

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, June 9, 1978

Time: 2:30 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): Before we proceed, I should like to introduce 25 pupils of Grade 5 standing from Shaughnessy Park School under the direction of Mrs. Gail Steen. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Inkster. On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. It deals with a report in the Winnipeg Free Press dealing with the matter dealt with by the Minister of Labour in yesterday's exchanges regarding her Estimates. It deals with the matter of the relief of Mr. Goodison from his responsibilities, and in particular it deals, Mr. Speaker, with a matter that I think is of grave importance as far as the operation of the Civil Service is concerned. Mr. Goodison is quoted in the article as saying that he was never aware that any oath was required, and he said that furthermore — he is not quoted — he said that Goodison said he was never required to take an oath; secondly, and I quote, "I was never aware that any oath was required."

Mr. Speaker, I think that in the interests of the Civil Service and the interests of the integrity of the people that are involved in this case and in the Civil Service, it's important to point out, and I'll table the oath which Mr. Goodison was required to take when he took on this job. It's dated March 8, 1977, and it reads: "I, James Vincent Goodison, do solemnly and sincerely swear that I will faithfully and honestly fulfill the duties which devolve upon me as an employee in the Government Service of Manitoba, and that I will not ask or receive any sum of money, service, recompense or matter or thing whatsoever, directly or indirectly, in return for what I have done or may do in the discharge of any of the duties of my office, except my salary, wages or other moneys to which I may be lawfully entitled, and that I will not, without due authority, in that behalf, disclose or make known any matter or thing which comes to my knowledge by reason of my employment in the Government Service of Manitoba, so help me God." Mr. Speaker, that's signed by him, and I table it, Mr. Speaker, so that the doubt is eliminated from the parties that are involved in this report and to point out that there is a degree of integrity that is undertaken by a member who joins the Civil Service; that included Mr. Goodison.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster on the same point of privilege.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. On the supposed point of privilege, because Mr. Speaker, by no stretch of anybody's imagination has the Minister of Finance raised any point of privilege. Mr. Speaker, the Estimates of the department are before the House, the Minister is making a matter of privilege as to how a former Deputy Minister is quoted in the newspaper and I submit that that is not a matter of the privileges of the House. As to the issue itself, the Estimates of the Department of Labour are before the committee, the committee will be meeting in a very few minutes, the Minister could make whatever explanation she wants to, Mr. Speaker, and if there is a supposed breach of confidentiality or breach of oath, that is something that the government is able to deal with. But it is not a question of the privileges of the House or a question of personal privilege of any member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance further on the point of privilege.

MR. CRAIK : On a point of order dealing with the matter of privilege. It is a matter of most serious House privilege, most serious House privilege, Mr. Speaker, when the rules and regulations that are set by this House are so seriously flaunted as what has been done in this case.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Inkster with some further

advice to the Chair.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would appreciate your taking this matter under advisement and seeing how a Deputy Minister is quoted in the newspaper becomes a matter of privileges of the House with regard to his performance as a civil servant or anybody else's and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is not a matter of House privilege, that the House is not involved in this at all. That is an argument between the administration and one of its previous civil servants, not a matter of House privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns on the same . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm inclined to raise the matter of House privilege. I am concerned . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the Honourable Member for St. Johns is raising another matter, I think I should dispose of the present one first before we deal with another.

I believe that on numerous occasions I have pointed out to members of the Chamber that articles which appeared in the newspapers are not, in my opinion, a matter of privilege. Whether it is correctly or incorrectly reported in the newspaper, I do not believe that that becomes a matter of privilege of a member to take up the time of the House. I think the member has a proper means to go to the newspaper and demand a retraction from the newspaper and therefore, I must say that in my opinion it is not a matter of privilege that the Minister of Finance has raised at this time.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. FOX: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may change the name of the Honourable Member for St. Vital to the Honourable Member for Burrows on the Public Utilities Committee which will be meeting next.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreed - ? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on second reading on Bill No. 14 — the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to join with the others who have already participated in this debate on this particular bill. I find it a bill that although it deals with three specific tax measures, three specific tax reductions I guess among other more minor adjustments, it is a bill that I suppose gets at the very heart of differences between the Government of Manitoba of today, the government of the Conservative Party of Manitoba and the opposition, Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

As the Minister of Finance has stated, the principle of the bill, and I am quoting, "Is aimed at rekindling both investor and consumer confidence in Manitoba." And the principle I presume is, that if we reduce taxes, then some very beneficial effects will occur, that the province's economy will be activated, that jobs will be created, that unemployment will be lessened, and that our standard of living will rise. Mr. Speaker, I only wish that would be the case. I only wish that this would be so, because if it were, I could rise on my feet and support this particular measure. But I am afraid that the taxes that are being proposed for reduction are either insignificant in one sense, or in another sense, simply will not do the trick that is required to stimulate the economy.

I believe the Minister in his support of this bill, reminds me of Freedman, the economist, who has the view that we should reduce government spending as much as possible, reduce taxes, and let the market economy go on its merry way and let the market decide what shall happen. Let the market make up its mind as to which areas of the country will grow, and let the market decide how jobs shall be created and so on. Well, unfortunately for the Province of Manitoba, our circumstances are such that I believe that the market economy has let us down and will continue to let us down, and for any Minister of Finance to suggest in the introduction of this bill, or in support of similar measures, that by reducing taxes that we're going to have increased private investment, I simply say that any suggestion along these lines will simply not hold water. I suggest that in the months and years ahead, this will become very obvious to all members of the House.

A very specific suggestion in this bill introduced by the Minister, was that there shall be a retail sales tax reduction, and of course this is in keeping with the federal government policy of attempting

to stimulate the economy and through an agreement between the province and the federal government, we see the sales tax reduced as it is now in effect. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, if it has any stimulus at all, it will have stimulus on the so-called big ticket items, that is the electrical appliances, the electric stoves, refrigerators, washing machines, dryers, and so forth, the television sets, the automobiles, and so on. Obviously there will be some stimulus in the sales of these particular products. The only unfortunate thing about this is that these items are not produced in the Province of Manitoba.

None of these big ticket items that I offhand can recall, are manufactured in this province of ours. They are either manufactured in central Canada, or they are manufactured in United States, some place in western Europe, perhaps Japan, goodness knows where, but unfortunately they're not manufactured here. And so while there may be a stimulation of factory production, it will not create jobs in our factories unfortunately. So I say although a reduction in retail sales tax may have a stimulating effect in central Canada, where most of our industry is located, it will certainly have a minimal, if any influence on manufacturing activity in the Province of Manitoba.

Of course, the other factor is that this is a temporary reduction and while we may see an increase in some retail sales in the summer months and the early fall, once the tax goes back up again to 5 percent or wherever it will go up to, we will see the reduction, I would submit, Mr. Speaker, a reduction in retail sales.

I would point out, of course, that we have to recognize that there are seasonal influences and at some times of the year, of course, we have higher spending levels than other times, such as at Christmas, but I would submit that this can be taken account of. We can so-call de-seasonalize the figures, take the seasonal influence out of the figures and look at them, and I would submit on doing that, that we'll see a reduction in the level of retail sales in the Province of Manitoba, and again, among these so-called big-ticket items, automobiles, appliances and so on.

The two-point reduction in personal income tax which, according to the Minister, is to restore the competitive balance I presume, between Manitoba and some other provinces where we're presumably competing for industry; again, I would suggest that this is not critical in bringing about additional investment in the province. The evidence speaks for itself, not only in this regard of the two-point reduction in personal tax, but also with regard to the reduction in corporation income tax facing small business. This is the other item that the Minister referred to in this bill, the major item. I would say neither of these are going to bring about any significant expansion in investment and industry.

Most of the significant investment that we have is not caused by the very small family size enterprises, small investors that may benefit by this particular taxation. I would suggest that most of the significant investment occurs by large corporations, national corporations, international corporations who are not really concerned with this type of tax manipulation. I say that it's up to the Minister of Finance, it's up to the government, to prove and to substantiate how this is going to restore the competitive balance, how this is going to bring about more manufacturing jobs, more industrial jobs in the province. Where are the examples? Show us, case in point, how this is going to stimulate industrialization of the province. How are you going to bring about more jobs? We have had great statements of faith, great statements of philosophy, but no concrete examples, no statistics, no hard facts to indicate concisely, clearly, that the two-point reduction in personal income tax or the reduction in the income tax for small business, is going to have a specific beneficial effect. We all desire a t, beneficial effect, but I submit very regrettably, that this is not going to be the case.

So I say that this bill perhaps strikes at the basis of the philosophical difference between the government and the opposition, between the Conservative Party and the New Democratic Party of Manitoba, the reduction of taxes to stimulate private investment. As I said, the reduction is really not that significant for the low income earners, but also the middle income persons — it is not that significant — a two-point reduction in personal income tax is not very significant.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Finance and the government will be disappointed in the months and the years ahead when they look at these figures. The private sector in contrast, I would say, Mr. Speaker, — I put the opposite case — that the private sector is suffering because of the cutback in government spendings. It is suffering because of the cutback. There are many many enterprises in Manitoba, small, medium sized and indeed large, whether it be the Rolling Mills at Selkirk, whether it be metal fabricators, whatever the industry. There are many many industries that are stimulated because of government spending and not to recognize that, Mr. Speaker, is not to recognize how the economy works. And if the honourable members think that all government spending is barren and meaningless, well I say they are under a deep illusion, and I'm sure they've got more intelligence than that, that they do realize that government spending can be stimulative of the economy, it can be beneficial to the private sector regardless of the benefits of the public spending itself. And I suggest that we're going to see in the months ahead that the private sector will continue to lag and indeed one of the reasons it's lagging right now is because some of the

manufacturers and others who have supplied goods and services because of government spending are finding a reduction in the demand for their services, a reduction in the demand for their output.

The Royal Bank of Canada in an article as quoted in the Globe and Mail early in May, on May 11th forecast a rather gloomy outlook for the Province of Manitoba and this is a survey that was published as I said in May. It was research done this spring and they say, as quoted in the Globe and Mail of May 11th, that Manitoba is expected to grow at a slower rate than the country as a whole over the next two years and there are other figures that they quote and generally speaking they don't paint a very bright picture for our economic future.

Similarly the Conference Board in Canada has issued reports and I'm not going to read or quote these statistics, but again Manitoba's future does not look that bright. Also, in the Financial Post you can read articles if you wish on Manitoba. People in this country are aware of what's going on in Manitoba, they are indeed aware of a governmental change, they are aware of tax changes such as being proposed in this bill, but even though they're aware, they're still prepared to predict a very gloomy economic outlook indeed for our economy. I can talk until I'm blue in the face to my honourable friend the Member for Minnedosa or is it the Minister of Public Works about deficit spending. This is a big no-no . . . —(Interjection)— Well at least the honourable members opposite are interested in this subject because as I say, it strikes at perhaps the very philosophical difference between members opposite and members on this side. They're so afraid of deficit spending. Well, nobody wants to see deficits, obviously not. No, who wants to see a deficit if you don't have to have one, but you know, governments are forced into deficits and I would repeat a statement I made a couple of weeks ago where the Honourable John G. Diefenbaker when he was Prime Minister of Canada, during most of those years the government of Canada had a very large deficit and these deficits of course were caused because of the depression that Canada suffered during the Conservative years, and I'm not suggesting for a moment it was because of the Conservative government. I'm suggesting that the Diefenbaker government, through a great deal of its regime, a great deal of its time in office, we suffered an economic recession and, as a result, they automatically experienced a deficit because government revenues fell off while, at the same time, government expenditures were maintained and indeed, when it comes to unemployment insurance, there is an actual increase in government spending.

So there are a number of years, from the years 1964 to 1974, which is the period after the Diefenbaker years, the government sector, if you take the federal and provincial governments as a whole, had a surplus. From 1964 right through to 1974, there were surpluses every year, year-in and year-out. So while we had deficits in government spending in Canada, we also had surpluses so it's not always that we have a deficit or should always have a deficit but in times of recession, in times of economic difficulties, in times of high unemployment, we automatically have deficits.

But I would go further. I would do as the government of Saskatchewan has done; I would budget for even greater deficit in order to help alleviate the unemployment of the day and to stimulate the private sector in the process. It's not being anti-business in doing that. In fact, you could make the case that you are being very pro-business by having a deficit on your accounts in times of recession. If we want to worsen the recession, I submit all the governments in Canada should hurry up and try to get themselves into a balance position or a surplus position and you'll see even more unemployment than we are now experiencing in Canada. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that rather than these tax cuts, that if the government — and I must admit the tax cuts are increasing the deficit. The only problem then is that while the tax cuts increase the deficits and have that obvious tendency, the government turns around and tries to make up for it by cutting services to people. And not only by cutting services directly to people, whether it be through the hospital system or through the nursing homes, but it is also adding to the municipal tax burdens by reducing support to municipalities. The case of the City of Winnipeg is an obvious case in point. They are adding to user fees, we're paying more for the use of personal care homes, students are paying more to go to universities, people who wish to use the public bus system are having to pay more and so on. Somewhere or other we've got to pay and so this government has seen fit to make the students pay more, the municipal rate payers pay more, the bus users pay more, university students shall pay more and so it's got to be paid for somehow and it hasn't gone away so the burden is still there.

Mr. Speaker, rather than use the techniques of the Minister of Finance, I would submit that it is time for more public investment. I think there are many areas of useful work, not simply make-work projects but useful government spending that could be engaged in, government spending that will to the infrastructure of this province, whether it be additional nursing homes or additional public housing or better municipal infrastructure, better facilities at the municipal level, or better increased technical and scientific research or medical research, whatever. There are many good things that can be done through the public sector. I believe that in the future we are going to ultimately see more reliance on the public sector for job creation because the fact is that the market economy

cannot employ all of our people. We will always, I am afraid, unless we are in times of war where there is a lot of government spending through the military and other defence efforts or military efforts, unless we are in time of war, we seem to suffer a lot of unemployment. I say the only, short of some drastic revolution or major change in the system, the only other way you're going to see the creation of jobs is through public initiatives, through job creation because of public investment, because of the public sector.

I have before me a report put out by the United States Department of Labour entitled "Perspectives on Public Job Creation," and this is the story you get out of this document, that in the United States they are now looking at ways and means of creating jobs for people, not only the disadvantaged but people who are displaced because of technology, technological changes, automation, but also people who are out of work because of the down-turn of the business cycle. It's a very interesting document with all kinds of ideas as to what could be done, useful projects, worthwhile projects, worthwhile work to put people to work, to put people in the employment stream rather than having them sit at home being unproductive and wasting their lives.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the Minister of Finance sees fit to cut these taxes at this time because it's not as though we were in a position of having a lot of funds, as though we have a surplus of wealth, that is not the case. It's particularly regrettable since we're seeing a major reduction in services to our people. I think that the public of Manitoba is aware of this reduction in services to people and is becoming more aware as days go by. I would submit that they are wondering what happened last October when the Conservatives were elected to office. What did they do? What is happening to the Province of Manitoba, because they see around them more unemployment, poorer services, a lower quality of health care, increasing municipal taxes, increasing user fees and they don't like what they see. They don't like what they're experiencing.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there are other ways that the government could find to stimulate the economy if that is their desire, as I know it is. There are other ways to rekindle investor confidence. There are other ways to stimulate consumer confidence. There are other ways to get the economy moving. I submit that this is not going to be that significant.. Time will tell and I think time will be on the side of those such as myself who regret that the government is carrying out a fiscal policy such as was announced in the Budget Speech and of which this particular bill is a part.

So, Mr. Speaker, no way can I support this particular measure. I think it is a step in the wrong direction and I would hope, in closing the debate, that the Minister of Finance could show us case in point, give us examples of what new industry is going to come in, give us examples of particular family businesses indeed that can be helped and will expand on this account. Because I think he's going to be very hard pressed to make his case. He's going on blind faith and I say blind faith is not good enough; we need some sound planning, we need some positive leadership from government and this piece of legislation certainly isn't that category.

MR. SPEAKER: Am I correct that the debate stands in the name of the Honourable Member for Kildonan? The Honourable Government House Leader.

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

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Health and Social Development and the Honourable Member for Crescentwood in the Chair for the Department of Labour.m

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Warren Steen: Lady and gentlemen, we have a quorum. We left off last evening on the Workplace Safety and Health, Item 2.(a)(1) and I had four persons at that time who were indicating that they wanted to speak, the Members for St. Johns, Transcona, Selkirk and Logan. Do those present who are on that list still wish to . . . The Member for St. Johns is not present, then Transcona, Selkirk, Logan and then Inkster.

The Member for Inkster on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may raise a point of order. Mr. Chairman, there was a discussion yesterday with regard to what was said by the Minister — and I believe this is a point of order — because everybody said, "We will look at the record and see it," and the record now being available, I believe that we should look at it and see it as was suggested in order to evaluate

the type of answers that we are getting from this Minister.

Mr. Chairman, I made the suggestion yesterday, both in the House and in the committee, that the Minister had expressed the opinion that a clause providing for maternity leave is one that was not properly put forward and is one that should be left out.

I said, Mr. Chairman, specifically: "Mr. Speaker, she gave the opinion that she does not favour such a clause," — Page 3414 in Hansard — "Mr. Speaker," — these are my words — "she gave the opinion that she does not favour such a clause."

Mrs. Price: "I did not make that statement. The member in charge of Housing said correctly what I said. I did not say I disfavoured. I said that I had had three children and my husband had not had any extra pay or did not deem it necessary. I did not say I disfavoured it at all and if you'll read the record, you will see that that is correct."

In another place, Mr. Chairman: "Mr. Speaker, then can I ask the Minister of Labour whether she was misquoted when the newspaper quoted her as saying she disfavours such a clause in a collective agreement?"

Her answer: "I've not seen the article, so I cannot comment on it."

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is the question and answer and I don't know that it could be any more clear than it is. Can I assume that the Minister is saying that she is in agreement with that statement? "I'm just making a statement that I managed to get along, have three children and it is up to the individuals who. . . ." — and I'm reading from Page 3323.

"I would like to get a more definitive opinion from the Minister, is she opposed to that idea?"

Mrs. Price: "I would think that in this day when we're trying to get jobs for people and to improve the economy, I think that point could be one that could be left out of their bargaining."

Mr. Speaker, I raise this question on a matter of trying to demonstrate that the Minister is quite willing to interfere in an existing dispute when the interference is on the part of management, that she will not make the statement which was to reiterate the position of her party, that she doesn't favour compulsory overtime. In another dispute, she said she won't enter into it. Now here are the words, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that they could be clearer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could I have the attention of the . . .

MR. GREEN: "I think that that point could be one that could be left out of their bargaining."

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Member for Inkster, are you still on a point of order or are you debating the issue now?

MR. GREEN: No, Mr. Chairman, I am on the same point of order. The point was that the Minister said she didn't make it. We said we would review the record. The record is now before us, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Well, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about the Workplace Safety and Health and I've got tremendous concerns about the Minister's attitude and approach on this whole particular issue. She seems incredibly defensive on it, and as a result I think she's confusing her facts as well in this particular respect. I think the Minister may in fact be getting horribly defensive because we are attacking her for being inaccurate and being incorrect, but the whole point about being a Minister is that when she makes statements, especially statements regarding other individuals, she'd better make sure that her facts are correct when she makes those types of statements. —(Interjection)— No, I'm not. All I'm saying is that it's her obligation as a Minister to hold that position responsibly and to be accountable.

We have a case in point with respect to Simplot and Hooker Chemicals where the Minister says that she fired Jim Goodison because he took files on Simplot and Hooker and took them to the Peter Warren show. That's what's stated in an interview in the Winnipeg Free Press dated June 9, 1978. So the interesting thing —(Interjection)— Well, she's quoted directly in that paper, quoted directly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GREEN: The Minister of Finance quoted Goodison in the paper, and he thought that was

MR. PARASIUK: And the interesting thing is that she's also quoted in other newspapers, December 30, 1977. That's not the reason why she fired Jim Goodison a year ago. She said she fired Jim Goodison because he had requested a confidential file when Mr. Pawley was in the office; that's

why she said she fired him. And also because he couldn't follow Conservative philosophy. So that's what she says about firing him at the time; half a year later she says she fired him for another reason.

Now, Mr. Goodison may have raised those points with Mr. Warren after he was fired, and that's the critical point. It was after the firing, not before, and you should check your facts on that. —(Interjection)— Not at all, he was fired. And that's the critical point. Now, you may not understand that point of integrity; maybe you don't understand it, but that's a very important issue in this Legislature.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Member for Transcona direct his remarks to the Chair and not to somebody opposite?

MR. PARASIUK: Oh, I'd be delighted to, I'd be delighted to. I wouldn't mind directing them to someone who doesn't have it when he raises those types of points, and that's an issue, a direct issue that I'm raising —(Interjection)— I'm having a person heckling me from the side because he doesn't understand what goes on down there. He understands about people taking some files out illegally; he had one of his colleagues do it right off the bat. Had one of his colleagues do it right off the bat. He understands about integrity, because he had to write his colleague a letter then saying, "Don't steal files." But this Deputy Minister had those files at his disposal, and that was not the reason why the Minister fired him. But the Minister is trying to rationalize her firing of Jim Goodison and she is doing so with inaccurate information. There is a difference in what she says on December 30, 1977 and what she says on June 9, 1978. I'm wondering now, Mr. Chairman, whether in fact a year from now when we ask her about Victor Rabinovitch, the past Executive Director of the Workplace Safety and Health Branch, why he left the government, she will say, "I told him to leave the government because he gave out information on lead poisoning." I am wondering if she will do that half a year from now.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, when we ask questions of the Minister we expect correct answers, and if we don't get the correct answers, obviously, we're going to question those. And we have been getting inaccurate answers right through, and if you read Hansard carefully you'll find inaccurate answer after inaccurate answer after inaccurate answer to questions that we are raising. And the point is, that when a Minister is appointed, when we ask questions we expect to get honest answers. And if we do not get the honest answers, we will raise those points over and over again until the Minister understands that it is her responsibility, her obligation, to provide honest answers, until such time as she decides that she is unable to carry out the responsibilities of the department. I'd like to ask her specifically whether in this respect the present Deputy Minister appeared on the Peter Warren show talking about Simplot and Hooker Chemicals?

MR. GREEN: Yes. I was on the program.

MR. PARASIUK: Did he do so? I am asking specifically whether he did so or not, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CRAIK: What is this, a cross-examination?

MR. PARASIUK: No. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know whether in fact you are the Chairman, or whether in fact the Minister of Finance, who is trying to protect the Minister of Labour, is the Chairman, because if that's the case, then this whole committee procedure is going down the drain.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think that the Minister of Finance is trying to protect the Minister of Labour at all. Are you asking the Minister a direct question now?

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, I asked her a direct question; he then said, "Is this a cross-examination?" I am asking her a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then my question as Chairman to the Minister of Labour is, are you now prepared to answer that question, or do you want to bank it?

The Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: Well, I would like to ask the Member for Transcona if he's through with his talking. If he is, I'm banking the questions here; I'll answer them all together.

MR. PARASIUK: No, I'm not. I've got some other questions . . .

MRS. PRICE: Carry on, then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: If in fact, I would —(Interjection)— No, no, I would hope that the Minister then will check out her material very carefully before she provides answers, and if she wants to bank them so that she will be in a position to provide accurate answers, I would be delighted to give her whatever opportunity and whatever time is required to ensure that when questions are asked, we will indeed get correct and accurate information. —(Interjection) I don't feel particularly good with you there either. —(Interjection)— Well, fine. It's a good spot to be.

Now, another case in point, and I'll go back to points that were raised yesterday, and I don't have Hansard and I'm recalling from memory what took place. And this concerns the item that the Member for St. Johns was raising with respect to Item 2(a) specifically. We were told that there is somewhere an Executive Director, and that is in the Administration, Research and Education section, which is 2(a). I look at the organizational chart which has been distributed, and I see a box there saying Workplace Safety and Health Division, the Office of the Executive Director. And I see a unit underneath that saying Administration, Research and Education Unit which reports, and it says here, directly to the Executive Director. I also see three other units, Safety and Health Inspection, Industrial Hygiene, and Occupational Medicine, which report also directly to the Executive Director, and those are the items I imagine to be 2(b), 2(c), 2(d), 2(e), 2(f), in this entire appropriation. And the point is, where in the appropriation is the position of Executive Director of Workplace Safety and Health located?

MRS. PRICE: I've made a note of it; I'm going to wait till you're through.

MR. PARASIUK: Do you intend to bank that question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Member for Transcona wish to carry on?

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, I do.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Are you in a position to indicate whether the positions that have been eliminated are the positions of administrative and research officer — or, sorry, research and education officer, is that one position that has been eliminated out of this section and is the other position that has been eliminated administrative officer? Do you wish to answer that question or are you going to bank that one too?

MRS. PRICE: I'd just rather wait until you are through talking and I'll answer whatever you have.

MR. PARASIUK: Okay, well, the point about that is that there will be a bit of difficulty here in that if, in fact, one of the positions which has been eliminated is the research and education officer, then I wonder whether, in fact, this whole new approach to Workplace Safety and Health can operate correctly. So that's a very important question in terms of determining what the thrust of this particular branch is going to be in industrial relations in Manitoba and I would hold now until I could get an answer on that, otherwise I will have to then speculate what the thrust is in the absence of an answer. That's why I am asking the Minister if she can give that answer which I think is something that her staff has readily at hand.

MRS. PRICE: First of all, I think that I can say that I have not given out any dishonest answers here in spite of what you gentlemen are trying to imply. Secondly, I did not fire Mr. Goodison; the Premier fired him. I did recommend it. He comes under the Premier and under the Premier you still have him to question and I suggest that you continue your remarks regarding Mr. Goodison to him. I did not at any time say that I fired Mr. Goodison because he requested my files when Mr. Paulley was in his office. Mr. Goodison himself gave that news to the press.

With regard to your ridiculing the organizational chart that is here, and it was thoroughly gone over last night by the Member for St. Johns, I find out that this set up was designed by Mr. Rabinovitch and he's not here to be able to answer for it.

With regard to the positions eliminated, I had mentioned those quite thoroughly last night also to the Member for St. Johns and told him that they are eliminated and we are not contemplating

refilling them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PARASIUK: I believe I still have the Chair. How is it working? Are we going to then ask questions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister said that she would answer your questions when you were finished and you gave the impression to me, as Chairman, that you were finished.

MR. PARASIUK: No, I'm sorry, I believe I said that I require an answer from the Minister in order to continue on with further questioning otherwise I would have to start speculating as to the thrust.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair recognizes the Member for Selkirk. The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to defer . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Transcona will go back on the list. As Chairman, I'm recognizing the Member for Selkirk.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to know why you are in fact changing the procedures entirely that you followed yesterday and days past. Have you caucused this matter with the caucus or are you acting impartially as a Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm acting impartially as a Chairman. I asked the Minister if she . . .

MR. PARASIUK: I would like to look at Hansard to see whether in fact you've changed your ruling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . I asked the Minister if she wished to answer your questions' she said when you're finished. You carried on. I am of the impression that you were finished because you waited for her reply to your questions, she gave you the answers and now I'm moving on to the Member for Selkirk.

MR. PARASIUK: Can I bring up Hansard to you to indicate that I did not give up the floor when I in fact asked that last question, and I asked the Minister to indicate it.

MRS. PRICE: I made a statement that I would answer at the end.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair is recognizing the Member for Selkirk.

MR. PARASIUK: I respect the Minister's position on her statement because I think she is trying to be fair in answering it. I don't think she needs your defence, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if it is correct that in studies which were completed in her department, that approximately 1,000 firms were to establish Workplace Safety Committees, and I would like the Minister to advise how many such committees have now been established, and of those firms that ought to establish such committees, how many have failed to establish such committees?

Then I would like to know from the Minister what action is contemplated then, in order to ensure that there is compliance by those firms that have neglected or refused to establish committees, Workplace Safety Committees?

MRS. PRICE: I would like to follow the same procedure and answer your questions altogether, if you don't mind.

MR. PAWLEY: Well, would the Minister . . . surely there are some of these questions that could be answered along the way. I'm just wondering how the procedure is going to develop now if everything is banked.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Member for Selkirk, if the Minister would prefer to make notations and answer the questions collectively for each and every member, we can put each and every member's name back on the list and just keep going around. One thing about this present system is that we'll let other members get an opportunity to speak a little more frequently.

MR. PAWLEY: Then I would also like the Minister to advise us as to if a complaint is made in a plant in respect to conditions, health conditions, whether it be dust or some other type of situation which exists in an industrial plant and a complaint is lodged with this division — Say today such a complaint is lodged — then I would like the Minister to advise as to when the branch would be in a position to respond to that complaint by a workman, time space wise. And I want the Minister also to deal with the question of inspectors. I would like the Minister to advise as to the number of inspectors that are available now to handle inspections, and whether there are in fact adequate inspectors or if it is true as had been indicated earlier by the Minister, I believe, that inspectors were being used from the electrical and mechanical division. If that in fact is the case, then I would like to know the percentage of inspections that are taking place on an annual basis in respect to (a) amusement rides and, (b) elevators.

I would also like the Minister to advise us as to the number of (a) mining accidents and, (b) industrial accidents resulting in fatality which have occurred in Manitoba from 1960 to the present time. And I would like, if it is possible, Mr. Chairman, an annual breakdown so we could ascertain whether there is a trend upwards or downwards insofar as the number of industrial and mining accidents resulting in fatality in the Province of Manitoba.

MRS. PRICE: Well, with regard to the Workplace Safety Committees, the companies have been ordered to have them, there isn't 1,000; there was 313 that had been ordered to have them and of those 290 are already in place.

There have been no refusals to comply, to our knowledge. We haven't received any complaints to that effect.

MR. PAWLEY: Could I just break in then?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. PAWLEY: What does the Minister intend to do insofar as the 23 that have not complied, to this time? Are they in the process of complying? Each and every one of the 23.

MRS. PRICE: Yes, they are.

MR. PAWLEY: Okay.

MRS. PRICE: With regard to complaints that are lodged due to infractions in the different workplaces, the inspectors will be out there the same day if it's, you know, within working hours of the department, or they are available. They are out the very same day.

MR. PAWLEY: So there is 24-hour response to complaints?

MRS. PRICE: No, no; I say if it's during the working hours.

MR. PAWLEY: A response within 24 hours?

MRS. PRICE: Within 24 hours, yes.

With regard to your last question, which I found quite lengthy, with regard to the mining accidents and the fatalities, etc., I would appreciate if you would give that to me in writing so that I can have my department give the answers, or I can get it out of Hansard and give you the reply to that.

MR. PAWLEY: I also asked about the use of inspectors, whether or not it is correct that inspectors are being borrowed from the Electrical and Mechanical Division in order to perform inspections under this section.

MRS. PRICE: Well, we have 17 field inspectors and there are 16 mines inspectors, and there are inspectors that are moved back and forth, yes.

MR. PAWLEY: Now, if so, could the Minister indicate to us — you may have to obtain this

— as to the percentage of annual inspections in both amusement ride areas, where there have been some serious accidents not only in Manitoba but elsewhere in the last two or three years, and I would also like advice as to whether there are elevator inspections, as to the annual percentage of this section.

MRS. PRICE: With regard to the amusement, I know that they are thoroughly inspected before they are even allowed to open in any of their fairgrounds, or whatever. And if they move to another site and have taken down their equipment and then built it up again in another site, that requires another licence and another inspection. They are thoroughly inspected.

MR. PAWLEY: What about the continuing annual amusement performances like the one that is advertised on a weekly basis, Kiddytown, I believe it is, operates from year to year, it's not dependent upon fares but is a constant, continuing amusement centre?

MRS. PRICE: It's the same routine as followed as I just mentioned for the amusement rides. They are inspected before they go into operation.

MR. PAWLEY: So you say, in fact then, that there's 100 percent inspection insofar as amusement

MRS. PRICE: They keep a very close watch in that respect and I think one of the reasons, as was pointed out to me some months ago, is because when they take down their machinery and then put it up, it's a whole new ball game and they have to make sure that everything is bolted and tightened up and properly reconstructed.

MR. PAWLEY: So inspections then are being conducted in a proper function in that area and elevators . . .

MRS. PRICE: I'm informed by a member in my department that the new ones are inspected once a year, but the older ones are inspected two or three times a year.

MR. PAWLEY: Okay, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you. Mr. Chairman. The questions I have to the Minister are in response to questioning from the Honourable Member for St. John's last evening. It was my understanding that the Minister had said that Safety and Health, Inspection, Industrial Hygiene and Occupational Medicine reported directly to the Minister or to her Deputy.

MRS. PRICE: No, to the Executive Director and then he reports in turn to the Deputy.

MR. JENKINS: Just a moment, Mr. Chairman. If the Honourable Minister would just let me finish

MRS. PRICE: Sorry.

MR. JENKINS: . . . and this is why the confusion, I have this confusion in my mind. The Minister, under the first set of questioning, said that these three directors reported directly to the Minister, herself, or to the Deputy Minister.

Later under questioning she said that when we found out in the Workplace Safety and Health Division that there were two staff man years, an Acting Director I believe — and the Minister can take as notice right now for banking, can she give us the name of the present Acting Director — and the Administration Research and Education Unit which was supposedly supposed to report to the Director.

Then later on, on a further set of questioning on the same thing, the Minister then said that the Safety and Health Inspection, the Industrial Hygiene and Occupational Medicine then reported to the Workplace Safety and Health Division Executive Director.

Now we are faced with two sets of answers from the Minister and this is one of the problems that we are running into in discussing the Estimates with the Minister. I would like the Minister to be able to say at this time in quite emphatically where the three directors of the three departments, or the three divisions that we're referring to, report to.

I was looking at the organizational charts, which she gave us the other day and which was

as presented by her department, and now it's been stated by the Minister that it was one that was drawn up by the departed Director of Workplace Health and Safety Act — that was Mr. Rabinovitch, I believe — and the Minister seems to have a great facility for blaming some of her problems on people who have already departed the scene. And, this was not my understanding when we received this the other day I think in request from the Honourable Member for Kildonan. It was my understanding it was prepared by the department. In all probability I would imagine from the department of the Deputy Minister. Now we find out that it was prepared by the Director of the Workplace Safety and Health Division.

So the problem that the Minister is finding herself in at the present time is that she's giving us two sets of answers to the basically the same questions, and until we can get some answers that seem to jive with each other, there's going to be a problem in discussing the Estimates of the Honourable Minister.

So, I want to get this clear once and for all, just who do these three divisions report to? We've already found out that the Administration Research and Education Unit is a non-existent one. I believe it is now going to be obliterated off the chart and in Resolution 79.(a)(1), which is Administration, Research and Education. Now is the present Acting Director doing research and education in the field of Workplace Safety? If he is not, then where is this research and education being carried on? Is it being carried on in the Division of Industrial Hygiene, Safety and Health, or Occupational Medicine? I'm not going to mention Fire Prevention and Mechanical Engineering because according to the chart here, they report directly to the Assistant Deputy Minister, and through him to the Deputy Minister, and through him to the Honourable Minister of Labour.

So where is the research and education that is listed here as (a) in 79(a) Administration? I can understand if the Minister tells me now that the Acting Workplace Safety and Health Executive Director, he will be in charge of the administration. If she's going to tell me that the three divisions that I have asked her about are under his jurisdiction that makes sense. But then, who is carrying out the research and education? Because from what the Minister told us last evening the Workplace Health and Safety Division Director is one person and he has one other person, clerical staff. So I want to know is he carrying it out — I don't think that the clerical staff would be carrying it out — or is it being carried out by the Safety and Health Inspection Unit, Industrial Hygiene, or Occupational Medicine? I would like answers to those questions.

MRS. PRICE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Firstly, I'm of the opinion that I answered all of these questions for the Member for St. Johns last night. I am really getting asked the same questions repeatedly; however, I will answer them once more. The three sub-committees that report to the Executive Director of the Workplace Safety are the Safety and Health Inspection, the Industrial Hygiene and Occupational Medicine. The three divisions that report directly to the Assistant Deputy Minister, the Deputy Minister and then the Minister are the Mechanical and Engineering, the Fire Prevention and the whole of the Workplace Safety. I wasn't laying any blame on Mr. Rabinovitch for the setting up of this division, but he is the one that instigated or originated the Workplace Safety Act for the Department of Labour last year. And this was how he set it up. I certainly wasn't making any reference to his being faulty or incapable.

With regard to your question about who is doing the education and the research, the Safety and Health Inspection Subdivision. The education is taking place in that subdivision. Research is taking place in both the Industrial Hygiene and in the Occupational Medicine.

MR. JENKINS: Could the Minister just repeat the first part of where the education and research, I just missed it. There was a bit of noise and I didn't hear it; I'm sorry.

MRS. PRICE: The Workplace Safety and Health has three subdivisions. The Safety and Health Inspection, and that is the department that the education process is taking place in. The Industrial Hygiene and Occupational Medicine both have ongoing research taking place in their divisions.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has expressed some exasperation about being asked the same questions and having to make answers, and frankly I really believe that we have to sympathize with her exasperation. I think we have to sympathize with her entire role, Mr. Chairman. Because the exasperation comes, and the renewed questions come, because with the greatest of respect to the Minister, who I will not accuse of being dishonest, she has been giving different answers to the same questions — not dishonest ones. And I know that sounds like I'm being a bit patronizing, but nevertheless I really believe that the Minister is trying to find the right answer. Well, Mr. Chairman,

I think that the Minister was put in a difficult role. I think that never having remembered saying — which I saw her say on television — that I don't ever remember saying that I don't know why I was made the Minister of Labour; I don't like unions.

MRS. PRICE: I would like to interject on that, Mr. Chairman. I never made a statement that I don't like unions. I certainly did not make that statement.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I didn't even say that.

MRS. PRICE: You did so.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I did so. Well, the Minister will have to go back in Hansard and I am now going to repeat what I said. Not having remembered making a statement to the effect, "I don't know why the Premier chose me as Minister of Labour, I don't like unions," is not a statement that I said she didn't like unions. You can go back in Hansard and read what I said. I saw the Minister on television and she was asked by John Robertson whether she made this statement. My recollection is . . . And here if she will accuse me of making a misstatement I will admit that I can't remember every word. Her answer to Mr. Robertson was, "I don't remember ever making such a statement." If she does not attack me now, I feel that I am on sound ground — which is all I said.

I really believe, Mr. Chairman, that that is a problem for the Minister. Really, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, there are all kinds of prejudices in the world; we all have them. Some we can't avoid. And I think that this Minister is like a fish out of water, and that's a problem not really of her doing; that is a problem of the doing of the First Minister, to do a thing like that. Because he has put into this position a person who finds it difficult to deal with the subject matter of her department because of, Mr. Chairman, an innate high regard for one segment of society on this issue and, I submit — and this is the submission — a low regard for the other segment. And that's why, Mr. Chairman, we get all of these statements, which are statements which are a problem.

Her statement with regard to the retail-wholesale strike where maternity leave is directly an issue, and they have just gone out on strike — not a week. They haven't been out a week, if that's going to affect the Member for Sturgeon Creek. The Member for Sturgeon Creek the other day said, "We made a statement after six months of strike."

Mr. Chairman, the Minister made a statement after 6 days and her statement to Mr. Cowan was that given the present situation, she thinks that that clause could be left out of bargaining.

Now, the Minister is now going to have to argue, because she made that statement, you know, and I am going to read it to her. I would like to get a more definite opinion, is she opposed to that idea. I would think that in this day when we are trying to get jobs for people and improve the economy, I think that that point could be one that could be left out of their bargaining.

The Minister is now going to have to try — because once you're in it, you try to follow it through — to say that that isn't a statement which disfavours that type of proposition in a group of proposals in a collective agreement. She is going to say, "Well, that doesn't say that I don't agree with it."

But what does it say, Mr. Chairman? It says, "I would think that when we're trying to get jobs for people and improve the economy, I think that point could be one that could be left out of their bargaining."

Would the Minister do me this favour? Don't make a statement about overtime; don't make a statement about union hiring. Merely say the following: I would think that the builders exchange and the difficulties that we are now having, that those two points could be well left out of their bargaining. I don't ask for anything more. If this statement is a neutral statement, would you please make a neutral statement the other way, that these points — compulsory overtime and union hiring practices — could be two that could be left out of their bargaining.

I mean I don't want a bias statement. I want the kind of a statement that the Minister of Labour would make, unbiased. But please tell that to the builders exchange in your own unbiased way. Because I believe the Minister . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister responsible for Housing.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I happen to have every respect for the Honourable Member for Inkster's debating ability, and I have listened to it for eight years, but I would like to know what that has to do with Item (a)(1) Salaries, under Workplace Safety. There is no question in my mind that it can come under the Minister's Salary, as to the statement that she has made or not. Now, with all due respect, we are all members of this committee and the item we are on is 2.(a)(1), and I think that we should probably stick with that.

I say that for this reason. We have gone through two days of this committee, Mr. Chairman, or three days, really not making enough headway, in my opinion, on the Estimates. We may have been on the Estimates but we have ended up in problems of wrangles and we will probably make more headway, we will probably get more answers, if we really bring the things up in the place they should be brought up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the point is a valid point and I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the committee's life will probably be extended by about four and one-half minutes by the speech that has been just made by the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

Because, Mr. Chairman, I was going to deal, and I will deal, with the item that is being dealt with and relate exactly what I'm saying to that item. Mr. Chairman, I believe and I say with all the greatest of respect to the Minister, that what has happened in the field of Occupational Safety and Health is ingrained in the Minister's anti-labour bias, that what she has done in this area is to undo what the labour movement regarded as a significant step forward, and that as a result of that this anti-labour bias which I've tried to state — and by the way, Mr. Chairman, I want to try to make friends with the Minister by saying that I have a labour bias. That it's nothing terrible, that I am not accusing her in having this bias, of being a person that is somehow to be disrespected. I think it is very well acknowledged that I have a labour bias and, therefore, probably one of the reasons — although in my opinion I could have handled it — the public would not have regarded me as being a good Minister of Labour.

Now, there's nothing wrong with that. I worked for labour unions for the three years before I came into the . . . From 1966 to 1969 I took very strong positions on the part of labour and I'm saying that this Labour Minister has a problem and it was expressed in her not being able to recollect having made the statement that I referred to earlier and which has come through, Mr. Chairman, in all of the discussions that we've had, the entire approach, and I deal with now Occupational Safety and Health, has been that this Minister was a very very willing partner, a very very willing instrument in having softened this program considerably because she really would not worry about what the labour union said about her changing it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to give you an example again of this approach that business creates jobs and we heard that the other day, if there was no business there would be no jobs. There were jobs before there were businesses. Before there was any business there were people tilling the soil, cutting down trees, building shelters for themselves and creating wealth, without any business. It's those people consuming that created businesses, not the other way around, but her statements with regard to the mining industry and she said she got them from the mining companies, were that there was a diminution, a slow-down of activity because of the New Democratic Party Government.

Mr. Chairman, in today's paper, June 9th: "In 1977 the company participated in 1,448,000 exploration programs with Sherritt's net cost \$879,000, according to the Sherritt President David Thomas," and I predicted this yesterday without seeing it in today's paper. I said it would go down because of Conservative policy not because of New Democratic Party policy. "According to Sherritt President, David Thomas, the exploration budget this year has been reduced," and why? — "due to metal market conditions, plus the fact that the Manitoba government isn't participating directly in exploration. However, Sherritt is actively seeking other partners to allow continuation of a worthwhile program in Manitoba." They're looking for new partners, up to now new partners haven't been found.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I didn't say, and I said yesterday — the Member for Sturgeon Creek will recall it — I said if you want to accuse us of something, don't accuse us of reduced activity, accuse us of spending more money and I will be able to defend that very easily because they're asking for a tax reduction and the amount of money that we're getting in increased taxes is less than we're spending in exploration.

But here it is on the record, and I want to tell the Honourable Minister that continuing to accuse all of the economic problems on labour unions, on New Democratic Party positions, is not in keeping with the role of a Minister of Labour and she knows it better than anybody else.

The Honourable Member said that there was a statement made, I think the Member for Transcona said a statement was made last January and now one in June and they were different. From January to June a difference can take place, but there was a statement made on June 5th and one of June 8th and they are different. And the Minister is honest, I accept the fact that she is honest, but I say mercy to this person, give her a different portfolio because she can probably handle it very well. But she is not the person, from the answers that we have been getting and from what is being done to this occupational health, to satisfy my friend the Member for Sturgeon Creek, she is not the person to handle this portfolio.

MRS. PRICE: Well to the Member for Inkster, I would like to go on record as telling you that I really need neither your sympathy nor your exasperation that you referred to me, and not being a member of the Legislature for 11 or 12 years like you have been and also not being a learned lawyer like you are and not getting the answers from me that you want to hear from me or the government, I know it's not sitting well with you.

I would like to also tell you I did belong to a union, I told you that before and it happened to be the Retail Clerks Union so I have an appreciation of both sides of the House and I would like to feel that I have an appreciation for both sides with the portfolio I am sitting in and I'm trying very much to have an appreciation for both sides.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, the other day the Minister indicated to us in this committee that there was a welfare provision available for people who were on the minimum wage. In the House subsequently she argued that she did not say that and so this is not relevant to the item that we are discussing, but it's my first opportunity to raise the issue. It can be raised as a matter of privilege although I don't think it's necessary in that context.

I refer her to Hansard of June 6th, page 3320, the top of page 3320 and the bottom of page 3321 and I simply refer that to the Minister for her benefit. I'm not going to go through it verbatim, but she will find that she made that statement.

I then would like her to tell us here now on what basis she was able to make that statement and pursuant to the discussions in the House, can she elaborate for us what are the provisions under the welfare program that she alluded to? She undertook, Mr. Chairman, to discuss the matter with the Minister of Health and to inform the committee and this is the first opportunity that we have had to get a report from her in that connection.

MRS. PRICE: Is that all that you have to ask? Well, I'll wait until you're through.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, no, no. Mr. Chairman, I can raise this as a matter of privilege . . . —(Interjection)—

MR. ENNS: Go ahead, you can raise anything you want to raise with the Minister.

MR. USKIW: . . . and it has to be dealt with. I am appealing to the sense of fair play on the part of the Minister. We can discuss this rationally or we can go into the matter of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Member for Lac du Bonnet, the Minister has the right to answer when she wishes. I'm sorry . . . if she doesn't wish to answer your question that's . . .

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, it's not a matter of refusing, I'm now raising a matter of privilege. This Minister indicated to this committee that there was a welfare provision that would provide financial assistance to people who are on the minimum wage. Subsequently in the House she said she didn't say that. I've illustrated two pages which if she wishes to look at those two pages she'll find that she did say so. She also undertook in the House under questioning to check the matter with the Minister of Health and to bring back a statement of clarification. I'm merely asking that she follow through on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Labour.

MRS. PRICE: I do not recall saying that there was a supplement to be had. I just said that if a person was in the dire straits that the Member for Selkirk was referring to that we wouldn't be seeing anybody starving to death. I have not read the Hansard so I can't say verbatim what I said, but I am certain that I did not say that we had a supplement for that.

MR. USKIW: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to read from Hansard for the benefit of the Minister. On the top, this is of page 3320 — 57.(b) that's the evening session — in answer to a question put by the Member for Churchill and I'll quote the Minister, "I would imagine they would be living below the poverty line but, as I say, there would be assistance somewhere in that respect. But I'm not responsible for any statements from my colleagues," and so on. But she indicates there that there would be assistance available. That is in one instance.

There are other instances, Mr. Chairman. On the bottom of page 3321, again in answer to the Member for Churchill, and I quote the Minister, "I think there is welfare assistance available. I don't

think there's anybody that has been allowed to starve to death in Manitoba. While I sympathize with some of the really out-reaching cases such as the Member for Selkirk mentioned, I do feel that there is some assistance available for anybody who is in those dire straits."

Those are the statements of the Minister. At that time I asked the Minister to indicate to us just what form of assistance was available. Subsequent to that, she said that she didn't say those things, but undertook to check with the Minister of Health. I presume she's had an opportunity to check it out and we would like to know what the answer is, Mr. Chairman.\$

MRS. PRICE: I don't recall hearing when you read just then any mention of the word supplement. I said there's . . . —(Interjection)— Well, people go on welfare, that's assistance isn't it? But I did not say a supplement in addition to a minimum wage.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, we were dealing at the time with the whole question of minimum wage and the fact that people on minimum wages were indeed living below the poverty line, depending on the size of their family, and it was in that connect on that the Minister indicated that there was welfare assistance available for those people — for those people. And I asked the Minister to clarify it for us, after which she denied having made the statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on a Point of Order, on a point of privilege if the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet wishes to discuss this question of social assistance, I suggest he avail himself to the other committee which is now sitting. The Minister of Health and Social Development is prepared to answer, and has answered questions for for the last two weeks on his department. I suggest that this committee get on with the business in front of us. Let's put the question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with the business of the Department of Labour . . .

MR. CHAIAN: Just a minute. The Minister of Highways has just moved to put the question.

MR. USKIW: Put what question8 Mr. Chairman, I r? ise on a atter of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm asking the Minister of Highways for clarification. Did he put a motion . . . ? We are on Item 2.(a)(1). If he puts the . . . It's a non-debatable thing.

MR. ENNS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm putting the mot on on Item 2. (a)(1), the Chair now places the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's an undebatable motion.

MR. ENNS: It's a non-debatable motion . . . no, we don't necessarily go to the House. Let's vote on it. —(Interjections)— I'm not asking for a division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the members present, the clerk informs me that the motion is a non-debatable motion, it is in order and that we can have a vote on this particular item. The Member for St. Johns on a Point of Order.

MR. GREEN: I am not as familiar with the rules as one would expect you to be, but it seems to me that you stated in this committee some weeks ago that the only two motions that can be put are that the committee rise or that an amount before us be reduced. I recall your saying that and I accepted your research as being correct. Now you are saying that we cannot debate a motion that the question be put and that we cannot debate at all.

You see, Mr. Chairman, the reason I say that is that as of last night I was in the middle, I had been recognized, I had the floor, the committee rose and I hadn't finished what I'd intended to do. Now you suddenly saw the Minister of Highways, who wanted to speak on a Point of Order but moved a motion, and I don't believe that he had the floor to make a motion at all. It seems to me that he raised a Point of Order . . . oh yes, and he interrupted the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have to ask you to run the meeting in the way that you've been doing up to now and that is attempting to be fair to all sides and to all individual members. I think it's wrong of the Minister of Highways to ask for the floor on the pretense of raising a Point of Order

and then bringing a motion in. He was out of order in both cases, I believe . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: And then he concluded his Point of Order by placing a motion before the committee.

MR. GREEN: But I don't think he had the floor for that purpose. Mr. Chairman, if that is the way that he can impose closure any time he wants and in the middle of any speech by just saying, "Point of Order", make a fictitious point and then move the previous question. I'm sure that that is not proper, Mr. Chairman. I'm letting morality and ethics aside for the Minister of Highways, I'm just saying it's not in order for him to do that, nor is it in order, Mr. Chairman, for you to recognize him under those circumstances.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Vital on the same point.

MR. WALDING: On the same Point of Order, Mr. Chairman. It's my belief that it's not in order for a member to get the floor by raising a Point of Order and then moving a motion. If he wishes to move a motion, whether it's closure or anything else, then he should indicate to the Chairman and wait until he catches the Chairman's eye, or his name is reached on the list, whatever the case may be. I believe that the motion is out of order and therefore is not acceptable.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to you that the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet had raised with you a matter of privilege. You had not decided that. The Honourable Member for Lakeside interjected and got the floor, by devious means, on a supposed Point of Order and then moved a motion. That is highly irregular and I think that you have to deal with the point of privilege before you deal with the Point of Order that was raised by the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would ask for some guidance from the Minister as to whether I gained the floor by devious means. Are the members opposite now suggesting that it is not possible for any member to raise a Point of Order in response to a Point of Order raised? —(Interjection)— I think, Mr. Chairman, that we should discuss that for the next half hour and it will be certainly as relevant as to any debate that has taken place in the last hour in this committee and I would ask guidance from the Chair as to whether a member has the opportunity of raising a Point of Order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, in my opinion any member of the committee has the right to raise the point on a Point of Order.

MR. ENNS: Then, Mr. Chairman, on the same Point of Order, having raised that Point of Order, I suggest that it's in order for me to call for retraction on the part of the Member for Logan that I gained that privilege through devious means.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Chairman, I have no intentions of withdrawing that remark. The honourable member has it on his own conscience how he moved that motion and I can suggest to him that I am not disputing his fact to raise a Point of Order, but I am disputing the fact that when he gains the floor on a supposed Point of Order and then moves a motion, it is a devious way to get the floor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on the same Point of Order, I would ask the Chair, either through memory or if need be through purusal of the transcript, but the comment of the Honourable Member for Logan was that I gained the floor by devious means to raise a Point of Order and I think there are enough members here . . . —(Interjection)— I simply want it understood that it is not through devious means that any member can raise a Point of Order in this committee. I would like that ruling, which I think we received from the Chair, understood because it's rather important. The future smooth functioning of this committee is important to the relative affairs of the people of Manitoba,

and the conduct of democracy in this province and I think it's important that that be established, Mr. Chairman. And, therefore, Mr. Chairman it's not out of order for me to request. I soften the original position, I request the Honourable Member for Logan to reconsider and not to allow that to weigh on his conscience over what appears to be a nice weekend coming up, that he should suggest that the Member for Lakeside approach something in a devious way.

MR. CHAIThe AN: Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can assure the honourable member that if he wishes to withdraw his motion, then I will withdraw that he gained the floor deviously. But if he's not prepared to withdraw his motion, then I'm not prepared to withdraw that he gained the floor on a devious manoeuver.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Highways.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I'm quite prepared to withdraw my motion. Upon contemplation, I believe he's out of order.

MR. JENKINS: And I am prepared to withdraw the remark that he gained the floor on devious

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister responsible for Housing back on a motion of privilege.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well on the point of privilege that the Member for Lac du Bonnet was raising. He quotes from the Hansard of June 6, 1978 pages 3320 and 3321. I would like to just bring out what he's quoting from. The Minister said, "I think" -- I think -- "anybody that is below the poverty level needs assistance of some sort." I think is what she said. He didn't stress that in the next place where he put it she said, "I would imagine they would be living below the poverty line but, as I say, there would be assistance somewhere in that respect. But I'm not responsible for any statements that my colleagues make," etc. She said, "I would imagine to begin with where she comes to 3321, "I think there's welfare assistance available," and in the House the other day the member asked the Minister of Health if he had discussed it with the Minister of Labour regarding whether somebody would or they wouldn't. The Minister of Labour is not the Minister of Health. She made statements, "I think", twice, "I would imagine", on one occasion, and on the next occasion she is saying to you plainly she believes that, or she thinks that, but she would have to consult with the Minister of Health on it, or you should ask the Minister of Health.

So this is what's been going on during this whole session of these Estimates. These gentlemen on the other side, Mr. Chairman, have been sitting there and waiting. They take down a statement that the Minister says -- I watched them -- and then they sit back, and the other one comes in, makes some statements. The other one comes back and says, "now ten minutes ago you said this," yesterday you said this. It's a form of interrogation that's well known in a lot of bad places and that's what's been going on.

Now, the Minister has correctly answered their questions. She did not presume. She did not presume at any time to tell what the Department of Health is doing or what the Welfare Department is doing. She said, "I think, I imagine, I think, I would assume."

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, unlike the Member for Sturgeon Creek, I happened to spend a good half hour yesterday downstairs going through the transcript, unlike the member who didn't do his research, and doesn't remember the section that I quoted only a moment ago, Mr. Chairman, so I will repeat it for his benefit. On Page 3320, I'm going to quote again the Minister, "I would imagine they would be living below the poverty line but, as I say, there would be assistance somewhere." There would be assistance, Mr. Chairman,

A MEMBER: If they were living below the poverty line.

MR. USKIW: That's correct; that's correct. That's right, and that's what we're dealing with.

MR. JOHNSTON: On the same point of privilege, Mr. Chairman. If they were living below the poverty line, there'd be assistance in public housing and I could verify that.

MR. USKIW: It has nothing to do with her statements. —(Interjections)—

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, we've gone through this two or three times. I merely point out that

these statements were made by the Minister, we attempted to find out from her just what form of assistance was available, we pursued that in the House the following day, in which case she denied having made the original statement, but offered to consult with the Minister of Health and to clarify the matter, and all we are asking is that the matter be clarified. We are not going to belabour the fact that she didn't remember what she had said. I'm not saying that she's trying to be devious. I'm saying that she forgot. She didn't remember what she said on the night of the 6th of June. So, I don't hold that against her, but she did undertake in the House to consult with the Department of Health and to bring back a statement of clarification to this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Housing.

MR. JOHNSTON: . . . Mr. Chairman, it may be an undertaking to the House, if I'm not mistaken, it wasn't — yes, I think maybe she said that she would bring it back to the committee and she has the privilege of consulting with the Minister of Health, she has the privilege of consulting with me, the Minister of Housing and I'll be very pleased to do so, and if anybody is living below the poverty line, I'll tell her what's available in housing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I'm only asking whether the Minister is prepared today to clarify the matter. If she isn't, we can skip the issue and she can come back tomorrow or Monday. I'm not insisting that she has to have the answer now. If she's unable to give us the answer, Monday will be another day.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Selkirk.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I just very briefly want to say, so we don't lose sight, we're not so much speaking of the general group below the poverty line, we were discussing a family with five dependents, receiving minimum wage. So we're not speaking about situations of families in general under the poverty line, whether that is considered to be under poverty line or not, that's another discussion. We are speaking in terms of a family of five dependents, plus the husband, the mother and the father, just so that is kept in mind when the Minister responds with an answer.

MR. JOHNSTON: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, . . . the Member for Selkirk was talking about a family, that's quite true. The Minister said "living below the poverty line" and she would check it out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Minister wish to respond to the Member for Lac du Bonnet?

MRS. PRICE: I have not been able to find two minutes in the day to confer with the Minister of Health to ask him about it.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, before we skip over to the next item, could we then have an undertaking that next week, Monday, that we will have a statement clarifying that question.

MRS. PRICE: I cannot make a statement that I will have it by Monday. The Minister of Health is in his Estimates too. I don't have an opportunity to speak to him before then, so I will give it as soon as I can. —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I have three more persons on the list that wish to speak after the Member for Lac du Bonnet. Is he through for the time being? I have the Member for Transcona, Selkirk and St. Johns. The Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to clarify some of the statements I made before concerning the Minister of Labour. I think when I said dishonest, I take that back. I don't want to imply that she was dishonest. There were inaccurate statements being made and I would stand by that. I also feel that she did feel that I was trying to ridicule the organizational chart. I wasn't at all, what would happen was that I was finding the Estimates and organizational chart, when placed side by side, confusing, especially in the light of the Minister's answers to questions from the Member for St. Johns. In that there is this organizational chart which indicates that one particular function as that of being executive director and I assume that the executive director's position would be allocated to that function. I would think that the secretary to the executive director would be allocated to that function. Then there are three line functions reporting to the executive director; safety and health

inspection, industrial hygiene and occupational medicine, and then there's a staff position that struck me, administration, research and education unit. So the impression given by this organizational chart is that there's this ongoing active role in administration, research and education. What I found is that we don't have this ongoing active role that is indicated in this organizational chart in administration, research and education because there is no administrative officer, there is no research and education officer, there's no clerical or secretarial staff in support to those people because they don't exist in that particular box. So I guess what we could do is strike out that box in relation to the organizational chart and I don't think that reflects at all on Mr. Rabinovitch in any way, shape or form. I guess this was the assumed organizational chart and the Minister, through the Estimates, has seen fit not to provide resources to make this organizational chart operational as drawn up here. But that does raise some concerns as to the entire thrust of workplace safety and health in the province, because when we have the description of this appropriation, we have, "generally promotes workplace safety and health through educational and related activities, and that there is going to be research undertaken" and of course we find that there isn't any staff resources to do that.

You see, I find this also contradictory in the light of statements that the Minister did make in response to questions raised in the House in the past by the Member for Churchill when he asked if the Minister would be setting up a commission of inquiry into mining safety in northern Manitoba, and he pointed out that there had been eighteen deaths in mines through industrial accidents, that this was a serious matter and did the Minister consider that it was important now in response to requests from groups up north that a commission be established. And the Minister at that time said that she didn't feel that it was necessary to set up a commission because this new legislation had been passed regarding workplace safety and health, that it was just being implemented and that we needed education. We needed to educate people about workplace safety and health, and that before we set up any commission, let's give the Workplace Safety and Health Program, as developed through the legislation and as administered by people who are going to be paid for out of these Estimates, a chance to get hold. But we find in looking at the Estimates that it isn't getting a fair chance to take hold. There is no educational officer. There is no research officer. There is no administrative officer, and we have 42 people in this particular branch supposedly.

So what would a research and education officer do? I think we have something in the order of 300 workplace safety and health committees. I would assume that these committees would want some assistance as to how they would be operating. They might want to sit down, to have some seminars possibly or discussions with someone from the department as to how the Act would operate, as to what workplace safety and health matters that they could really raise effectively and deal with in these committees. And 320 or 340 committees are a lot of committees. So it's important then that these committees if they are set up, and the Minister has indicated that virtually all of them have been set up, do get an odd chance to operate effectively, and surely they will need some assistance, some guiding assistance, especially in the early years. I can see it if the program had been operational for maybe 10 years, and the Minister said, well, I don't think we need an education function performed with respect to this program. I can understand that possibly. But when it's just getting under way, I can't understand the logic of the Minister eliminating that position.

These workplace safety and health committees, if in fact they are to operate correctly, will surely need to tie into a research function as well, and again that's been eliminated. So how are they supposed to operate effectively, or are they just going to be paper committees. Are they really going to deal effectively with the issues that they will be tackling and this is a new area for everyone. It's a new area for management. It's a new area for workers, and it's a new area in terms of the operations of committees in this respect, by in large for government too. So, I would think that you shouldn't starve it with respect to those necessary resources.

Now, we also have an administrative officer being cut out. I would assume that an administrative officer would deal with the routine day to day administrative procedures, would deal with staff relations, would deal with staff training, which again is very important because we've got a new Act, a new direction. That's quite important as well, I would assume also that the administrative officer would deal with matters pertaining to equipment. Undoubtedly there will be equipment coming in that people will be using and they want explanations as to how it will be used. So it strikes me that an administrative officer is necessary. It strikes me that a research and education officer is necessary as well, and the Minister has indicated that we do need an education thrust with respect to this whole program, and yet we find, when answers are forthcoming, that there really isn't this research function and education function being carried out.

So we are left wondering what is the intent of the government with respect to this program. Is it to give lip service to the program, but to starve it of resources so it really can't operate effectively? Is it to starve it of resources only half way so perhaps it doesn't work particularly well and it doesn't meet its expectations. And it doesn't meet its expectations because it never got the proper chance to do so and then a year from now we will get amendments coming in changing it around. I think

Friday, June 9, 1978

those are serious questions to raise. I think they're serious concerns that we have and I think they are serious concerns that a lot of people have, especially workers, be they unionized or non-unionized. I would think that especially the non-unionized workers probably have cause for greater concern because I understand that through some collective agreements there has been some provision for workplace safety and health committees. But the large bulk of workers are not unionized, so what types of protection do they have? If in fact there is an industrial accident, who in fact do the inspection officers deal with? Do they deal with the workers in a plant that isn't unionized? Do they call them altogether and say look, there's been an industrial accident, this is what took place, these are the conditions as we found them. Possibly there were some deficiencies. We've recommended to management that these deficiencies be corrected according to four or five recommendations which we list. Here they are. We want you to know about this as well to ensure that management actually does carry out these changes, because your life may in fact be in danger if these changes aren't carried out.

Now, is that the procedure? I'm not sure because surely there are more than 320 workplaces. So I would think that this is only the beginning of a program that has to get sufficient attention and right now, according to the answers given by the Minister to date, it would strike me that right in this very crucial subsection, namely administration, research and education, resources have been totally eliminated. So that means that the executive director gets a tremendous load put on him or her. What then will the executive director have to do? The executive director will have to be the senior departmental official —(Interjection)— Well, the reason why I'm answering the questions, Mr. Chairman . . . And I don't mind the interjection of the Minister of Highways who comes in late and doesn't realize that when I try to ask questions and then get an answer, and then try to ask another question, that the Minister said she would bank the questions and that you yourself ruled in her favour and basically prevented me from continuing my discussion of this matter, so I had to wait for about 45 minutes in order to get a chance to enter the debate again.

I don't mind that, but I did indicate to you at that time that there would have to be a bit of speculation involved in my questioning as a result, since I wasn't getting answers. So if the Minister of Highways wants to sit in through the Estimates procedure completely so that he knows finally what he is talking about, then I welcome him to do so.

Mr. Chairman, we have a situation where the executive director does have a great load upon his or her shoulders. This person has to be the executive person, because it's called executive director and if I remember the way the public service operates, this person is the senior person responsible for this entire program. That means that reports coming out of the safety and health division would go through the executive director. Reports coming out of the occupational medicine division would go through the executive director. That means that the executive director, when the executive director passes on this material to his or her superior, has to be knowledgeable as to what's contained in those reports, and has to, in a sense, give a professional stamp to the report before it's submitted up to the Deputy or to the Minister. And that's very important in public administration terms because if the executive director doesn't have the time to do this properly, then I think the credibility of this entire branch and the entire program will suffer tremendously.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I think that one of the tasks of the executive director will be, in many instances, to synthesize the reports coming out of the various sections below him in order to come up with a comprehensive report relating to an issue. And I think, Mr. Chairman, we found an example of the lack of synthesis when we looked at the report distributed yesterday by the Minister of Labour, which came from one subsection but didn't deal with a number of issues that I think pertained to the anhydrous ammonia issue.

I think had the executive director had a chance to look at it, the executive director would have realized that that report from I think occupational medicine or sorry, I think from the mechanical and engineering, didn't deal with the whole issue of education. Is the public educated about anhydrous ammonia? Are the various groups that have to deal with it educated with respect to this particular problem? What about hospital staff? What about fire departments? What about police departments? I don't think they know about this in many respects. And the Minister indicated herself that she assumed that this would be the responsibility somehow of all these people to act spontaneously on their own to make sure that they are educated. The company, after all, has provided some type of training for its own staff, but the point is I think it's the responsibility of this program to ensure the people are cognizant of the various aspects of the issue of anhydrous ammonia pertaining to education, pertaining to a knowledge of what to do in handling it and what to do if someone in fact comes in contact with it, or what to do in fact if the prevailing wind isn't blowing. What happens if it is blowing in another direction and you do have a cloud of anhydrous ammonia going towards a community even though the odds have been played, even though the permanent site for anhydrous ammonia is in a sense downwind from the community? What happens if you get that one in five days or one in ten days when the wind is blowing from the other direction? Who will deal with that matter? Does EMO know how to deal with it? Does the local police force know how to deal

with it?

Now I don't think that the head of mechanical and engineering would deal with those particular questions and I don't blame the head for not dealing with those particular aspects. That report dealt with the mechanical and engineering aspects of anhydrous ammonia but not with respect to these other issues. That I think is what the executive director should have been dealing with. And if the executive director is overloaded with administrative work, and if the executive director doesn't have the opportunity to carry out his or her tasks properly, then a number of matters will drop between stools, and that's why it's important to have the executive director bringing together these various people who are expert in their particular area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the members of the committee, the hour of 4:30 having arrived, Committee rise. The Member for Transcona will be on the list first next week.7 --- ...

SUPPLY — HEALTH AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats: I would direct the honourable members to Page 43 in the Estimates, Health and Social Development. We are on Resolution No. 65, clause 9. Acquisition and Construction of Physical Assets. Clause 9—pass — The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, last night I asked the Minister and he undertook today to have the information with regard to the capital of \$398,000 being requested in this year's Estimates, and an accounting of \$405.8 thousand, which was indicated by the Minister of Finance that would be spent within this fiscal year out of last year's capital authority, Schedule B.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: That is correct, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the indulgence of the honourable member in permitting me to give him that information today. I had the information, but I didn't have it in Committee with me last night. I wasn't that confident that we were going to finish the debate on the previous resolution.

Sir, we're looking at an appropriation under this capital resolution of \$398,000, which is directed towards the Pelican Lake Training Centre, the Vital Statistics Computer Retrieval System, and the Childrens' Dental Health Plan. I will move to the \$405,000 carryover in a moment or two, but perhaps I could just deal with the printed appropriation in front of us first.

For the information of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks and other members of the Committee, the Pelican Lake Training Centre is in our plans and projections for this year to the extent of the installation of a sewer system to meet an order of the Clean Environment Commission, and we are appropriating or asking for permission to appropriate \$115,000 for that project.

The Vital Statistics Computer Retrieval System is a project that involves the microfilming of records, and the completion of the establishment of an automated retrieval system, for the Vital Statistics Branch, and the current — well, it isn't current — but the present capital appropriation that we are requesting and intending to apply in that area amounts to \$33,000.00. This is required to complete the microfilming of records and complete the final automation of that retrieval system. This project started in May of 1977 with an initial capital allocation of \$100,000, so there is \$33,000 we're asking there, Mr. Chairman.

And third, the Childrens Dental Health Plan for clinics and equipment, what is being sought there, projected there in capital, is a quarter of a million dollars, \$250,000.00.

Those three items, Sir, total \$398,000, so that's the capital on which we are asking approval from the Legislature. The other part of the question asked by my honourable friend had to do with the carryover of \$405,800 for capital projects for the department. That total was included in the Department of Finance listing, then there was a subsequent review made of each project and the carryover authority was reduced by \$215,500.00. That leaves, Sir, \$190,300 of carryover that will be used during 1978-79. The Department of Finance has amended its records accordingly.

The \$90,300 comprises the following items, Mr. Chairman. Once again, the Pelican Lake Training Centre, in this case \$48,900.00. It's to be used together with the \$115,000 that I have already referred to, provided in the appropriation under discussion, for the installation of that sewer and water system. Second item, the Vital Statistics Computer Retrieval System, once again referred to a few minutes ago under this appropriation. In this case in the capital carryover, the amount we're intending to apply is \$6,500, once again completing the microfilming of records in the final automated retrieval system, that is in addition to the \$33,000 provided under appropriation 9, resolution 65, but it is the same project.

The other two items are different, new items, Mr. Chairman. One is the Residential Smoke Detector's Program. This is an ongoing program to assist operators of residential facilities to install

smoke detectors, that covers foster homes, group homes, and guest homes. The original authority was \$122,000 that was approved during 1977-78. . . —(Interjection)— Yes, but don't put that \$122,000 into your column yet. The original authority was \$122,000; the actual expenditures in 1977-78 were \$7,500, leaving a balance of \$114,500, and that's what we're carrying over here. So the figure to put into your column as you follow my remarks is \$114,500, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks., \$114,500.00.

he other item, Sir, is for ambulance equipment purchases. The original authority was \$28,000, that was approved during 1977-78, \$28,000 approved during 1977-78, but actual expenditures of \$7,600, leaving an unexpended balance of \$20,400, which is the figure to be added into the column that I'm providing honourable gentlemen with in my remarks at the moment. \$20,400, that's the carry-over and that obviously represents the balance of the authorized \$28,000 to purchase two ambulances; one for Wabowden and one for Grand Rapids-Easterville.

So the four project totals that I've given honourable members in the last few minutes, Sir, include one for \$48,900, one for \$6,500, one for \$114,500, one for \$20,400 for a total of \$190,300, and that represents our revised carry-over, and the records of the Department of Finance have been amended to so state that total, Mr. Chairman. The other \$215,500 from the original carry-over authority of \$405,800 has been amended out of the program, and that total has been reduced by that amount.

If the honourable member needs any further information on that, I'll certainly try to supply it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, a question on the installation of these residential smoke detectors in foster homes, group homes, etc., were those spent by the government directly, by the Minister's department, or was it in the form of a grant to the home itself? How did that take place?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: My understanding is that it's in the form of a grant to the home itself, Mr. Chairman, but I would have to confirm that to the honourable member. Not all that much was expended in 1977-78, so we're sort of coming into the mechanics of that system now. I'll have to confirm that to the honourable member.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Chairman, in looking and listening to the Minister and looking at the Estimates, the format — this goes back to the problem of the change in format. If one looks at the Estimates sheets and when comparing 1978-79 with 1977-78, one would be under the impression that in fact this House voted \$3,506,000 for Health and Social Development last year to be spent, and it shows that amount in the left-hand column and only \$398,000 this year. In other words the government this year is spending considerably less compared to what was voted last year.

The fact of the matter is that the \$3,506,000 was not directly voted by this House. It was under Schedule B, which is General Purposes, which could have been used for any number of projects, and the department did in fact indicate what moneys it thought it might require under Schedule B, and they did make out a list indicating that it would run to \$3,506,000, but there wasn't a vote specifically which could be tied to this particular Estimate. This is the problem I'm having throughout these Estimates, where we look at a column on the left-hand side indicating a certain capital vote with a much smaller one on the right-hand side. In my opinion, unless the capital vote was designated, as some of Schedule B was, for specific departments, for specific uses like Manitoba Water Services Board, etc, where they can only be spent for that purpose, then it would be fair to say that that should be shown on the left-hand column to indicate what the former government had intended and asked the House to approve in the way of Capital Expenditures. But the method chosen by this government to indicate an amount which was a possibility of being spent, but there was no commitment on the part of the government nor in the vote that took place last year that it must be spent by this department, or at all, and very often it was simply allowed to stand, and we know now from other Estimates — other departments — that in fact money is being used from 1976-77 Capital Authority, that hasn't been spent and is still being carried forward, because the government always felt, and we still do, that you needed a certain pool of money that you could draw on legitimately and with the capital vote having been approved to interject, if necessary, into the economy by the construction of certain facilities or by making grants to municipalities so they can construct facilities, but you needed that flexibility.

But what I object to, is that anyone looking at this without being knowledgeable on it, could look and say, "The former government voted and got authority to spend \$3,506,000. We, the new government, we're only going to spend \$398,000, look how much money we're saving." The fact

is, that was never the amount voted by this House. The \$3,506,000 might have been a figure, an amount drawn out of a much larger pot.

As I recall, the General Purposes Capital last year, undesignated, was \$82 million, so it's out of the \$82 million that this \$3.5 million might have been drawn, but it was a request by the department. Some of it might indeed have been spent as has already been indicated by the Minister, where he indicated certain amounts were spent and others, like in the Vital Statistics, and Pelican Lake, and there is still money flowing for those particular purposes. I believe Dental Health, last year, \$250,000 was spent, and nothing is going to be spent this year. So I feel that there's an attempt here, frankly, to place the Estimates in such a light as to show a high spending on the part of the former government, and a very low spending on the part of this government.

The fact is, we know from this department and others, that even the right-hand column isn't correct, because the right-hand column represents new authority being requested by government, plus authority voted last year under the broad General Purposes Schedule B, which could be used for any department, and is being used, as the Minister now indicates, to the extent of \$190,000 without it appearing on the right-hand column at all.

In other words, it's as if they are going to be doing \$600,000 worth of capital works for \$398,000.00. Now, that's a bargain and that is how it appears here. The Minister is really doing a miraculous thing. He is able to construct \$600,000 worth of facilities and only pay \$398,000 for it. That's what one reads into this, and that's what one can glean from this, if looking at it the way it has been presented.

This is just an example of what we found in other departments and it's misleading. It is trying to create a false impression that the former government did, in fact, was committed, had got an approval to spend \$3-½ million in this department for specific purposes, when that isn't the case. And on the other hand, this government is going to be doing even more for less money. As I say it's misleading, it's incorrect and it's trying to create an image, which is totally misleading insofar as being fair to the former government and misleading insofar as indicating what this government is actually doing in this fiscal year.

Now, I know the Minister of Health himself is not responsible for the format and I can't fault him personally, but it is the only occasion I have, in dealing with this particular department, to again highlight our dissatisfaction for what I feel is a conscious effort on the part of that government there to distort and to put a false front on their spending Estimates this year to try to convince the public that they are spending very little, when in fact they are going to be spending about \$30 million more, but they are not showing it because it's an authority from last year.

At the same time, by taking that authority and somehow spreading it around a number of departments, when in fact there was nothing; there was no reason for them to have shown \$3.5 million under Health and Social Development for last year. The figure should have been more in line with the actual expenditures made in that department. I suspect it added up to less than \$3.5 million, not that raw figure which was prepared by a department, saying, "We think we might draw down \$3-½ million." For example, \$900,000 they thought they would spend on the Childrens Dental Health Plan, we know they didn't. We know they didn't because the Minister put a freeze on it. He had no intention of it. I'm not sure we would have done it either but we know that they spent \$250,000 and not \$900,000.00. But here it still shows as if, in fact, they had authority to spend that, and that's what the House voted, and that's what I object to.

So I think it's wrong. It gives a false impression. It is misleading and it's trying to perpetuate an image that this government is trying to sell the public that they are such fantastic administrators that they are able to — with almost no moneys in these Acquisition and Construction of Physical Assets, a line that appears in every one of the Estimates — that they are able for half the money to deliver double the program. In fact, we know that isn't the case. They are going to be spending \$600,000, they are not going to be spending \$400,000, but the \$200,000 is charged to last year, but it's taken from last year's authority.

I still say that to have been perfectly frank and above board this year that the government should have lapsed all authority and have simply come in and stated, "This is our program; this is what we want; this is the money that we are requesting, that we are going to be spending, and we are not going to be using some unused capital authority voted in 1977 or 1976, or 1975," because some of it even goes back to 1975 although not perhaps in his department, but certainly in other departments.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like the Honourable Minister to give us a breakdown of what was spent out of this \$3,506,000 in this last year. I'd also like to hear him give us the rationale for the split in expenditures in Pelican Lake, and in the Vital Statistics Computer Program, where some was apportioned to this current year and some to the previous year. I don't understand the

reasoning behind it and I'd like the Minister to explain it.

I'd also like to know how much of the authorized unexpended capital authority from previous years will still be available to the Minister, other than the amount he mentioned, that is still on the books as being authorized unspent, and which could then be authorized at any time by Cabinet.

Finally, I'd like the Minister to tell us how much money is being spent under his administration in this current fiscal year for capital in hospital construction in the Province of Manitoba. All of which becomes the debts of the people of Manitoba required to be repaid by the people of Manitoba, and paid out of tax dollars through the per diem, or whatever other method is used by this government to finance the repayment of the capital debt, which is undertaken by the construction of authorized hospitals and any other capital works under this department.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, first dealing with the point raised by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, let me just say that the \$3,506,000 in the left-hand column simply represents the 1977-78 Loan Act approval. That was the amount that was approved. It included, for example, \$1 million for the Brandon Indian Residential School — the so-called Kelly Centre. Our intention is to accommodate that alcohol treatment centre, whether it is called the Kelly Centre or not — and I believe it is, regardless of where it is located — but that alcohol treatment centre in another facility. We are not pursuing the possibility of acquiring the old Brandon Indian Residential School.

So the picture, the scenario, is simply one of presenting honourable members with the figures for the adjusted vote, current and capital, in this department that was approved by the Legislature last year and over and against that showing the requested vote asked this year.

The \$3,506,000 simply represents the adjusted vote and, in the capital area, the Loan Act approval that was given under a Loan Act which is now obviously expired and is replaced with a . . . —(Interjection)— Yes, but in essence there is a small carry-over, as I have suggested, but that Loan Act approval really is now outdated. —(Interjection)— Well, it is, because we're dealing with a new fiscal year and we're dealing with approval that we need for new expenditures and we are asking for a very small carry-over, really, out of what was approved in total.

I recognize the point that the honourable member raised. It's come up with respect to other departments. It's certainly been kept to a minimum as far as the Department of Health and Social Development is concerned. I have no qualms about admitting, for the record, and inviting my honourable friend to publicize it as broadly as he wishes; that we have proceeded on the basis of requesting a carry-over of \$190,300 in capital for Acquisition and Construction of Physical Assets in the Department of Health and Social Development, in this fiscal year, from what was approved previously.

That is the position that should be known and should be down in black and white, notwithstanding the format of the Estimates, which I think is consistent with the principle of demonstrating what the adjusted vote was that was passed in the House by the Legislature in the previous year. That's all the \$3,506,000 represents.

The Honourable Member for St. Johns asked me a number of questions. I may have to ask him to repeat a couple of them, but one of them was for a breakdown of what that \$3,506,000 was intended for and how much of it was spent?

MR. CHERNIACK: That's it.

MR. SHERMAN: The \$3,506,000 was the Loan Act approval. The projects approved during 1977-78 totalled in cost, \$929,700, that was the total approved in 1977-78, \$929,700; actual expenditures, the total expenditure, Mr. Chairman, was \$737,000, leaving a balance of \$192,700; and what the money was spent on was . . . —(Interjection)— All right, it ranged from the Childrens Dental Health Plan to the Pelican Lake Training Centre.

There are one or two other questions that the honourable member asked me about whether or not there was additional capital authority, or I still had in reserve the possibility of requesting additional capital carry-over for my department for this year. The answer to that question, Mr. Chairman, is no. This is what I have requested. This is what the Department of Finance now shows in their records, that we have \$190,300 of capital carry-over.

The honourable member asked me, why projects like Pelican Lake and the Vital Statistics Computer Retrieval System are split in terms of the financial delineation offered, and asked me for the rationale for having part of it under our request for this year and part of it under capital carry-over.

The reason for that, Mr. Chairman, is that on Pelican Lake, for example, the work being done there on the installation of the sewer and water system, was one of the projects that was approved during 1977-78, and the amount approved for expenditure was \$71,000; and of that sum approximately \$22,100 was spent last year. So that left \$48,900 still to be expended on the project,

out of the capital authority voted for last year, the capital approval given last year. That's the \$48,900 that we have in our capital carry-over on the project, and we require an additional \$115,000 to complete the project. So we have asked for \$115,000 in the capital authority that we're requesting this year in the department.

The same thing applies on the Vital Statistics Computer Retrieval System. The project approved and given Loan Act approval in 1977-78 amounted to \$100,000.00. The actual expenditure was \$93,500, leaving a balance of \$6,500, which we are carrying over. We need close to \$40,000 to complete it, so we have to ask for the other \$33,000 in the vote on capital authority, that we're putting to the Legislature this year. That's the reason for the differentiation in listings, for the split in figures with respect to the two projects.

The other question I think the Honourable Member for St. Johns asked me, had to do with how much capital was being spent in the hospital and the health facility field this year. I've just forgotten whether he was asking me for an estimate. I didn't quite catch whether he was asking me for an estimate as to what capital was being spent on capital projects in the health facility field this year, in general, or was it in relation to a particular commitment?

MR. CHERNIACK: Total.

MR. SHERMAN: Total? Well, the total approved capital program, as announced in the Throne Speech, is \$12.2 million; but that doesn't include what's going into the Seven Oaks Hospital. The cash flow into the Seven Oaks Hospital is approximately \$700,000 a month, so we're looking at . . . —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon? Yes. So you're looking at \$8-½ million there and the \$12.2 million was in relation to the projects we announced, so we're looking at approximately \$20-½ million.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Honourable Minister. It now appears that this government and this Minister for this department, is committed to another \$20 million in capital expenditure, which will be required to be paid by the citizens of the taxpayers of Manitoba in future years. Therefore if one were truthfully to picture the proposed expenditures of this government in this year, there's another \$20 million to be spent this year which is not shown in the Estimates and which will still add up at the end of the year to another \$20 million that the taxpayers of the future will have to repay plus interest thereon. That's not no different than it was in previous years except that the administration of which the Honourable Minister is a part has been talking in these figures in such way as to make it appear that the previous government has been running up debt, but this government will no longer run up debt that will not show up in the Estimates.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks has already shown that we found that we had to force it out of the government, some \$30 million additional expenditures that will be involved and it is not farfetched to say, "Well now we know of another \$20 million in this year."

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister . . . —(Interjection)— Oh, the Honourable Minister said they would not all be spent. He said \$8.5 million will be spent this year only on the Seven Oaks Hospital and there will be more spent in future years and he said \$12 million announced in the Throne Speech, possibly that will not all be spent this year. I may have mistaken the \$12 million as being a projection over more than one year, but in any event, there is more money being spent on health services in this current year in a capital way to create more deficit, which is not shown in these Estimates. That's the point I wanted to make and I think that point is clear.

Mr. Chairman, a smaller item that I want the Minister to inform us about, is he said that it was originally planned that some \$5,000 \$40 was going to be spent this year out of previous authority and, therefore, not recorded in the Estimates book, but then it was cut back to \$190,000 which would seem to be \$216,000 having been reduced, he said by the Finance Department. I never knew when I was in the Finance Ministry that I had the authority to cut back that kind of money from other departments, but I'd like to know what is the nature of that cutback? What item was cut back? I don't want the Ministry popping up and down all the time, I'll give him my next question.

How can he possibly say that there is no more authority available for capital expenditures by his department when he says in one breath and in print, that there was \$3-½ million authorized last year and then says there was \$929,000 approved this year, and deny that there is over \$2-½ million authorized, according to his words, not approved for expenditure and then say there's no money left that could be spent by this government; and by this Minister by Cabinet approval. He has to explain that, Mr. Chairman, because the authority is there, he says it, I say it, anybody else will say it, the authority is there. Although I will argue that General Purposes gives a much broader authority, not just to this department, but this department and these Estimates would indicate \$3-½

million was approved last year, only less than \$1 million spent last year, \$2½ million left over and he says there's no authority. I want him to explain that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE: Just before we proceed, Mr. Chairman, it's usual for the Minister to have his staff here when we're going through line by line. The staff for the Manitoba Health Services Commission was in the Chamber to provide the Minister with information. I have a number of questions to ask on correctional institutions. This is the Construction and Physical Assets for the whole department and included in that is Corrective a Rehabilitative Services and I have gone through the Estimates and I don't see where the money which was drawn from the same source of general purpose is included in these Estimates relative to the correctional institutions, for example, at Brandon and The Pas.

I had mentioned to the Minister of Finance earlier, I gave him notice that it was my intention to introduce an amendment when we're dealing with this Capital Supply Bill, that I don't think the government should be deprived of the opportunity of presenting an honest picture to the citizens in Manitoba. I did give notice at the time but I'll repeat it, that I think that all capital authority on Schedule B should lapse as of March 31, 1978, that's all unexpended capital, not on all committed capital, so that the government can pass concomitantly a bill which would under their own authority raise these moneys.

I would ask, Mr. Chairman, on a Point of Order if the Minister should not have his staff present so that they could provide him with the information because I have a number of questions relative to correctional institution capital expenditures which should be included under this line.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have sent word to my office to call in the resources staff so that questions that are posed by honourable members at this time can be answered directly by those closer to the fiscal and financial operations of the department than I am and so that I don't have to defer these questions. Perhaps we could mark time on the question raised by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre for the moment and I will attempt to respond to the Honourable Member for St. Johns for the moment.

First of all, I don't dispute the fact, I'm sorry, I don't dispute the fact that there is capital authority. Obviously there is capital carry-over, there is voted authority for applying a further capital carry-over to this department's capital program for this year. What I meant was that I don't have the authority . . . What has been determined up to this point in time in the Executive Council by the First Minister and by me, in concert with my colleagues, is that these are the projects for which I have authority to ask the Legislature for permission to expend capital and to ask permission for carry-over of capital.

Now, I don't dispute the Honourable Member for St. Johns, the technical accuracy of his contention that the authority is there to apply something in the neighbourhood of \$2-½ million further because it's in the approved capital amount carried over from 1977-78, but I don't have Executive Council authority to do any more than what I'm showing you at the present time.

The other question of the Honourable Member for St. Johns had to do with the authority that we cancelled and I can give him the detail on that. It amounted to \$215,500. It was done on our initiative, we simply advised the Ministry of Finance, the Department of Finance to amend their records accordingly. It consisted of three projects, one of which was vans for the Childrens Dental Health Program in which \$2.4 million was the unexpended balance. There had been \$606,300 spend in 1977-78 out of an approved total of \$608,700, leaving a balance of \$2,400 unused and that is not being carried forward, or I'm not requesting that it be carried forward, that therefore presumably, from our perspective, would lapse.

The major item was the inner-city Employment Program, that was \$212,400, represented the balance of the original authority of \$400,000 in this area approved under the The Loan Act 1977-78, approved as a project for 1977-78 and of which only \$187,600 was spent in 1977-78. So there was a balance of \$212,400 in unused funds as at March 31, 1978. Honourable members will recall that that employment program is now being administered and funded by my department as a work activity project and those funds are . . . The program is continuing at the present level of service but the funds are being provided under a different appropriation. The work activity project appropriation under an earlier resolution on the Income Security Division side of my Estimates which we dealt with a few days ago. So that was that \$212,400 and the remaining amount, relatively small amount of \$700 under the Special Employment Program which represents the unspent funds out of an original authority of \$71,000 for three projects carried out at the Manitoba Health Services Commission. The projects were all completed during 1977-78 and they were completed for \$70,300 where \$71,000

Friday, June 9, 1978

had been approved, so there was an unspent balance of \$700 which we don't need. So those three, \$2,400, \$212,400 and \$700 add up to \$215,500 which is the amount by which we are reducing that original \$405,000 carry-over authority.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Honourable Minister first for giving the details and also for the forthright manner in which he is responding. We've now confirmed that there is an authority of \$2.5 million unapproved, unexpended but authorized from last year in the minds of the Minister and I assume, therefore, the minds of his government. I put it that way because we on this side know that General Purposes are indeed General Purposes and not allocated the way they have done it, but they have done it that way and they have shown \$3.5 million authorized and almost implied that is was authorized to be spent in the previous year by saying that this year they are only going to spend a certain percentage more than in previous years in the overall and the \$30 million was even greater than that.

I will leave it at that, Mr. Chairman, except to indicate to the Minister that when we deal with his salary I may then be asking him to give us an accounting. If he would look back to the 1976 Capital Appropriation and find that there under Health and Rehabilitation under General Purposes in Schedule B, there was a figure of \$4,378,000 under Health and Rehabilitation and since that is a continuing authority and does not lapse, it would be interesting to know how much of that money was spent so as to ascertain how much of that money is authorized and not spent and, therefore, available to the Cabinet to be used just by a mere authority from Cabinet to be used in this current year as it can do the \$2.5 million we've referred to from 1977. It may well be that there's more money there and, therefore, more than \$2.5 million available in legal authority today to the Cabinet to spend in addition to the moneys set out in the Estimates before us, and in addition to the \$30 million that they've already admitted that they are going to spend over and above that.

If the Honourable Minister is clear on what I've just said, then I don't even ask him to respond at this stage as long as the information will be available during his salary discussion.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe I'm clear on the request, to the Honourable Member for St. Johns, and I will be prepared to deal with it as best I can under the debate on my salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister said something which caught my attention. He referred to the Brandon Indian Residential School which was a project we were looking at and might have cost at that time, a rough calculation of perhaps \$1 million and he indicated, no, they were not looking at the Brandon Indian Residential School but in fact, were perhaps looking for a facility for an alcoholic facility somewhere else. Which means this to me, that instead of spending the amount of let's say \$1 million for the Brandon Indian Residential School, that he's thinking in terms of spending that same money, but for an alcoholic facility elsewhere. Now, since he's not asking for capital in this year, where would he get that money whether it be \$1 million, a half a million or, \$1.5 million, where would he get it from except from the unused previous years authority, the one that we say should have lapsed, but which haven't lapsed and could still be used by a stroke of a pen at the Cabinet to use for the alcoholic facility that the Minister is talking about.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not in a position to make a definitive announcement at this point, but I certainly would like to attempt to respond to the honourable member's question and I can tell him that the thinking is that it may be possible with the new correctional institution that's being built in Brandon, to accommodate the alcohol treatment facility and program that was contemplated and projected for the Indian Residential School within that new facility. That decision has not been finally taken and I don't want to leave the impression with the committee that I am making that kind of an announcement this afternoon. But the fact is that it's under very serious consideration. The fact is that the Cabinet has looked at the financial resources available to the taxpayers of Manitoba, has looked at the twin needs in Brandon, acknowledges the kind of usefulness that the Kelly Centre would be put to in the Indian Residential School, but for various reasons, cost being one of them, and technical difficulties related to negotiations in connection with that residential facility being another and the configuration and size of the new correctional institution being another, has come to the conclusion that it may well be the more viable route to try to combine the two. In that case we would not be into an additional capital expense because the Brandon Correctional Institution, the new institution I believe is being constructed to accommodate 68 beds.

The addition of the Kelly Centre clientele would mean an additional 23 beds and I can assure the honourable member that the new correctional institution if he cares to visit it, or he probably may well have done so, I think he would agree the advice from my department officials and others is that that institution could easily accommodate more than the 68 beds projected for it. So that, Sir, as I say is not an official solution this afternoon but that is a possible solution we're looking at.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I'm not pressing the Minister for a policy statement this afternoon and that's really not my concern. My concern is more the financial presentation and if whether or not they combine the Brandon Correctional with the Kelly Centre or they move to the Brandon Residential School, I'm not interested in at this point. What I am interested in, is where are they going to get the funds for it? They are not budgeting for it they are only asking for \$398,000, they're telling us they're only going to have to use \$190,000 of last year's Capital Authority vote, so where are they going to get the money from? I say to you the only place they can get it from is unused capital authority from 1977, 1976, 1975 voted by the previous government for which we have been criticized because we asked for large capital authorities, which they're not asking for, they don't have to because it's already been voted. Whether it combines one facility with another, it doesn't matter, he's still going to need the capital authority for it. So I can see that a month from now or six weeks or whatever length of time it takes the Cabinet to make up its mind about this facility, they're going to have to draw down capital authority. They're not asking for, they haven't got the guts to ask for it publicly here, so they're going to simply hide behind the fact that it was voted and unspent in previous years, and they'll be able to draw down on it again because the former government had no hesitation about coming to the House and saying we want capital authority as in last year, \$82 million which would be spent, maybe for this, maybe for that but giving us the latitude so we could, during the course of a year, make decisions and act on it.

This government's going to have to do the same, but instead of asking for the capital, they're simply going to use unexpended capital. So I'm not satisfied when the Minister says, "Well, all I'm asking for is \$190,000 of last year's capital at this time." And that's right, that's all he's asking for today June 9th, but July 9th he may give the green light and the Cabinet may give the green light for a facility in Brandon costing in excess of \$1 million. They're not asking for that authority, but they're leaning on the fact that the former government did ask for it, did receive it and the money is there which they will use at their pleasure when they want to, and again as I say, somehow indicate or try to say to the people of Manitoba, "You see all we ask for is \$398,000, but in fact we're going to deliver a \$1 million program."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose if we're going to count noses, we technically have to count noses in both the committees to see if we have 10 members in the House. Just for the benefit of staff, what I was looking for and further to what the Member for Seven Oaks said — I disagree with him somewhat. I think the government is going to accept a responsible position and vote for that amendment, wiping out all capital authority as of March 31st, then coming forth . . . The Legislature has power to make any legislation retroactive and they have interim supply which they can I'm sure, with the approval of the provincial auditor, say that this is the amounts of money that they're going to expend as of April 1, 1978. But for a specific example, the construction time-line for the Brandon Correctional Institution was 26 months. Now some capital flowed from the awarding of the contract to March 31st and the specific question is: How much actual cash flowed relative to this project prior to March 31 of 1978 and how much capital is going to be expended in an estimate to be forwarded to the contract during the current fiscal year?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I have to apologize to the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, I'm going to have to ask him to repeat part of that question. I was pursuing the question that he'd asked me earlier with respect to capital authority and capital projections for corrections and rehabilitation this year, 11 2 which was a question he raised with an eye on the \$398,000 in Resolution 65. The answer to that question is one that we'll have to deal with when we move on to Resolution 63, dealing with Corrective and Rehabilitative Services, because at that juncture my Correction staff will be able to provide the information relative to the kind of capital that we are seeking authority for spending in Corrections and Rehabilitation this year. That is not part of the \$398,000 capital appropriation resolution we're looking at, at this juncture; there's a separate authority for Corrections and Rehabilitation in the capital category relative to this year's Loan Act, and I can deal with that on the Corrective and Rehabilitative Services resolution.

The vote on it will come under Public Works, but I can explain it to the honourable member when we're dealing with that particular resolution. But he should not be misled by the particular

resolution we're looking at right now, of \$398,000, because that does not relate, in any way, to Corrections and Rehabilitation.

The point he just raised in the last few moments, I would have to ask him to repeat, if he would be so kind. Might I just say, that when we're looking at the capital authority that Public Works is seeking to implement and apply in 1978-79, which covers a number of departments, we are looking at a total request of \$24,721,000.00. That includes fire code upgrading work and a wide number of other projects; and the Corrections and Rehabilitations apportionment of that is included in that \$24.7 million total. I will endeavour to present him with specifics when we're on the Corrections and Rehabilitation resolution.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, this is exactly the type of thing that prompted me to suggest to our group that we put in that amendment to their Capital Supply bill, and I really don't fault staff for this, because it's a fast footwork routine.

I looked through the reconciliation statement in the forefront of the Department of Health and Social Development — albeit the previous government had two Ministers in this particular department, it was one department. So the Minister, under Resolution 65 — if they want to be consistent with what they are putting before the public as being a consistent position — all capital expenditures relative to the total department, which includes Corrective and Rehabilitative Services, should be included in this particular line.

You know, part of the charge against us as pointed out by the Member for St. Johns, there's roughly \$2 ½ million which is laying around in previously voted authority, which hasn't been committed, which they are now charging against this department as if we spent it.

But, Mr. Chairman, in looking at the reconciliation there is a transfer out of this department to Public Works, of \$727'200, and it's this type of thing which I think is confusing to the public, and after all in the final analysis, it is how well the public understands the presentation of these Estimates. Because the Minister, I know, is not trying to confuse the House in the way he's presenting it but nevertheless, a little bit of it here and a little bit of it there, we found it out in the Department of Agriculture, that this was the case, that they were charging against us some — I think it was \$3.2 million — as if we had spent the money. And of course it gets out to the public that we spent that money when that is not the case.

So once again, and I don't want to repeat myself in speaking to the amendment before the Committee, but nevertheless the government should be prepared, and that's why I gave the Minister of Finance notice that they should be prepared to isolate exactly that money which hasn't been spent as of March 31, 1978, and accept the responsibility of advising the people of Manitoba that that is the case; and they have the authority to pass concomitant legislation, effective as of April 1, 1978, that such authority does exist. I think it's incumbent upon the government to do so, so that a clear picture will be presented to the people of the Province of Manitoba.

This specific case that I mentioned so that it can be demonstrated to the public — that to which we refer — is the construction of the new correctional institution in Brandon was over a 26-month construction period. The process, has been in the past, that moneys were allocated — under an appropriation — and cash flowed from that allocation, so that certain moneys would have flowed from the awarding of the contract to March 31, 1978. The specific question I asked the Minister, how much money was actually paid out relative to the construction of the new Brandon Correctional Institution, prior to March 31, 1978?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, on that specific question, Mr. Chairman, I can get the information but I'll have to take it as notice. I can get the information for the honourable member, but I'll have to take it as notice and seek that information out.

I just want to say in respect of the general question, the general subject, that what we're looking at in Resolution 65, the \$398,000, are capital projects that are the specific undertakings of the department. They don't require Public Works input, or Public Works authority, or Public Works involvement in any way. As I pointed out earlier, when I gave the individual totals and the breakdown of the \$398,000 to the honourable members, they involve specific in-department projects and undertakings that can be handled by and in the department without Public Works involvement.

Now if the Ministry of Corrections and Rehabilitative Services had something like one of these projects that I specified, the Vital Statistics Computer Retrieval System project for example, it would be in that \$398,000.00. But there is nothing like that for Corrections and Rehabilitative Services in that total.

What the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre is getting at is major capital projects of a construction, or renovation nature, and those are handled under the Public Works appropriation. It's the same thing as if the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks were to ask me about fire safety upgrading at the Manitoba School for the Retarded in Portage, or renovations and fire safety upgrading at the Brandon Mental Health Centre or the Selkirk Mental Health Centre, that isn't in

that \$398,000.00. That's part of a \$5 million appropriation coming through Public Works for fire safety upgrading and renovation in the provincial institutions this year, and that is accounted for in the Public Works vote.

But here we're just dealing with some in-department projects and Corrections and Rehabilitative Services are not affected or involved at this point. They will be when we're looking at Resolution 63, and I can relate them then to the vote — or the share of the vote — that Corrections and Rehabilitative Services gets under the Public Works appropriation for this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicates that these major projects are under Public Works, I can't quarrel. But the \$3 ½ which is shown for 1977-78 authority, includes the Brandon Indian Residential School, of a million dollars; and as well does include some expenditures of the Manitoba School for Retardates; I think it was \$751,000.00. So the work may have been done by Public Works but charged to Health and Social Development.

So my concern is that the implication is being left that somehow what is shown here is purely internal work and it was in the department. And, as I indicated before, we know that all that's been spent is under \$1 million, and yet there's \$2 ½ million which that Minister has and which — if he can convince his colleagues tomorrow to spend on some alcohol facility, or anything else, the Selkirk Home, the Manitoba Home, the Correctional Institution, the Alcoholic facility — he can do so without, in any way, affecting or changing the figures on the righthand side and affecting the vote that the government has asked us to approve this year. In other words, the charge will all be on the former government, as if they in fact had done the spending.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to put the Minister in a spot. I heard his undertaking that he'd explain these item by item. What he says is correct, that the instrumentality that government uses for construction for the departments is Public Works. But unless the procedure has changed, nevertheless the process was for the Minister of the department involved to co-operate with the Minister of Public Works, to forward an instrument to Management Committee to vet the allocation of capital, and subsequently the Cabinet as a whole was responsible for it.

But rather than belabour it at this point, Mr. Chairman, perhaps we should proceed with Item 63.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Clause 9.—pass. Resolution No. 65: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$398,000 for Health and Social Development, Acquisition Construction of Physical Assets, \$398,000—pass.

Resolution No. 63, Clause 7. Corrective and Rehabilitative Services, (a) Ministerial (1) Minister's Compensation—pass; (2)—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: I would suggest we just pass (a) because it's a Nil appropriation and any points that we wish to raise, we can raise under (b).

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a)—pass; (b)(1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister can explain what he intends to do with this Administration and Executive Function in this particular area.

A MEMBER: Yes, a good idea.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I approach the field of Corrective and Rehabilitative Services from the perspective of the profession and the discipline in relation to what's happening not only in Manitoba but right across the country today and indeed throughout jurisdictions, I would venture to suggest, across the western world. We know that the system of corrections and rehabilitation and the system of justice, generally, are under some considerable and ongoing campaign of criticism, particularly some segments of the system, and particularly some segments of the system in Canada.

Manitoba, like its other counterparts across the country and its federal counterpart is receiving and undergoing wide-ranging and critical examination in the field of Corrections and Rehabilitative Services from many and diverse sources, Sir. Some of them being the media, professionals, the public, community leaders, and I would have to observe the two groups whose criticism is the most

devastating and the most important and the most meaningful, the recipients of correctional services and the correctional manpower providing those services.

The criticism is occurring at a time when national confidence in the criminal justice system and the part that Corrections plays in this process is somewhat tenuous. This is a time when special concern is being focused on current and persistent fragmentation of penal services, accompanied by problems of inadequate public support, dwindling assurance in the concept of community corrections, media and systems reports of overcrowding and violence, undiminished recidivism rates, outmoded legislation, and uncertainty and ineffectiveness that are symptomatic of a rather broadly disjoined system of justice services generally. So there are many who are embarked on the search for solutions to correctional problems and the search for upgrading of programs and services to provide new and improved orientation of enterprises in this field, benefiting both society and the offender. Some of these efforts are obstructed now by current fiscal restraints and equally important, Sir, hard-line public opinion.

Requests for increased fiscal resources necessary to upgrade efficiency and effectiveness often times meet with very little support, very little sympathy and the current and ongoing crisis in other penal systems, I would submit, is reflected here in equal measure in Manitoba.

So I approach the assignment as Minister responsible for Corrective and Rehabilitative Services with a sense of considerable challenge, Mr. Chairman. I know that the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre who formerly was the Minister of the Crown responsible for Corrections and Rehabilitative Services and was indeed a Minister of a separate department at that time, has wide experience in this field and I look forward to the suggestions, the comments and the criticisms that he will contribute during this debate on these particular Estimates, with a spirit of interest and appreciation. I make no bones about the fact that I have considerable to learn and considerable to cover in this field. I've tried to address it with conscience and with effort in the seven and a half months that I've been in office, but it is complicated, it is sophisticated, there are no easy answers. Even the experts find that their expertise necessarily must undergo ongoing review, re-examination and amendment and so I don't profess to come to the committee with the presentation of my Estimates this year, with anything more than a request for helpful and co-operative consideration of the problems and the challenges that we all face together, and an invitation for some suggestions as to the directions that Manitobans would be best advised to pursue in this field in the immediate future.

Some of the problems that we look at in definitive terms at the present time include overcrowded facilities, racial tensions, fragmented services, the whole problem of staff safety, the whole matter of resident populations exhibiting more severe attitudes and including larger and more violent criminal components and the strain of institutional environments. Combined, they all contribute to the uneasiness abroad in the system today.

I want to assure the committee, Mr. Chairman, that as Minister I'm deeply concerned that there are subsurface factors that may give rise to violent and destructive incidents or reduce staff morale and reduce staff performance to levels that make it very difficult to maintain operational effectiveness and efficiency. This is a primary area on which my officials and I and my colleagues hope to concentrate attention in the months ahead with the hopeful conclusion of producing some effective remedies and some effective new courses of action. I believe that a system for regular inspection and ongoing monitoring of all aspects of Correctional and Probation Services based on firm standards would serve as an important and realistic policy and a course of action for the government and the people of Manitoba. I believe that that kind of an approach would hopefully produce the following benefits for us. It would give us a machinery by which we could measure and regulate the quality and performance of this system; it would promote improved planning services and resources; it would help us to identify achievements throughout the system; it would help us to improve attitudes in the system and confidence in the system and it would help in communicating the policies and procedures and goals and problems of correctional agencies generally within the system and outward to the public and to the policymakers.

So it's really at that complicated and challenging level and from that perspective that I approach my stewardship in this Ministry at the present time. I want to say for the record, Mr. Chairman, that nobody moving into this responsibility could have had better support, closer co-operation, stronger reinforcement than has been afforded me by my Deputy Minister in this Ministry, Dr. John Banman, and his staff and my staff reaching throughout all the branches of the Ministry itself, including the executive function, the probation and parole service, the field of juvenile corrections, the service dealing with adult corrections, our Financial and Administrative Branch, our Staff Training Branch and our human resources people and personnel generally. So, I want to say to the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre that I believe that I was fortunate in inheriting a strong sense of loyalty and purpose and direction in this Ministry and I think it's no doubt a tribute in considerable measure to the way in which the Ministry and/or the department was directed in the past.

There are some obvious questions that will arise quickly in the mind of the Honourable Member

for Winnipeg Centre and other members relative to the appropriations being requested on a line by line basis in front of us at the moment, but the general approach that I take and the general overview that I take is contained within my remarks up to this juncture, Mr. Chairman, and I would be pleased to entertain, as best I can, the questions that now would arise from the opposite side of the committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, it's rather a pleasant experience to sit here and listen to what I would have said had I been there, because I see that the staff is doing their excellent good job in preparing good notes for the Minister.

By in large, I wish to commend the Minister, because if we look around the room that we occupy, we see the relative importance of this particular appropriation. It's really not that much of a priority in most people's minds. I want to commend the Minister having had to sit and fight for the moneys to be allocated to this area. It's very difficult to compete with things that seem to be higher on the public's list of priorities than correction, such as roads and things of that nature. There are some areas doubtless that I will argue that he should have maybe fought a little harder.

In opening the debate on this particular item, I wish to take this opportunity to publicly thank the staff of this section of government, and correct the Minister, it was not a department, and it was very very difficult to keep arguing this way, that this was a separate Ministry within the Department of Health and Social Development, but it was one department. Because when you are dealing with strong-minded and strong-willed people, they have a tendency sometimes to get their bit in the teeth and take off, but I think in the final analysis if there is to be a solution in dealing with people that have difficulty behaving themselves in generally accepted terms, it has to be done in co-operation with the community and it is in that sense more of a social service than it is a punitive service.

But I've said it before and I'll repeat it, and I probably will have to point out the exceptions to it. I think the Minister, by and large, will continue to accept the good advice he gets from competent people that we have established in Manitoba a firm but fair system of corrective and rehabilitative services, and this is what the public should be aware of.

Earlier today, Mr. Chairman, my colleague, the Member for Seven Oaks, was talking about the Kelly Centre in Brandon, and while this place did not come to fruition under the prior administration, I wanted to take this opportunity — we just have a minute left in this day, so I'd just like to put in on the record — the reason why we had entertained calling such a facility Kelly Centre was in recognition of the contribution made by the former Assistant Deputy Minister in this Ministry, Mr. Perry Kelly, who died at an early age, doubtless contributed to by the amount of effort that he put into serving the people of the province of Manitoba, because here was one man who was able to look at a major construction project and to squeeze out the last possible penny so that we could have a functional building and an appropriate building and the institution in Brandon which the Minister referred to earlier is as a result of his efforts. And if the Minister would care to consult with the staff, he will see that some of the designs of the architects who worked on this place earlier, architects having a tendency to build Taj Mahals, that the place was to be flashed with copper and other such things, and a crash-proof gate. The gate itself was I think over \$52,000 or so, so that when you get down to the rock bottom of it, Mr. Kelly, before he left us, was able to save in this one particular area I think a couple of million dollars of the taxpayers of Manitoba's money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with Rule 19 (2) I'm interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour and will return at the call of the Chair.

The Honourable, the Government House Leader.

MR. JORGENSEN: I believe that there's general agreement that we do not proceed with Private Member's Hour today, to therefore I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs that . . .

MR. BOYCE: Before you put the motion, I would assume that this item has been passed.

MR. JORGENSEN: Very well. Mr. Chairman, do you want to pass that item?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (b)(1)—pass.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

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

Friday, June 9, 1978

MR. SPEAKER: *The Honourable Member for Rac'isson.*

MR. ABE KOVNATS: *Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dauphin, that the Report of Committee be received.*

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: *The Honourable Government House Leader.*

MR. JORGENSEN: *Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, that the House do now adjourn.*

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