass; (c)—pass; (d) Vital Statistics — (Interjection)— On the last Item?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, please.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are on Item (c)(2) Other Expenditures — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: I just want to confirm. That, of course, Operational Support Services; this is just strictly providing the service to the department, to the personnel of the cars and the department and the space for offices in the department?

MR. MINAKER: That is correct. It does such as that, administrative studies of group and computer services, space vehicles on communication program

and statistics branch, that basic backing. — (Interjection)— No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I notice the 100,000 increase in salaries over the last year's print. Does that reflect an increase in staff, or what would account for it, because as I see it, the funds for the drug standards and therapeutic committee have been deleted from this particular (c) section, and so I'm wondering what would account for this increase?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, it relates to two items, one is general salary increments and increases, and the other is, there was one SMY transferred from the Accounting Services, and then there was clerical SMY transfer from the Vital Statistics Branch, so there's an additional two SMYs and that, basically is the increase of the salaries.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Formerly, this is why I asked the first question, Mr. Chairman, formerly it also included support service relative to fee and service negotiation with various professional associations. Is that done now with the one that we were talking about or is that still done by this group?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, that's done in Financial Services Branch.

MR. DESJARDINS: This is what we're talking about, Financial — the Financial now deals with the outside agencies, Financial is not just dealing with the department, or is that done with the outside agencies, what was it, the Residential Care and External Agencies?

MR. MINAKER: They do the financial review for Joe Cels, external agency.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I notice there's an amount recoverable from Canada of 228,000 which is a substantial increase from the previous year. Does Canada contribute under CAP to the salaries of these people, and because the salaries went up, this accounts for the federal increase?

MR. MINAKER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2)—pass; (c)—pass; (d) Vital Statistics (1) Salaries—pass; (2)—pass; (d)—pass. Resolution No. 28—pass. Resolve that there be Granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding 2,847,200 for Community Services and Corrections, Financial and Administrative Services, 2,847,200—pass. Resolution No. 29, Clause 3. Community Health and Social Services — Regional Operations (a) Administration (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (3)—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I notice a sharp drop in the Professional Training. Is that because of the split in the department that occurred, or what would account for that kind of drop from 25,000 down to 10,000.00?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, basically, I think it was 25,300 last year, it wasn't used the last year and it was cut back to what was thought to be a realistic figure. It was estimated last year and it just wasn't used, so rather than fudge it, it was put in at the actual estimated amount, and hat, as you know, was used — well, I'm sure the member is familiar with what it's being used for.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (3)—pass; (a)—pass. (b) Regional Personal Services (1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think that this is probably one of the most important items under the Minister's jurisdiction. I would like the Minister to give us some explanation, maybe before we go into this, some of the work being done for the panelling, not the panelling, I guess the panelling is done under the Minister of Health, but some of the work being done for personal care homes and home care is done by this work. Could the Minister give us a breakdown, he has 715 people in this department now, can we have a breakdown, would the Minister take it slowly, because I like to write it down, of these people, and maybe he can give us a word of explanation what they do also while he enumerates them.

MR. MINAKER: I'll go very slowly. Firstly, I'll give you the staff breakdown. As the honourable member knows, there are eight regional directors; there's 180 public health nurses; there are 14 community health workers; there are five public health educators; there are 83 child and family service workers; there are 106 mental health and mental health retardation workers; there are 21 vocational rehabilitation workers; there are 4 services to the aged; there are 66 home care workers; 12 home economists; 36 miscellaneous services staff, these are non-classified secretarial type; and then there are 138 administrative support; and 35 term, which would be for holiday relief spaces, for a total of 708. And then there's 9 new SMYs — there are 4 community health workers and 5 public health nurses. And they will be all Public Health Nurse II and there will be one in the Winnipeg region, one in the EastMan region, one in the Parklands region, one in the NorMan region, and one in the Thompson region.

The community health workers, 3 will be in the EastMan region, and one in the Interlake region.

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

MR. PARASIUK: This is the appropriation that really provides the direct contact with individuals through the regional offices. I believe that, what are there, 7 regional offices? 8 regional offices, each staffed by a director, and each providing, not only these particular services, but I would think some of the other ones through home care and child and

family and a number of others, and this is the section that was supposedly implementing all the general plans laid down by the community health directorate within the Department of Health. I note that there has been really no increase in this appropriation. We have a tiny appropriation of 1.9 percent, which, again, if you take into account inflation, it's probably a real decrease in spending of 8 percent in this appropriation which the other Minister said delivers the health care that we felt wasn't being delivered in a sufficiently comprehensive manner when we talked about the other Minister's estimates, and he said, well, when you get into regional personal services and community health and social services, the regional operations, this is the section which provides for that type of comprehensive delivery that we talked about. I can't understand why we have the reduction in this area if this is the area that actually provides the direct field contact with the citizens of Manitoba, because the items talked about, social services, public health nursing, family planning services, home ec services, vocational rehabilitation, child and family services, mental health and mental retardation services, these are all vital, critical areas delivered at the regional level, through now, I guess it's 8 directorates. We have a real reduction in spending here and given inflation, I just can't understand that. I just can't understand why that's taking place.

Indeed, if you look at it, I think what's increased has been the amount recoverable from Canada, that has increased, so that really, the province is cutting back in this particular area, and again, using the provincial funds.

Can he indicate to us what was recoverable from Canada last year in this item, and what it is now, and why the province is showing such a low priority to an item which the other Minister said was critical to the effective delivery of a comprehensive medical and social service approach to health care?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if the honourable member was in the House when I gave the additional staff that's included in this year's department or not, but the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has that information. The reason why it looks like there isn't that much difference in the salaries in moneys allotted is the fact that this figure for 1980-81 does not include any allocation of salary increases in that figure, that will come later on in the fall, whereas the 1979-80 figure he's comparing to includes that increase from last year, and if the MGEA agrees to the proposal that's being put forward — I understand it was in the paper, that indicated some 9, 9 1/2 percent increase — then we would have to increase that figure by 9 1/2 percent to find the actual adjusted vote figure which will occur later on in the year.

The other thing is that all the spaces are allocated for in this figure I assume that they'll all be filled and are filled for the total year, whereas in the 1979-80 figure could be the turnover, there may have been 2 or 3 percent vacancy rate, but the prime difference is the fact that the salary increases are not included in this year's figure and would therefore increase, as I indicated by 9 1/2 percent.

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

MR. PARASIUK: I'll wait until we get to that item, with respect to Recoverable from Canada, yes.

MR. MINAKER: I don't have that particular figure handy, but we'll get it for the honourable member.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think at one time we were trying to help some of the people, we had new careerists and I have noticed that the Minister hasn't given a number, unless they have been transferred somewhere else.

Another thing, the Health Officers were in this. Now is that under the Department of Health? I imagine the Health Officers are under the Department of Health, but do they work with this group? Certainly the Health Officers are needed to deliver this service. How does that work; can the Minister explain how this works? It might be that their salaries are provided for under the Minister of Health.

MR. MINAKER: To answer the last question, Mr. Chairman, the Medical Health Officers still work as they did in the past. They have been transferred on paper and they report to the Minister of Health. I believe there are 9 at the present time.

With regard to the New Careers, all of the four Community Health Workers that have been hired are New Careers people, and I believe there are another 14, making a total of 18 at the present time. I can get that information for the honourable member if he wants. By region, the Community Health Works, who are the New Careers people, there are 3 in EastMan, which I just had indicated to you. —(Interjection)— Yes, these are all New Careers. Of the 4 I mentioned, 3 are in EastMan and 1 is in Interlake, which he has already got written down, I believe. —(Interjection)— No, 4 out of 4 are New Careers, yes. Parklands has 2; NorMan has 6; Thompson has 6, for a total of 18.

MR. DESJARDINS: Am I to understand that these Community Health Workers are all New Careerists?

MR. MINAKER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Whatever it was that was passed back and forward in the last couple of shots, I think we missed because I didn't identify the speakers. If you care to have it on the record . . .

The Honourable Minister.

MR. MINAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface asked if all of the Community Health Workers were New Careerists and my answer to that question is yes.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister explain — there has been a division of departments — could the Minister explain the role of these people, the 66 that are the Home Care Workers. What is their role; what do they do, and if there are any of the staff that are involved also for either the panelling, or helping in the panelling, or

visiting the people that are asking to be panelled to go into personal care homes, could the Minister explain that also?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, in Home Care, the social workers, we have 21 in Winnipeg. We have 23 public health nurses that are involved in home care in the Winnipeg area. In the rural areas our public health nurses deliver that service for home care and they are to review and analyze individuals, or couples, in their home to see if they are capable of receiving home care or whether they should be panelled and listed for personal care. This is their primary responsibility.

MR. DESJARDINS: When the Minister said personal care, they receive personal care, does he mean the personal care institutions or home care? The Minister indicates that he means the institutions. So they are doing the panelling, then, in the rural area and if I understand it right, there are some people under Home Care — I didn't get the number, I'll get that later — and 23 public health nurses that are helping with the panelling in the city.

Mr. Chairman, I am quite concerned because in an area where — I remember the last year, and this met with the approval of all of the Members of this House — we felt that we needed more public health nurses. The Home Care was a program that was getting started, that had been in existence for just a few years and the public health nurses that were needed in the field then were assigned a responsibility in Home Care. In 1976-77, Mr. Chairman, there were 191 public health nurses. Now, even with the 5 new ones, there are 185 and I don't know how many vacancies we have in this. I wonder if the Minister feels that this is enough. It seems to me that the program will need more public health nurses than that. There was such a demand for them and we are now giving them more and more of a responsibility in home care. In fact, there are 23 that are doing just that in Winnipeg. I wonder how many of the others are helping out at some time. Who replaces these nurses? Does the Minister feel that we have an extra number, that we had too many health nurses at the time, or is there a shortage? Is the Minister ready to hire more? Is it that there is a shortage of public health nurses, or what? I think that this is quite an important item, probably the most important item there, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I would think probably that we could use a few more health nurses. I don't know the numbers but there were, I think, requests for some and we were able to get 9 staff added. One of the things that has improved to some degree, my understanding is that one of my objectives as a Minister is not to have things be delayed on my desk or on my Deputy Minister's desk with regard to vacancies in the department, and I did make a promise to some of the Regional Directors that I met that I would do everything within my power to approve the re-hiring of vacant positions as quickly as possible and I understand that with that method we are eliminating the numbers of vacant spaces. The present vacancy rate is, I believe, about 5 percent so that with close attention now we have eliminated a lot of the vacant spaces and that

relates, obviously, to the public health nurse situation as well.

MR. DESJARDINS: I would like to understand this, Mr. Chairman. In the item that we are considering at this time we have 717 staff man years. The Minister also gave us the information that there were 35 vacancies, of those 717. That's not bad because there is quite a turnover.

Now I am asking about the public health nurses. The Minister apparently had 180 last year because he added at the end, he added 9 more and of those 9, 5 were public health nurses. I would imagine that if he needed 5 more, then there wouldn't be too many vacancies in the public health nurses.

Can the Minister tell me how many of these 185 staff man years are vacant?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, at the present time there are 34 vacancies in the Community Services and Corrections department and 15 are public health nurses; 12 Public Health Nurse II; 2 Public Health Nurse III; and 1 Public Health Nurse IV. I might add, they're all being filled as fast as we can get them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour is 4:30. I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and I will return to the Chair at 8:00 o'clock this evening in Committee.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We are now under Private Members' Hour. On Thursdays we deal first with bills. We have one bill, Bill No. 44, an Act to amend The Medical Act standing in the name of the Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I'd ask that the bill stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed) Then proceed with Resolutions. We have Resolution No. 15.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could wait a couple of minutes until the other committee comes into the House. I notice the House is very sparsely occupied at the moment. The other committee members aren't here yet.

RESOLUTION NO. 15 — USE OF SEAT BELTS

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed? (Agreed) We're now under Private Members' Hour. The resolution before the House is the Use of Seat Belts standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. George, and he has 10 minutes.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In taking part in this debate I wanted to direct a few remarks to the Minister of Highways. He's coming into the Chamber, Mr. Speaker. I'm certainly pleased that the

Minister is here and I don't see him wearing his helmet coming into the Chamber, because I am certainly disappointed to say the least, at the comments that we have received from the Minister of Highways in terms of his position with respect to whether seat belts should be legislated and whether or not, not only seat belts, whether the use of helmets should be legislated in the province of Manitoba.

This Minister of Highways, to say the least, would have to be dragged screaming and kicking before he would see the problem or the situation with respect to the benefits that would accrue to motorists and to the public of Manitoba in general if the use of seat belts were to be legislated. Mr. Speaker, the Minister gave statistics and said that, well, most accidents happen under 30 miles an hour and so there is basically no need for seat belt use, Mr. Speaker.

I wanted to give the Minister some personal experiences that have happened to very close friends of mine in the last year-and-a-half from my home community. It just occurred just north of Winnipeg on Metro Route 90, wherein six people lost their lives in a split second as a result of a head-on motor vehicle collision. They were riding in a van, Mr. Speaker. It happened that those people were travelling at the going rate of speed and a vehicle approached them, it happened to be a semi-trailer truck, but just the truck not pulling a trailer, and he, I guess, jammed his brakes; the highway was slippery to some degree and when he jammed his breaks his vehicle slid into the other lane with no chance of getting out of the way. Everybody in that vehicle, every passenger in that vehicle was not tied down. They had no seat belts on. As a result, Mr. Speaker, one family, virtually the entire family was wiped out. Four people were killed; a father, mother, and two children were killed. The father and one child were in the front seat and the rest of the people were in seats in the back but no one was tied down. As a result, those four people died and a mother and a child also died in that accident.

When you looked at the van and the damage that the van incurred as a result of that collision, the front was damaged. There was no doubt about it, severely damaged, but the van was not crushed to the point that one could say that everyone had to lose their lives.

But what had happened, Mr. Speaker, is those people who were in the seats behind the front seat, and even, I would venture to say, the way the van collided with the oncoming truck that the child who was in the passenger side, had he been strapped in, may have survived the accident. I will not say that he would not but certainly his chances of survival would have been greater. The other people who were in the back seats, Mr. Speaker, were thrown around that van, and I can only relate an example of putting a half a dozen eggs in a big cardboard box and then just shaking it, and that's precisely what happened to the bodies of those people in the van. They were thrown around in the van as if they were as loose as an egg in a box and they were just mutilated as a result of the impact.

I don't want to leave the impression to members of the Chamber that I'm trying to bring this out as a very emotional and very disheartening situation. This is but one example, Mr. Speaker, of things that do

occur and if we can impress upon citizens of this province that the use of seat belts is a good thing and should be worn, chances are that the majority of motorists will abide by the law, as they are doing so in other provinces, that the use of seat belts should be worn by the majority of motorists and really should become law because most people would then of course abide by the law and there would be savings in terms of lives.

The Minister of Highways in this province has indicated that he does not want to tamper with the freedoms of the motorists involved, in terms of their freedom of choice, whether they were or were not. Mr. Speaker, by that kind of an attitude portrayed by a Minister of the government, of saying he does not want to tamper with the freedoms of individuals. Mr. Speaker, we as a society have to bear the cost and the burden of those people who are injured and possibly injured to the point where they are quadriplegics, that we will have to, as a society, look after them for a lifetime through our Medicare system, through our Health and Welfare system, that if they're involved in an accident whereby they may be crippled for life, we as a society are and will be paying those costs.

Mr. Speaker, what kind of freedoms do we have? Do we say that we should be able to be free and burden everyone in society, or the majority of citizens in society, to pay for our stupidities in terms of not using seat belts? The same thing applies for helmets, Mr. Speaker. Do we in society say that it's okay for that motorcyclist to get on his bike, throw his helmet off, smash into a car or get thrown off the bike and smash his head into a curb, because the majority, the statistics are very clear that the majority of accidents and injuries on motorcycles and motor bikes are as such that head injuries do occur.

Now there are arguments, granted, on the reverse, on both sides, that there can be an instance where an individual will claim that, had I worn those seat belts, this may not have happened to me. But, Mr. Speaker, when the Minister has all the officials and the data at his discretion in the Motor Vehicle Branch and he can ask his Assistant Deputy Minister whether or not the majority of accidents that are reported, that are investigated not only by his branch, by the University of Manitoba, are as a result and could have been lessened — the injuries in those accidents could have been lessened by the use of seat belts and by the use of helmets.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Minister reconsiders his ill-advised statements that he has made on this issue, that he not be so adamant and that the expenses that we in society bear today in terms of the health care costs of those people who are injured in those accidents, that we as a society are much more mature so as to be able to say to society, yes, we shall govern ourselves; we shall govern ourselves and try and reduce the cost to society, try and reduce the injuries and the hurt and the loss of life to society in as many ways as we can.

One of the ways, Mr. Speaker, is for the Minister to screw up his courage and throw away his ill-conceived feelings toward what the actual situation is and look at what the situation has been in areas that have adopted seat belt legislation, have adopted helmet legislation and move in a very forthright way to bring the legislation to the House, not debate the

resolution. Let's see if the Minister has safety in mind. He talked about safety in the Highways committee and he talked about his interest in safety but is he prepared to do something. It appears by his statements this Minister is not, Mr. Speaker. At least he should bring the item forward and have it debated in the Legislature and see whether or not he can gain the support of the members of the Legislature in this respect. But he hasn't even got the guts to bring that measure forward, Mr. Speaker. At least Ministers previous, both Conservative and NDP in times previous, were prepared to bring the issue forward, have it debated, and if it did not pass, at least they tried. But this Minister isn't even prepared to do that, Mr. Speaker. I urge him to reconsider his position, to bring the legislation forward and see whether or not the majority of members in the Legislature are prepared to listen to the debate, hear public representation, and proceed with the legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. LLOYD G. HYDE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have listened with interest to the debate that has taken place on the belt legislation, whether there should be compulsory or non-compulsory legislation in the province of Manitoba. I have had, like most of my colleagues, considerable correspondence and discussions with people both within my constituency and also with people from outside of our constituency.

Medical doctors, Mr. Speaker, most doctors, I believe, are asking for the support on this issue, but certainly not all doctors. Not all doctors want to see compulsory action taken on this issue. The doctors in favour, I have to say, are putting up a very good argument but let us not lose sight of the fact that there are also many arguments put up by people who have a strong argument against the use of seat belts of any kind.

Mr. Speaker, there is a strong argument put forth in favour of the seat belt and there is also strong evidence that seat belts are not the answer to many deaths resulting from car accidents. The message I am getting from the majority of the people is, do not try to force me to buckle up. Mr. Speaker, elderly people are saying to me, they are saying to me that no legislation will make me wear a seat belt while riding in my car.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. George related just a moment ago of this tragic accident just north of the city claiming the lives; I believe he said the entire family. He claims that this may not have happened had they all been wearing seat belts but he has no definite proof, no definite proof at all that this would be the case. He has said that those people, had they been wearing their belts, could very well be alive today. Mr. Speaker, that may be the case. We have no proof of that, whether it could be or could not be.

However, Mr. Speaker, I want to read into the record of this House a letter that appeared to the editor of the Winnipeg Tribune Wednesday, May 7th of 1980, headed: Seat belts would have killed us when car went into deep river.

I would like to respond to Joan Friesen's letter to the editor of May 1. As an almost victim of a fatal car accident two years ago where seat belts would have been a definite hazard, I would like to express my concern over the compulsory seat belt laws.

In our experience, that is my husband's, our daughter's, her friend's and myself — all four of our lives would have come to an abrupt end had we been wearing seat belts. Thank God that we were free of that restriction and therefore lived to tell the tale.

We would have been wiped out had we been wearing seat belts — completely submerged in seven feet of water, with automatic door locks and windows winds, upside down in a current in the middle of a river in North Dakota. Without assistance from the 'guy upstairs' and my husband's strong will to live, there is no way that any of us would have made it.

No matter what the legislation, my husband, daughter, her friend and I will never wear seat belts, and we are certainly convinced that everybody should have the right to make his own decision in this regard.

Signed by Doris M. Burns.

MR. DOERN: Would the member submit to a question?

MR. HYDE: Following my remarks please. The message I am getting from the majority of the people is, don't force me to wear seat belts. Mr. Speaker, statistics are indicating today that deaths on our highways are on the decline. If these facts, Mr. Speaker, are accurate, and I don't doubt that they are, I suggest that the reduction of the number of deaths on our highways will be credited to the reduction of the speed that many of us drive our cars on the highways today.

So if a driver on our roads wants to live he would be well to take and reduce his rate of speed.

Mr. Speaker, I want to relate to this House of a car-train accident that occurred a few years ago west of Portage la Prairie. This happened while I was employed by a funeral parlour and I attended this accident. I will not go into details of the accident, but I want to relate to this House what the medical doctor said to me. He said, That man could very well be alive today if he had not been wearing that seat belt. Now, I could take and relate to you, Mr. Speaker, the circumstances of that man's death, but this is not the place to do so. However, the doctor did say that man, if he would have been free of that car, not wearing a seat belt, he would have been thrown clear on the impact.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that the outcome of this accident, or any accident, could very well be quite different, but there is always that doubt. Encouragement to our driving public to drive safely is our motto. We will continue to encourage the public of Manitoba and those who are from outside of our province, who are using our public roads, to use their seat belts. These seat belts are installed by the manufacturers of our automobiles, they are put there for our protection. We will continue, Mr. Speaker, to urge the travelling public to drive carefully. It is their own lives they are dealing with, we will continue to urge the use of seat belts, but not on a compulsory note.

Mr. Speaker, I will move, seconded by the Member for Springfield, that the resolution be amended by striking out all words after the first Whereas, and substituted thereafter, the following words:

WHEREAS the wearing of seatbelts is considered by several health and safety organizations to enhance vehicle occupant safety in certain types of accidents;

WHEREAS only four other provinces have compulsory seatbelt legislation;

WHEREAS Manitoba has the second lowest fatality rate in the nation;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the province of Manitoba continue its comprehensive safety programming; and also

BE IT RESOLVED the various safety groups, both private and public, in the province of Manitoba be encouraged to continue their successful efforts in the promotion of safe driving in the province; and

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that this Legislature encourage the voluntary use of passenger restraint systems by our driving public and that the Minister of Highways and Transportation further monitor information available as to the effectiveness of compulsory seatbelt legislation in the jurisdiction with the same.

MR. SPEAKER: It's been moved by the Honourable Member for Portage, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the resolution be amended by striking out all words after the first WHEREAS, and substituting therefore the following words:

WHEREAS the wearing of seatbelts is considered — there may be a minor problem with sentence structure here, but I don't think you want two Whereases together, but I think that's only a minor correction that can be made and with the permission of the House I would make it.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Would it be in order to ask a question of the member? I believe he agreed to submit to a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I just wonder if the Member has any examples of — first of all, just a couple of questions. Did he get any complaints from elderly citizens or constituents about being forced to wear seatbelts on airplanes and also, did he get any examples from people on planes whose lives were saved in a crash because they weren't wearing them? Does he know of any examples where someone could attribute the saving of their life to not wearing a belt while the plane crashed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, no, I have to say that I didn't receive any complaints from the elderly people in that respect. However, I would suggest to him that

the numbers of senior citizens that are riding our airways of today are not in comparison at all to the number of people that are riding in their private automobiles today. He must be ready to admit to this House, I'm sure, that senior citizens, for the most part, would have very much difficulty in establishing themselves to the wearing of seatbelts in their own automobiles.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, could the honourable member distribute some of the — oh, I understand. I wish members, when they are moving amendments would have copies here for other members. At least we would be able then to discuss with some sense the resolution that is before us, and I think it is only incumbent upon members, if they are going to move amendments to resolutions, that they do have at least five or six copies available as a matter of courtesy to other members of this Chamber, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I suppose that I should get used to standing and speaking to amendments which are intended not to support nor clarify the position put forth by the original resolution, but rather to dilute the impact of it and also to, in some small or greater way, destroy the intent. I'd just like to address myself to some of the comments that the Member for Portage made when introducing his amendment and that is in respect to the illustration he gave that not all doctors are in favour of seatbelt usage, or mandatory seatbelt usage, and that may well indeed be the case, without going into specifics. But one must remember that their professional association, that their professional group, in either a concensus or a majority opinion — I'm not certain which one — made the statement that they were indeed in favour of seatbelt usage, mandatory seatbelt usage, and while there may be the detractors within that group, I think if we are going to base our arguments on their opinions that we are better off to base our arguments on the opinions of the larger group, rather than one or two specific detractors who may have their own reasons for not wishing the seatbelts used. The member also said that only four other provinces had found it necessary to impose mandatory seatbelt usage. Well, I would just refer to the statement made by the Member for Elmwood in his introductory words and he said that 80 percent of the population are, indeed, under legislation of this sort. So I think that's a significant factor that may not have been one that the member was thinking of when he introduced that particular statistic.

I have to admit that I was not certain today whether or not I was going to enter this debate at this time because I do believe that it will go on for some time, being an issue of a somewhat contentious nature. But having heard the presentations from the Member for Portage and the Minister of Highways, I believe it is necessary to clear the record in certain instances; to answer a

number of their allegations, or their charges, or their innuendoes and, finally, to put my own thoughts on the record because I believe that is an important function of any and every legislator in this Chamber.

I'd also like to, before getting into the bulk of my address, just refer to another statement that the Member for Portage made and that was the fact that in many instances seatbelts may have a negative impact, rather than a positive benefit. I think he referred to or implied that could be in the case of cars being submerged. I believe he read a letter to that effect. I'd just like to read to the member from a Transport Canada Road Safety Report called The Human Collision and it says basically that a study of belted drivers, who were killed in motor vehicle accidents in Ontario between 1972 and 1975, found that very few died in a car that burned or was submerged in water. During this four-year period, 175 belted drivers died in traffic accidents. Of these, only three died in burning or submerged cars. In the period, 1973 to 1975, no belted driver died as a result of fire or water. And the reason for that, according to this report, is that when you are in an accident of that nature it is very important that you remain conscious so that you have the ability to escape. It doesn't take very long to unbuckle a belt and get out. It takes quite bit longer time to regain consciousness after banging yourself silly on the windshield or being thrown from the front to the back, or hitting yourself on the steering column or the dashboard. So the fact is that while there may be cases, and I don't refute the fact that there may be the odd instance where someone believes that their life was saved because they didn't have a seatbelt on, the logic, and also besides the logic, the record very plainly states that it is more important to remain conscious and that you have a much greater chance of surviving the impact even if the car does start on fire or even if the car does become submerged, if you are conscious.

This type of resolution — speaking to it in a general sense — tests the ability of us as legislators, Mr. Speaker, because there is no perfect position, there are no good guys on the white horse and bad guys on the black horse on this, it's an issue that transcends partisan politics; it transcends the differences that separate us in this Chamber. It's an emotional issue to a certain extent and the Minister of Highways referred to the fact in his remarks that it is an emotional issue and I agree with him. But besides being an emotional issue, it is an issue that there are some fairly substantive facts that we can reflect upon before making our decision. So, in spite of those facts, the fact does remain that it is an emotional issue and the bottom line will be one of belief. We will throw our statistics back and forth as we do perhaps too often in this Chamber, but the bottom line is that it's going to come down to a matter of personal belief and how we interpret those statistics. There will be those — let there be no doubt about it — who will try to confuse the issue. They will play upon the emotionalism without providing us with the facts to back up their emotional opinions; they will provoke rather than discuss. We will hear again, as we've heard many times in this Chamber, the one big argument, the one big seatbelt argument, put everybody in big seatbelt, protect them from cradle to grave, socialist

philosophy, restrict. It's just a continuation of their one big farm, their one big oil company, their one big challenges that flow every time we discuss an issue of importance in this Chamber. So we will hear those. We will hear the one big seat belt argument and that it is an imposition on individual freedoms, that you can't make me buckle up. The Minister referred to it briefly in his remarks. He said I believe we should encourage and we are encouraging our drivers to use seat belts for their own safety but I believe we should leave it up to the individual to determine whether or not he should use it himself.

On the surface, the argument sounds logical. On the surface, the argument sounds presentable, that we allow them the choice to fly out at 50 miles an hour through their windshield and bounce along the concrete like that pumpkin we've all seen in the commercial. We allow them the choice to be a pumpkin; we allow them the choice to be an egg, as the Member for St. George said. The fact is that the argument, while superficially correct, Mr. Speaker, does not bear up under much scrutiny. The freedom to bang themselves silly in an accident is not the type of freedom I believe the Minister meant to imply; it is not the type of freedom I think his government is pursuing.

But I have to address myself to another comment made by the Minister, and also I believe made by the Member for Portage, and that is that there are negative side effects to using seat belts. So we have the positive benefits and the positive benefits are great. The positive benefits of wearing seat belts are well-known but we are not going to force people to buckle up because we know that as well as positive aspects there are negative aspects. There is a contrary side to the equation. The fact is that superficially, again, the Minister's logic does have some validity, superficially, and I am not suggesting by that he is a superficial Minister, I'll allow opinion to be formed by others in this room, but I am suggesting his arguments are superficial.

First he said there are safety measures that don't have any negative aspects to them; and he mentioned hard hats, safety glasses; I assume he would throw safety shoes into that category, life lines, all sorts of other safety measures that he believes do not have negative aspects to them. Well I have to inform the Minister, having worked in industries that demand that type of personal protection, and having also had that type of personal protection mandatory within the industry and valuing that sort of personal protection.

I don't mean to have my remarks interpreted as being negative towards it but I do want to point out, the fact is, safety glasses, for example, may fog up on you when you come inside from being outside working, if you're working in a mine or a mill or if you're working in an area that demands you travel from an outside condition, which is cold, to an inside condition, which is warm. There's also the argument that safety glasses restrict the vision to the sides. That's an argument I've heard, because as a union steward in many of these operations I had to, from time to time, suggest to my co-workers that they wear the safety glasses; that they wear the hard hats; that they wear the safety shoes, and I've heard all the arguments against them. I've heard all the arguments against them, so the fact is, contrary to

what the Minister would have us believe, there is no one perfect, foolproof safety measure; it does not exist, seat belts included among them.

So superficial argument, yes, but it does not again bear up to close scrutiny. What we have to do, and the Minister knows, this is what we have to do, because he's in the position of having to make decisions from time to time, we have to weigh the risks, we have to say this is the positive side of the equation, this is the negative side of the equation and we have to analyze it and we have to conceptualize it and we have to apply our knowledge to the decision we will have to make. Are they in fact, more positive than negative? I think the Minister will have to admit that the good in the use of seat belts outweighs the bad aspects that may accompany them.

The Member for Elmwood says ten to one, 100 to one, I'm not certain of where he derives those figures, but I do know the benefit of wearing seat belts is substantial in comparison to those negative impacts that may occur.

I have to address myself to one particular illustration the Minister provided us with and that is someone being thrown out of their car. He says, We also have certain accidents, although these are in the minority, Mr. Speaker, where either the passenger or the driver has been saved by being thrown clear of the vehicle. Now, I will admit, and these are the Ministers' words in his presentation on April 1st, I will admit there are accidents where the passenger or the driver being thrown clear has been killed, but there are accidents where their lives have been spared by being thrown clear of the vehicle.

I'll read to you again from the report I referred to earlier from Transport Canada. It said that about one-quarter of all passenger and driver deaths result from being thrown out. Is that what the Minister is talking about? Being thrown clear of the car, he says. They refer to it in a different phraseology which would lead one to believe there is a different perspective on the problem. They refer to it as being thrown out. One study estimates about 80 percent of these deaths could have been prevented if the person had stayed in the car.

So what's he telling us? He's telling us that people shouldn't wear their seat belts so that they can be thrown out of the car and be subjected to more risk of injury and fatality. If one doubts that argument for one minute, one can only look at the comparison of automobile accidents and motorcycle accidents. Why do motorcycle accidents usually result in such severe and oftentimes fatal injuries, in a much higher percentage than automobile accidents? There's nothing to protect the driver. The driver is automatically thrown out, each and every time, and that's why you have the significant difference in the frequency and severity of your accidents. So that does not, again, bear up under close scrutiny. The Minister's personal opinions may be exactly that, but when you analyze them you will find out that neither in theory nor in practice do they have much validity.

The fact is when seat belts are used properly, they are an effective and efficient safety measure and the Minister should be aware of that. I think the Minister is aware of that, he just doesn't want to admit it; but the fact is every study that has been done in any detail has proved that to be the case.

Let me refer to a very specific study and a very detailed study, one done south of the border recently by the Department of Transport, the 1976 Highway Needs Report. That committee made this categorical statement, and I would like to put in the record, Since the effectiveness of seat belts is so great and almost all cars now have these belts installed, it could be said that the country's greatest highway safety need, above all others, is for a counter-measure program which will achieve higher belt-wearing rates by car occupants.

That's what the resolution from the Member for Elmwood refers to. That is exactly the intent and the substance of that resolution. So I must support it because it is not only my opinion but it is the opinion of those who have studied this; it is the opinion of the experts that mandatory seat belt usage will result in fewer accidents.

This committee, by the way, it was a blue ribbon panel, had 103 highway experts on it and they studied 200 possible safety measures and they narrowed the list down to 37 control measures that were potentially high pay-off control measures. At the top of the list was mandatory seat belt usage. By the way, the next most cost-effective measure cost 20 times as much to implement per life that it would save, as did seat belts. For the information of the members opposite and the Minister, a 55-mile speed limit, which they refer to, was 42 times as costly in that instance.

I would like to close, Mr. Speaker, by suggesting the Minister stand and that the Minister set the record straight that he is not, by his examples of the fact that there may be potentially harmful side effects to the use of seat belts, suggesting people don't use their seat belts because that's what those kinds of irresponsible statements do. Those kind of statements from the Minister and from the Member for Portage and there will be others who make them, can only encourage people not to use their seat belts. The fact they refuse to implement mandatory seat belt usage can only encourage people not to use their seat belts; can only call in to question the effectiveness of seat belt usage, and I believe they want to be a better government than that. I believe the Minister does not want his impressions to be misinterpreted by the public, so I would hope he would take that opportunity to set the record straight. I would hope he would take the opportunity to once and all affirm his belief and his considerations in this regard that he believes seat belt usage to be an effective, an efficient and a proper way of implementing better safety conditions on our highways, and I hope he takes that opportunity, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amended resolution as introduced by the Member for Portage, I would like to say, in supporting this resolution, that the Minister continue to monitor the situation and to encourage the voluntary use of seat belts, that I believe that is in the best interests of the people of Manitoba that be the route which he should proceed.

I think probably, as the Member for Churchill has indicated, that the fact that it is somewhat of a philosophical area in which both sides are debating, that in fact I firmly believe the people of this province should have the responsibility; that where it's in the best interest of their own health and well being, they should take on the responsibility of ensuring their own safety.

I would also like to say I believe the seat belt legislation, as far as the compulsory aspect of it is concerned, I feel is something that has not, and I say has not, discouraged or has not decreased the rate of accidents in other parts of Canada, as we have seen the indications in the resolutions that Manitoba still has the second lowest of fatalities in the country; with four other provinces having compulsory seat belts, that in fact we can pride ourselves in having a better record than the other provinces of the nation. But I think in fact it is the principle on which are debating. —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, the Member for Elmwood says Let's do better, and I agree. I think there are other ways that we can do better, and that is through the methods that the Minister has been proposing, that this government has been proposing. I think that in the long term, through the voluntary, through the educative system, that we in fact will encourage the use of seat belts and in fact if the result is to have less accidents, less fatalities, then in fact it will work. But the actual fact of introducing a compulsory aspect to the use of them I do not believe is the answer.

I'd like to further say that, as the members have mentioned around me just a few minutes ago, the fact that the members opposite had some eight years in which to introduce compulsory seat belts. In fact, if they felt that strongly about it, they could have put in place. I would say I'm wondering why at this particular junction they feel so strongly about it. Have things changed? —(Interjection)— The member says two-and-a-half years, but have things changed that much since they were in government.

Mr. Speaker, I believe again, that it is a matter of principle, that people do have a responsibility; they have the responsibility to protect themselves and they have the right to choose whether or not they want to protect themselves. I'm sure I sympathize with those people who have been in a situation where wearing a seat belt would have prevented them from being injured or in fact sympathize with those families who have lost members of their family because of the lack of use of seat belts, but it has been debated here this afternoon and will be debated long into the future whether in fact one particular accident, with a seat belt or without, would have happened differently in the reverse situation. That I'm sure no one will ever be able to determine because those situations really can't happen in reverse because it's too late after the actual accident happens.

I think the other thing is, and let's just look at it on a practical basis and I think we should look at it in the basis of when people get into an automobile to go to a particular place, long distance drivers, I do not believe, have demonstrated their irresponsibility. In fact, the more miles that people drive the better drivers, I would say, they are, the more practised they are and the more ability they have to cope with

certain situations. They're very, in most cases I would say, defensive drivers.

I believe, and I don't have the statistics, but I would think from some of the conversations and some of the people I've heard speak on these particular issues, that the majority of accidents happen very close to the home in which people live, whether it's their business or whether it's their residences. And I would think that if they were to say, if they were going a very short distance, the majority of times that they were travelling those short distances they say, why bother because I'm only going a certain distance, and would not take that additional time to buckle up, so to speak.

Mr. Speaker, whether in fact there were compulsory seat belt legislation in place or not I really don't believe that it would, in fact, force those people to save their own lives. I believe that they would abuse that law the same as they would abuse another law, unless there was some mechanism, and this could be in fact . . . —(Interjection)— Well, I'm sure we have a very efficient Attorney-General. I would feel that probably the people who build cars or the people who have input into the mechanization of transportation today, if they in fact built an automatic system that would, in fact, force you to put that particular protective mechanism on, then in fact if that were the case, if you were forced to by a mechanical measure within the car or a mechanical instrument, then it would be forced useage. I do not believe it can be done effectively by trying to interfere with the rights of that particular human being. So I support the amendment and do not support the compulsory part of the resolution as introduced by the Member for Elmwood.

I have, Mr. Speaker, a certain concern when we start to talk about compulsory use of seat belts as it refers to drivers of automobiles. I can foresee the day when we may be having to introduce it, or the member opposite would be suggesting we should have it on combines, tractors —(Interjection)— Horses, yes, even horses the Member for Lakeside suggests, we may have to go that far.

I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that the farm community have indicated an irresponsibility as far as the actual operations of machines but in fact the accidents that happen on farms usually happen when farmers get off the tractor seat when they shouldn't, not in fact whether the seat belt would hold them on, but I think it's a matter of getting off and doing something to a machine that's in operation, or the mechanical parts of that machine, which in fact they get entangled in.

I guess, Mr. Speaker, the other point that I'd like to make in speaking to this resolution and I think it's an important part of our driving in this particular province, that we continue to use and support the breathalyzer mechanism of controlling accidents. I think that is probably a far greater and better method of cutting down the fatality accidents or the accident incidents. In fact people who are driving automobiles are driving in the public domain and they should have their full senses about them and not be under the influence of alcohol or other drugs. So I think that, Mr. Speaker, has far more significance and importance to it than the compulsion of seat belts but in fact . . . We have a continuation and I fully support the breathalyzer

control measure as far as drinking and driving, and it is compulsory because a larger number of people use alcohol, I'm sure, or abuse it, than use it for medicinal purposes.

Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, I support the amendment to the resolution and would suggest that all members of this House do so, to further encourage the better education system of people that we expect to use them, but not to impose restrictions on the freedom of those particular people. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there is much to be said on both sides of this resolution and I think that the very fact that we have been debating it in the House, or resolutions analogous to it, for many years would indicate that it's not because of some bad motivation or some lack of sincerity or some obtuseness on the part of one group in the House, and sincerity and wisdom on the other side of the House. Both sides of the House have been divided on this question. The argument, Mr. Speaker, that is made mostly by people who don't wish to see this type of legislation is made on behalf of those who say that they don't want the state to impose conditions on them unless it is absolutely necessary. It is the argument, Mr. Speaker, that we treasure individual freedom and we fear state control. Whether the argument is right or wrong in any particular situation, Mr. Speaker, I don't like it being ridiculed.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Member for Churchill's argument. It may be that he's right. It may be that there is more sense to the position of requiring compulsory seat belts than there is to the position of opposing it. But there is, Mr. Speaker, rationale, sincerity and seriousness, I submit great seriousness. It's one of the most serious kinds of questions that can come before any group of people who exercise power over others and that's what we are talking about.

If I was satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that the wearing of a seat belt is not only necessary to the safety of the individual who wears one, but to others, I would vote for it in a moment. I have not yet been convinced. People have said, well, the guy who doesn't wear a seat belt and he gets hurt, we have to pay his medical bills. On that basis, Mr. Speaker, we should outlaw many more things before seat belts. I mean, we should outlaw cigarettes long before seat belts because cigarettes put more people into the hospital and we pay more money for the care of them than we do with regard to seat belts.

The argument that going on the road requires a person to take care of himself in a way other than he himself would be willing to do if there was no law, is merely an argument, Mr. Speaker. It is not the end-all. I cannot say that I sat on the government side of the House for eight years and rejected that position because I was stupid. It wasn't because I was stupid. It's because there is a problem involved.

I spoke yesterday about an interesting submission that was made to Law Amendments Committee by — not by a doctor, who was it? — a lawyer named Howe, who took this position on the receiving of a

blood transfusion. He said we, the state, say you must have a transfusion. By the way, I've been party to that. I still think that despite Dr. Howe's arguments that we are right in the limited cases that we use. But, Mr. Speaker, there is an argument; it applies to the seat belts and it applies to the helmets, and it should not be ridiculed. It can be posed, it can be argued but it should not be ridiculed.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. When this matter next comes up, the Honourable Member will have 17 minutes.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Minister for Government Services, that this House do now adjourn and resume in Committee of Supply at 8:00 o'clock.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning (Friday).