

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, April 17, 1979

**Time: 2:30 p.m.**

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** Before we proceed, I should like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the gallery, where we have 40 students from Nelson McIntyre Collegiate School, together with their guests, 40 students from Nova Scotia, under the direction of Miss Glade. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

We also have 100 members of the Manitoba Metis Federation present this afternoon. On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this afternoon.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Presenting Petitions.

## READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

**MR. CLERK:** The Petition of Rossmere Golf and Country Club Limited praying for the passing of An Act to Grant Additional Powers to Rossmere Golf and Country Club Limited.

## PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

**MR. WARREN STEEN:** Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, we have it in its correct order now. I beg to present the Second Report of the Committee of Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

**MR. CLERK:** Your Committee met on Tuesday, April 17, 1979, and examined the Annual Report of Manitoba Forestry Resources Ltd., for the year ended September 30, 1978.

Having received all information desired by any member of the Committee from the President and Chairman of the Board, Mr. Leifur Hallgrimson, the report was adopted.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

**MR. STEEN:** I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. James, that the Report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## COMMITTEE REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Radisson.

**MR. ABE KOVNATS:** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, and has directed me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that the report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Can the First Minister confirm that a meeting has been arranged for later this afternoon between himself and representatives of the Manitoba Metis Federation.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood):** Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that my office has been in touch with the President of the Manitoba Metis Federation to arrange a meeting which I expect will take place on Thursday, although a date has not been firmed up with the President as yet. The Minister of Northern Affairs is not available in the House this afternoon because of a medical appointment and we will have that meeting probably Thursday if that is agreeable to Mr. Morrisseau.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, further to the First Minister — during the past seventeen months some seventeen proposals have been made to the provincial government by the Manitoba Metis Federation requesting action with respect to various areas of concern to the Federation; fishing, housing, jobs, etc. Can the First Minister indicate whether or not he will on behalf of his government be indicating a position in respect to any one of these proposals that have been made to his government since December of 1977, at that meeting.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, of course I cannot at this stage forecast any discussions that will take place at a meeting to be held this week. There have already been two or three meetings in which I have participated over the last few days. I expect that the meeting that is proposed for Thursday will be in the same vein, to review any additional proposals that may be made. We had a proposal, of course, from the Federation, I believe it was May 1978, asking for a very extensive employment program costing some \$61 million. Whether some aspects of that will be reviewed or a refined version of it, one can't anticipate at this stage. But we will be receptive to hear and to continue the discussions that have been going on and also to be brought up to date with respect to any advances that have been made by The Federation with respect to their negotiations with the Federal Manpower people.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I am not referring to any additional proposals but referring to the seventeen proposals that have been made to his government at various times, December to the present time. Can the First Minister in fact deny or confirm that there has been no policy response on the part of his government to any one of those seventeen proposals up to the present date.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that there have been ongoing discussions with the Federation and these will continue. As and when there are decisions that are made they will, of course, be reported in due course.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, in December of 1977 there was filed a Development Plan referred to as a Social Economic Development Proposal by the Manitoba Metis Federation. This proposal was presented to his government.

Is he in a position to indicate what his government's policy position is in respect to the Social Economic Development Proposal submitted to his government by the Manitoba Metis Federation? Is his government in support of the proposal or is it, in fact, rejecting that proposal?

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to indicate that kind of detail in Orders of the Day. I daresay, when the Estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs are before the House, my honourable friend will have ample opportunity to discuss that, and any other matters of that concern.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Well, is the First Minister in a position to indicate to us as to why there has been no indication as to the position of his government in respect to that proposal, despite the fact that the proposal was submitted to his government in December of 1977?

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend was in government long enough to know, that proposals of varied sorts and kinds are submitted to governments, whether of his stripe or our stripe, from time-to-time, not all of which are acted upon, not all of which are treated with immediately, because some of the requests that are made — I'm not being specific in this case

— but in the general sense, some of the requests that are made cannot be acted upon. So, my honourable friend I hardly think needs that kind of re-enlightenment that that is the case.

Any proposals that have been submitted by the Federation will be reviewed, if they are thought to be reasonable there will be further discussion upon them. But I can remember, Mr. Speaker, I forget the date, when the Federation — I believe it was — presented a proposal to the government of which my honourable friend was a distinguished member, requesting large land grants in Manitoba. I might equally ask my honourable friend what reaction his government gave to that proposal?

**MR. PAWLEY:** If, indeed, the First Minister is indicating a rejection of the proposal, or any one of those proposals, can he enlighten the House as to why that indication has not been made to the Manitoba Metis Federation so they would know, they would know in fact that their proposal has been rejected by this government, rather than waiting in a period of grey as to what is the intentions — policy intentions — on the part of his government?

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, the discussions will continue with the Federation with respect to any and all matters that they wish to raise with the government, notwithstanding any attributions, implications or suggestions that my honourable friend may wish to imply in the course of his questioning today.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. RONALD McBRYDE (The Pas):** Mr. Speaker, I wanted to address a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs, and I don't know if I'll get a better answer today since he's not here, than I normally do, but, Mr. Speaker, I'll redirect the question to the First Minister.

I wonder if the First Minister can confirm that the Tawow project to relocate northern people from remote communities to Leaf Rapids for employment with Sherritt-Gordon Mines, whether that project that was designed to handle 50 families, whether there are less than 25 families now in that program?

**MR. LYON:** Well, Mr. Speaker, some mention was made of the relocation program the other day in the House. My information is that that program is continuing, and is under way, and that there are approximately 50 families involved in the program. As the Minister indicated to the House the other day, there is a housing problem. There is a possibility that that problem can be at least in part ameliorated, that there may well be fifty more families that can be accommodated in that program according to the information I have been given, subject of course to negotiations that are going on with respect to the question of housing. But that topic was dealt with the other day.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas with a supplementary.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I guess another question to the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister could confirm that the Thompson Metis Federation Program, relocation of families from remote communities to work at INCO; whether that program that was designed to handle thirty families, has less than ten families presently in that program?

**MR. LYON:** No, Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm that and even if I could, I would not draw from it the conclusion that my honourable friend is obviously attempting to draw. There are a number of components that go into relocation programs. One of the major components is the willingness of the people to accept employment and that is an element that has to be worked on by all of the parties who are involved; that is, both government levels, the mining companies, and the Federation, to the extent that they are involved in this program and I think that all parties working co-operatively together can try to overcome that and a number of other problems that are not new to the Province of Manitoba, regrettably, but have been part of the employment history of this province for some time.

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister then could clarify that of the few programs that are left to assist northern residents to obtain employment, is one of the major problems the unwillingness of people to accept employment?

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, what I was indicating is that in one of the relocation programs, that is

one element. What I can also indicate for my honourable friend however, is that in addition to the relocation programs, we have an expanded highways and roads program going on in northern Manitoba this year. We are looking at the whole policy of the fishery, wherein in rough terms, the poundages taken from our northern lakes of decreased approximately 50 percent over the past ten to twelve years and in which Metis people have been in the past actively involved. In addition, we have the usual maintenance and enhancement programs being carried on with respect to waterworks, airports, and other infrastructure developments in northern Manitoba. So my honourable friend will readily appreciate that it would be erroneous to say that there are not meaningful programs going on in northern Manitoba.

As I said to him the other day however, there are not patchwork, makework, hothouse programs going on which were raising expectations falsely of people as they did in my honourable friend's time in government, and that will not go on.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. GERALD W.J. MERCIER (Osborne):** Mr. Speaker, in response to a number of questions from the Member for Kildonan with respect to the death of a Mr. De Silva due to the collapse of an excavation trench, Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise him that charges have been laid and served in respect to breaches of certain regulations under The Workplace Safety and Health Act. They have now been served upon the defendant, A. Simoes Construction Company Ltd.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to a question by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland yesterday about the condition of provincial road No. 304, I want to assure the honourable member that the Department of Highways is aware of problems in the area within the community of Bissett. We are doing what we can at this particular time to alleviate them. There has been a particular condition of that road due to new construction last fall that has aggravated the problem.

I think the honourable member will understand that at this particular time, what we need more than anything else is sunshine in order for us to be able to effect the kind of maintenance improvements to that road that will help that situation.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister could indicate, that of those few programs that are left to assist with employment in northern Manitoba, whether he has any plans, whether his government has any plans or programs projected to replace the 860 jobs that have been eliminated by the change of priorities of his government?

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, without accepting in any way, shape or form the statistics used by the Honourable Member for The Pas, I would invite him to listen carefully to the Estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs, the Department of Labour, other departments of government when they're before the House so that he may be further enlightened.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas with a supplementary.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, speaking to the ministers whose Estimates the First Minister has just mentioned, is like talking to the wind, and therefore, I'd like to address another question to the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it continues to be the policy of his government that welfare is preferable to assisting people to find jobs in northern Manitoba.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, it has never been the policy of this government, and I would hope it was not the policy of my honourable friends opposite, and I would hope it is not the policy of any government in Canada. I find the question impertinent and insulting to some of our guests here today.

**A MEMBER:** Hear, hear.

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, the citizens of northern Manitoba have indicated many times to this

government, that they would prefer jobs to welfare any day. However, Mr. Speaker,  
—(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. May I point out to all members of the gallery that it is customary for members of the gallery to refrain from any active participation in the debates and what goes on on the floor of the Chamber. If it continues, we would have no alternative but to take some other action. I would hope that members of the public would co-operate, and allow the members of the Chamber to ask their questions and answers to be given to the questions. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, with a final supplementary. I wonder if the First Minister could confirm, in regards to northern Manitoba, the provincial responsibility, welfare rates, the number of employable persons in receipt of social assistance has increased under his government. Could he confirm that please?

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, no, I couldn't, but my honourable friend obviously had the opportunity during the last 59 hours to put that question to the Minister of Health.

**A MEMBER:** 63.

**MR. LYON:** 63.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. HARVEY BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister, in view of his statement that his government claims to not prefer welfare to employment opportunities, I would ask him what has become of the special Northern Employment Program and the Inner City Employment program, which were both established to provide financial assistance to native people seeking to help themselves develop jobs through the establishment of useful economic enterprises. I would ask him, Mr. Speaker, why his government has reduced the funding to these particular assistance programs and in the case of at least one of them has eliminated it entirely, Mr. Speaker, thereby reducing the opportunity for people to work and thereby abandoning people to the only alternative and that is welfare.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, again without accepting any of my honourable friend's real or mythical premises, I can say to him that the relocation program that has been mentioned in the House on a number of occasions in the last few days is an expanded program. I would say to him as well that the economic climate of the province at the present time is considerably better than it was eighteen months ago, thereby increasing the number of jobs that are available in the private sector, and that that condition hopefully is going to continue, because no longer do we have a government in office, Mr. Speaker, that is in a confrontational position either with the private sector or with any elements of the community of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. BOSTROM:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the Honourable Premier's suggestion that the economic climate has improved is not accepted by members that are in the gallery today, or else they wouldn't be here. And Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister if the program that he keeps harping on regarding the transferring of people from remote communities to mining centres in northern Manitoba is the only program that he intends to follow as a government, and why, Mr. Speaker, he has eliminated programs like the Special Northern Employment Program, the Inner City Employment Program, and has reduced funding to other employment programs and eliminated staff in the departments of Northern Affairs and Renewable Resources that were employed in trying to attempt to relate people in northern communities to the resources that are there, in order that they may be able to provide useful, productive employment for themselves. Why, Mr. Speaker, has he eliminated these programs and he still pretends . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that his questions are repetitious? Does the honourable member have a new question?

**MR. BOSTROM:** Well, Mr. Speaker, they may be repetitious only to the point that we're not getting answers, and Mr. Speaker, we'll continue to ask questions until we do get answers. But I ask the Premier to answer the questions that we have asked here today.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I've already indicated to my honourable friend that, based on previous experience, we do not accept the premises of his questions or the facts that he alleges are a basis for his questions. My honourable friend will have ample opportunity during the Estimates of the Department of Northern Affairs to advance his particular ideas with respect to employment programs, projects that the government is or should be carrying on, or any other constructive ideas which we would welcome having from him. However, we will not, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated before, try to engage in that kind of raising of false expectations by patchwork make-work government bureaucratic programs which did no good for anyone.

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

**MR. BOSTROM:** Mr. Speaker, I refer in my final supplementary to an evaluation which was prepared by his government, an evaluation of the special employment programs which he has eliminated in this province. Mr. Speaker, I ask him if he cannot confirm that the special employment programs that were established by the New Democratic government in 1977, created 22,500 man-months of useful productive work in the province of Manitoba, and, Mr. Speaker, his government has eliminated those programs. And I ask him if he is going to put anything in place to try to replace those programs and/or improve upon them because, Mr. Speaker, if we were the government we would have improved upon them?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I cannot in any way, shape or form, as I've said before, confirm my honourable friend's real or mythical statistics. They tend to be more mythical than real.

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

**MR. A.R. (Pete) ADAM (Ste. Rose):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the First Minister. I would like to ask him why his government is following a policy of bringing in Mexican offshore workers, when in perpetuity — that was pretty well established last night in Agriculture Committee — when we have thousands of people willing to work in Manitoba? Why would we be bringing in offshore Mexican workers?

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend will obviously have all the time that he wishes to pursue that matter in the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture, which are currently —(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, if the Member for St. Johns, who is legless at most times, although his tongue seems to be very active, if he would care to engage in the debate in the Department of Agriculture, where he is such an expert, we would love to hear from him. You know, the Member for St. Johns is lost if he gets north of Selkirk Avenue, but, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend will have the opportunity to pursue that question in the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture. Do I hear yawnings and gapings from St. Johns again, Mr. Speaker? —(Interjections)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. —(Interjections)— Order please, order please. —(Interjections)— May I suggest to all members that they allow the courtesy —(Interjections)— Order please.

The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to add to the query put by the Member for Ste. Rose, that immigration policy with respect to workers coming in or out of Manitoba is not established by government. We have a department, of course, through Manpower that is involved in immigration matters, but these matters are largely at the behest of the employers, who may be seeking assistance at particular times of the year. If my honourable friend has a question to direct to them, I suggest that he speak to them directly.

**MR. ADAM:** Yes, a supplementary to the First Minister, would he not agree that his Minister has to make the request for immigration of these workers into Manitoba? And I would like to elaborate

a little more fully, Mr. Speaker, that last night we have passed that particular section, and we were not able to get answers, and that is why I'm posing that question to you, Sir.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the Estimates is that there's always the Minister's Salary, and if my honourable friend wishes to raise the question again, I'm sure that he will be free to do so.

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

**MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Lac du Bonnet):** Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the First Minister wouldn't want it left on the record that it is another jurisdiction that determined that there should be out-of-the-country labour brought into this province in the last two years. Mr. Speaker, does the First Minister not communicate with the Minister of Agriculture and his Manpower people, who have requested that out-of-the-country labour be brought in and made that request to the government of Canada, and it is on the basis of that request, that that is being done?

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, —(Interjection)— what's your problem? —(Interjection) Mr. Speaker, I can only say to my honourable friend, that the information that the Minister of Agriculture has given to the Committee, indicates that there is an agreement in existence among all parties with respect to this matter, and if he wishes to pursue that a little further in the Department of Agriculture Estimates, he's free to do so. I've never seen the honourable member very shy about doing such things.

**MR. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Speaker, this would be an appropriate time to ask the First Minister if he would guarantee that there would be no Motions of Closure on debate in the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture?

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I can give no such guarantee, especially in face of the filibustering that's done by the Member for Lac du Bonnet and others.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. JAMES DOWNEY (Arthur):** Mr. Speaker, I took a question as notice last week, on April 11th, from the Member for St. George, and the Member for Lac du Bonnet, and I have the answers to the questions that I took in regards to the turkey quota that's available to Manitoba producers.

First of all, let me clarify that it is the Producer Board and their people who have done the negotiating for any change in quota for Manitoba, so it hasn't been the responsibility of government, in fact, the actual Producer Board.

The base quota, which we have had in Manitoba, something like 8.9 percent of the National quota has not changed. We will be continuing to share in that total national amount of quota available. There has been negotiations, however, on the additional quota that has been allocated to the National Plan. That percentage works out to somewhat less, in fact, from what the 8.9 percent is, but there has been no change in the basic quota. The only change in any quota allocation is, in fact, on the new total sharing of the total amount allocated.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. Due to the fact that these Metis people just emerged from a sit-in, I find it pitiful they had to take such extremes to focus their problems, and I think that the First Minister is not answering questions explicitly. We want answers that we can understand, they can understand, and do something about the problems.

My first question, Mr. Speaker: What number of departmental staff in Northern Affairs and Labour and Manpower are directly involved in career, relocation, and counselling of Metis family heads?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question as notice for the Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs, but I might suggest to my honourable friend that it would be much more appropriately asked on the Estimates of that department. This is not the appropriate time in Question

Period for items of departmental detail.

**MR. BARRO:** Mr. Speaker, I expected the answer. There are two standard answers to two standard phases. The first phase: "Due to the mess we inherited from the former government. "The second phase: "We'll take it as notice until we get into the Estimates."

Second question: What percent of northern public sector jobs, including utilities and Crown Corporations, are presently filled by Native people?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Member for Flin Flon that detailed technical questions are questions that either could be written questions of the Ministry, or else could be raised during Estimates.

The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. BARROW:** Mr. Speaker, can you tell us how to ask any question and get an answer?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Flin Flon should know that it is highly improper for a member to direct a straight question at the Speaker.

The Honourable Member for Flin Flon, I'm sorry, I'm pointing out to the honourable member that he is out of order if he asks a direct question of the Speaker.

**MR. BARROW:** On a Point of Order.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On a Point of Order.

**MR. BARROW:** Mr. Speaker, be improper and arrogant like the First Minister and his front bench.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Churchill.

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Education. I would ask the Minister of Education if he can inform the House as to what percentage of jobs created under last year's Private Section Youth Employment Program went to native youth students for 1978-79?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Education.

**HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli):** Mr. Speaker, I don't carry those figures around with me. I'll have to take that question as notice. That particular program now rests with the Minister of Labour; Minister of Northern Affairs. He has that data in his department but I will take it as notice.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Churchill.

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my second question to the Minister of Health. Recently, last week, we asked the Minister if he could confirm that there had been eight suicides in the past number of months in the Thompson area of northern Manitoba. He said at that time that he would take that question as notice and undertake to get an answer back to us. I wonder if he can now confirm that those eight suicides have taken place and that this is statistically far in excess of the yearly average for the entire population of northern Manitoba for the past seven years, and can the Minister further confirm that the rash of recent suicides is at least partially attributable to the high levels of frustration, which we are seeing around us all the time in these days, felt by northern residents because of the lack of opportunity and what is rapidly translating into a lack of hope?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L.R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** No, Mr. Speaker. I can no more confirm that today than I could last week when the honourable member asked me the question and I took it as notice. I have asked for a report on the situation. I expect to have it very shortly; certainly some time this week, and I will respond to the honourable member's question at that time.

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



**MR. COWAN:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my final question to the First Minister. Is the First Minister prepared to meet with the many delegates of the Manitoba Metis Federation who are here today, who have requested a meeting with him today? If they would agree to meeting with the First Minister in the absence of the Minister of Northern Affairs, is he prepared to commit himself as he leaves these Chambers today to have that meeting with those people, who want to talk to their Premier, to the First Minister of this province, so they can clue him in on some of the facts that he has obviously chosen to ignore and some of the facts that he has obviously chosen to belittle?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated that my office has been in touch with the president of the Federation. I thank my honourable friend for Churchill for his intercession. I'm not aware that he has been in the habit of making appointments for the Premier's office however.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, it seems with the difficulty that people are having getting in to meet the First Minister, that no one is making appointments for the First Minister's office. I don't intend to make an appointment, I intend. . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. Does the honourable member have a question he wants to ask? The Honourable Member for Churchill with a question.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question to the First Minister: Is he prepared to meet with the delegation that is here today from the Manitoba Metis Federation, who want to meet with him to discuss some very real problems and concerns? Is he prepared to meet with them today, this afternoon, when they are prepared to bring their concerns before him?

**MR. BARROW:** And if not; why not?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I have already answered that question. My office has been in touch with the president of the Federation. I'm not aware that the Member for Churchill is an official of the Federation. I would prefer, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the. . . —(Interjection)— If the Member for St. Johns would like to make raucous noises, might I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he do it outside of the House.

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Johns on a matter of privilege.

**MR. LYON:** Privilege? How do you spell it?

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I would like to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that I informed the First Minister that his Minister of Northern Affairs has just walked into the Chamber. If he does not want that kind of helpful information, I'll try not to give it to him.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Johns did not have a matter of privilege.

The Honourable First Minister.

**MR. LYON:** Mr. Speaker, I was just concluding before I was interrupted by the helpful Member for St. Johns, by saying that any appointments with respect to the Minister and myself will be made directly with the president or officers that he designates of the Manitoba Metis Federation.

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

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, seeing as how the president of the Manitoba Metis Federation is in the gallery, is the First Minister prepared, now that the Minister of Northern Affairs has entered the gallery and is present, is the First Minister prepared to meet briefly with

the president of the Manitoba Metis Federation outside the Chambers here, as soon as the Question Period is over, so as they can arrange that meeting that he feels should be arranged between the two of them?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that he asked the same questions for the third time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable, the Minister of Labour. Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Labour assure unemployed people generally, and particularly the unemployed people who are in the Chamber making a public demonstration today, that his government will do everything to see that both the public sector and the private sector operates in such a way as to make jobs available for those people in the Province of Manitoba who are seeking to obtain the same?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Labour.

**HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson):** I'd like to believe, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Member for Inkster, that there will be a great amount of work taking place in northern Manitoba in the next few months. The Member for Inkster is aware that my Estimates have not been tabled, but I can tell him in general terms that there is several million dollars worth of variety of types of work that will be going on in northern Manitoba, and I'd like to assure him that it's the government's position and certainly my position that the majority of that work shall go to the people living in that particular area. I think I have established that reasonably credible in this House. I have established it with the first major policy that I made with the blessing of the government that work on all winter roads two years ago should go to the people living in the community. And this was a new move, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister's affirmative reply, and I gather it was an affirmative reply, can the Minister tell me why he and every member of the Treasury Branch, and every member of the Conservative Party, voted yesterday not to implement programs in the public and private sectors to make jobs available for every citizen in the Province of Manitoba who wants to obtain same?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I point out before the Minister answers, he has one minute left in the Question Period.

The Honourable of Labour.

**MR. MacMASTER:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster is attempting to win his point here that he couldn't win in debate otherwise. He's asking another round-about question. He's saying, as he said with the resolution that he's referring to that at all expense, regardless of caution, regardless of budget restraints, regardless of the interest of the public, that public money should be spent regardless of the interests of all the citizens of the province. That kind of money we should dig in our pockets, bring out that kind of money to provide jobs for people at all costs. That's what he's insinuating, Mr. Speaker, and I can't accept that premise.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time for questioning having expired —(Interjection)— The Honourable Member for Inkster on a matter of privilege.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege, I at no time, nor has any member of this side said that employment opportunities should be provided no matter what the expense. Nobody has ever taken that position.

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

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health, 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.**

**MATTER OF GRIEVANCE**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRIDE:** Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to this afternoon rise on my matter of grievance, my opportunity to speak under this section of the proceedings. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on the subject of the employment and unemployment situation in northern Manitoba that has resulted directly from the actions and inactions of the existing government.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the First Minister would stay and take this opportunity to listen to the situation that exists in the northern part of our province so that he might have some understanding of the very serious problems being faced by northern residents, especially northern residents of native background, Mr. Chairman. I would hope that the Minister would stay and listen to that, because one of the biggest problems in terms of creation of unemployment in northern Manitoba has been his government and more specifically, Mr. Speaker, his Minister of Northern Affairs and Manpower, and Mr. Speaker, it is very unfortunate that the First Minister is unable to stay and get some understanding of the situation and has to rely upon the information provided to him by his Minister, who is not part of the solution, Mr. Speaker, but who is part of the problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what we are seeing in northern Manitoba is a result of the Conservative philosophy, the philosophy of this government under the leadership of this First Minister. It is a policy, Mr. Speaker, which they title Restraint but which is, Mr. Speaker, a change in priorities away from programs to assist people to programs to assist only big business, the elite and friends of the Conservative Party. Mr. Speaker, it is not a restraint program, it is just a change in priorities that is seriously affecting people in the northern part of our province. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed unfortunate that people have to take drastic action to bring to the attention of this government, who seem to be unable to listen, unable or unwilling to understand what the situation is and what some of the possible remedies and solutions are to problems facing residents in the northern part of our province, and indeed, Mr. Speaker, Indian and Metis people throughout Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Member for Churchill mentioned the figure that the Metis Federation people mentioned during their recent demonstration of eight suicides in the remote communities in our province, and Mr. Speaker, I mentioned before in debate in this House a situation that I came upon in the community of Pelican Rapids a few years ago when a young person in that community had committed suicide. The RCMP went and interviewed the young people in that community, Mr. Speaker, and the response of a number, of a significant number of those young people that were out of school and unemployed was "Why not?" Mr. Speaker, that is what my colleague had mentioned when he mentioned the word "Giving up hope", Mr. Speaker, because that is what is starting to take place in northern Manitoba and in the remote communities of northern Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that there are no quick and magic solutions to the social economic problems faced by many people in the remote areas of our province; many people in the Indian and Metis communities in our province, but Mr. Speaker, there are a number of possibilities, a number of things we know that work, that are of assistance in creating employment and creating some hope in the possibilities. Now, Mr. Speaker, what we saw before in the past number of years under the leadership of the New Democratic Party was the beginning, Mr. Speaker, a small beginning, a small step in an upward spiral. That is, Mr. Speaker, the beginning of employment opportunities, the beginning of economic development, not just, Mr. Speaker, relocation programs, but programs that would get economic development and employment creation at the community level, at the level where the people live and where they can take immediate benefit of them.

Mr. Speaker, the relocation type program is one program in sixteen, a package of sixteen types of programs that need to be put in place and that need to be fully developed and discussed with the native organizations like the Manitoba Metis Federation, the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood and the Northern Association of Community Councils. Mr. Speaker, that was under way, small steps were being made in that direction. So the cycle of poverty that through historical accident, through historical development, had come about in northern Manitoba, was beginning to change. Mr. Speaker, that was due to some effort on our part as government, and more importantly, Mr. Speaker, was due to the efforts of the people in the communities and the efforts of their representatives and their organizations to bring about this change in direction, to bring a downward spiral into an upward spiral, a spiral of hope and a spiral of opportunity.

But what has happened, Mr. Speaker, in the period of eighteen short months, is first a slowing

down of that upward spiral, a grinding to a halt of that upward spiral and a reversal, so that now we see in the province of Manitoba people moving backwards, the downward spiral beginning. Mr. Speaker, it wasn't that difficult for this government to stop the upward movement and turn it into a downward movement. But it'll be more difficult, Mr. Speaker, for them to stop the downward movement and again turn it into an upward spiral that would give the people opportunity and hope. Even with the determination of the leaders of the Indian and Metis communities, even with their diligent effort, it will take some time just to stop the process that has started since this government came to office and begin to move in a beneficial direction.

But Mr. Speaker, what we see here and we see it here today in the question period, and we've seen it today, yesterday and for the past year and-a-half of members opposite, is a belief that people do not deserve to be assisted. That if people cannot make it 100 percent on their own, then let them go on welfare. If people cannot make it without some priming of the pump, without some input from government to get things going, to get things started, then let them go on welfare. And, Mr. Speaker, we've seen it in the Estimates of the Minister of Health and Social Development; we saw that the figures are now increasing in terms of the welfare payments in the remote communities.

Mr. Speaker, we don't see it accurately reflected in the Unemployment Insurance statistics, because Mr. Speaker, the Indian reserves in many of the remote settlements are ignored in the compiling of those statistics and therefore, put this province at a distinct disadvantage, in terms of federal programs that would assist. Mr. Speaker, I am not unhappy that the people in Manitoba, the Indian and Metis people of Manitoba have decided to not accept the reversal of the progress that was being made, have not accepted turning the clock backwards, have not accepted that they should be given up upon, that this government should forget about them, ignore them and give up on the possibility that was there. I am not at all displeased that they have decided to fight back for their own rights, privileges and opportunities in our province.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen it in the community of Easterville, where the community refused to lay down and die for this government, and now we see it, Mr. Speaker, in the efforts of a number of Metis people with the backup of the Manitoba Metis Federation, who are not willing to lay down and die for this government or lay down and play dead, Mr. Speaker, for this government. But, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure to what lengths, to what length people are going to have to go; they're going to have to extend themselves to get the attention of this particular government, because, Mr. Speaker, what we have seen is for some reason, the sole northern representative in the government benches who seems to be determined not to assist northern development, not to help create employment in northern Manitoba, not to provide meaningful employment for people in northern Manitoba, not to make sure that the civil servants reflect the ethnic background of the people in northern Manitoba. But what we have, Mr. Speaker, is a minister that seems determined to make his reputation with this First Minister and with this First Minister's and Conservative philosophy to cut programs, to eliminate opportunity and then attempt to pretend that something is happening. Mr. Speaker, the program that this First Minister mentioned, when questioned about the economic opportunities, the employment opportunities for any of the Metis people in our province, the examples that he mentioned are what are the remnants, Mr. Speaker, of a program developed by the previous government. The few remnants of a detailed program developed by the previous government and in the process of being further expanded on and improved in discussion and consultation with the native people of this province.

So, Mr. Speaker, what they take is a few remnants, and say, "Well, we do have a program, we are doing something." They are doing something, Mr. Speaker, they have cut a number of programs. They have cut a number of staff; they have eliminated financial assistance and in a few cases, from the Tawow Project, relocation project, which seems to be the only thing they can think of when we talk about employment, is 1/16th of a program that's necessary. Mr. Speaker, that project has been reduced, now maybe, maybe as a result of the public pressure now being applied, the minister will reinstate that project to its previous level. But Mr. Speaker, that program has been reduced. The relocation program in Thompson, on contract with the Manitoba Metis Federation, Thompson region, has been reduced, Mr. Speaker.

The only program that has continued at its previous levels was a new program that had just been negotiated and was under way for a number of months, that was negotiated with the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company of Flin Flon and the Department of Northern Affairs, our northern development core. That has been the only program that I can see in this minister's whole department, that has been continued at its previous level.

So, Mr. Speaker, perhaps there are some results already from the action taken by the Metis Federation and now that the minister and the First Minister seem to indicate that at least those programs will be restored to their previous level.

But, Mr. Speaker, what is happening, is the attitude, the philosophy behind what is taking place

in northern Manitoba is relected by a number of members opposite who have spoken in this Legislature. The Member for Rock Lake, who stood up and said, "Well, I knew somebody up north who wanted to hire ten people and he could only find two. Now, Mr. Speaker, I know somebody up north who wanted to hire three people and had eighteen applications for that particular job. Mr. Speaker, it is not a case of people not wanting to go to work, it is not a case of not being able to go to work; Mr. Speaker, sometimes there are problems if a family moves from a remote community into the city of Thompson or the community of Leaf Rapids. And, Mr. Speaker, when that Leaf Rapids' project was first developed, the figure set when we negotiated with Sherritt-Gordon was that if 25 percent of the people stayed in that program, 25 people remained living in that community and working for Sherritt-Gordon, that we would consider that program successful. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what guideline or what criteria that the members opposite have, that this government has, as they reflect the implementation of their Conservative philosophy through the reduction and the elimination of northern programs.

But the attitude is there, Mr. Speaker, expressed by members opposite. The Member for Swar River, who said that the project in his constituency at Pelican Rapids should be eliminated, the Manwow Project in his constituency; Mr. Speaker, a community where employment is extremely difficult to find and a community in which there are very few other opportunities available to the residents of that community.

But what have we seen, Mr. Speaker, by this government in an area, in a situation, in a problem through historical accident, where people have been left in a desperate situation? Instead of an increase in opportunities, instead of an increase in negotiation and discussion, instead of a implementation of some actual employment programs, we have seen the elimination of those programs, and Mr. Speaker, my estimate and my calculations are, that there have been 860 jobs directly eliminated by the actions of this government. Jobs in production, jobs in private industry, jobs serving the people through government service. 860 jobs directly eliminated by the actions of this government, and Mr. Speaker, what are some of these situations? Mr. Speaker, we had in place under the Northern Manpower Corps a plant at The Pas, Manitoba doing what was called a Woodworking Shop which did the cabinets, cupboards and other interior necessities for the housing programs in Metis communities and other communities. Mr. Speaker, the anticipated number of people employed in that case, Mr. Speaker, nearly all Metis people and all native people for sure, a figure of 30 people when that project was sold off by this government. We had, Mr. Speaker, a Churchill Prefab Housing plant which the Minister of Northern Affairs likes to raise because certainly, Mr. Speaker, there were problems in marketing after the contracts for the Churchill redevelopment were met, which may or may not have been overcome by aggressive salesmanship rather than the application of a rigid, philosophical position that said eliminate this project. Mr. Speaker, there were up to 86 jobs in the last year of the operation of that plant and over 100 at peak periods in the operation of that plant.

Mr. Speaker, we saw by this Minister of Northern Affairs the elimination and sale of Minago Contractors. And, Mr. Speaker, when this Minister of Northern Affairs stood to help defend the Minister of Health and Social Development, because of cutbacks in the work activities projects, the Minister who eliminated that construction company was not even aware, Mr. Speaker, of the profit position of that company in the last two years of its operation and the final profit of that company to the Province of Manitoba upon its sale. Mr. Speaker, the Minister chose to sell out that operation before he was even familiar with the benefits and the possibilities of that operation and the fact that that operation in its operations made profits for the last two years of its operation and, Mr. Speaker, sold its assets — assets earned and built up in northern Manitoba, assets earned and built up for the most part by people from remote communities and other northern residents working for that operation — assets, Mr. Speaker, which sold for a million dollars and which, Mr. Speaker, after this government found every possible deduction including special employment grants that go to other industries and that consider those as part of their income. When everything that could be taken off of the profits of that company, there was still \$375,000 clear profit — clear profit from a Crown Corporation employing native people in northern Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. And this government saw fit to eliminate that operation and to take that \$375,000, Mr. Speaker, which could go directly towards the proposals of the Manitoba Metis Federation, their project and program proposals that they have put forward to this government and that those proposals have been ignored.

There was \$375,000 gratis that came to them because of the efforts of northern Manitobans, Mr. Speaker. They put that into general revenue, Mr. Speaker, so we could eliminate the estate tax, so that we could provide assistance to large business in the Province of Manitoba and have those poor people that need assistance, instead of reinvesting that profit in northern Manitoba in employment creation in northern Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, then the Minister sold out and eliminated Mistik Creek Logging Operation, a

with ManFor at The Pas. And then the Minister sold out the Pakwagan Log Milling operation at Wabowden. And then, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health and Social Development was forced to cut the Work Activities Program — 130 employment opportunities eliminated by the actions of this government under that program.

Mr. Speaker, a program that really has been working well in the remote communities especially, providing employment at the community level where people could most take advantage of it, was a Special Northern Employment Program. Mr. Speaker, I like to think of the example of the community of Pine Dock, a community that is a small fishing community with a high unemployment rate especially off-season in fishing. Mr. Speaker, Special Northern Employment Project gave a \$5,000 grant to that community and with that \$5,000 grant, they were able to create employment for 18 people in a pulp cutting operation on a continuing and ongoing basis. When they weren't fishing, they could be cutting pulp. With a small amount of seed money by the Province of Manitoba, \$5,000, 18 jobs were created. Mr. Speaker, those 18 people and their families now — unemployment insurance if they have enough stamps from their fishing or welfare. The welfare is going to cost a lot more than \$5,000, Mr. Speaker, but that is the logic of this dogmatic philosophically bound government where they cannot see the benefits of assisting people to develop and to grow. That is a direct kind of result of their program. Mr. Speaker, they have taken that Special Northern Employment Program which has provided seed money for a number of operations and eliminated it — justddid away with it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there were probably up to 60 jobs a year created through that kind of seed money to those operations. Immediately upon assuming office, they eliminated another project that did indeed require some subsidy, a project known as Easterville Harvesting. It employed up to 60 people in off-season, Mr. Speaker. That project was eliminated.

The other, Mr. Speaker, incomplete list of some of the direct employment opportunities — there was other assistance given, Mr. Speaker, through the Northern Manpower Corps and when the government talked about saving money by cutting the Northern Manpower Corps let us not forget they are talking about saving 40 cents on every dollar because that was a direct measure to bring our tax dollars from the federal government into the Province of Manitoba and the federal government picked up 60 percent of the cost of those projects and where it was all treaty Indians involved, 100 percent of the cost of those projects.

Mr. Speaker, in order to make it look like there was some fat in government service when they couldn't find it, they had to start eliminating programs and to make it look like they were eliminating lots, they were able to say they eliminated so many thousand dollars when in fact it was only 40 percent of that money that they were saving the taxpayer of Manitoba. It looks like in fact, Mr. Speaker, they are costing the taxpayer of Manitoba a lot more.

The Manitoba Metis Federation estimates say that \$94,000 is the cost of keeping a family on welfare or in a dependent position. Mr. Speaker, that figure is rather high but if you consider the jail population in the Province of Manitoba that is Indian and Metis people and the fact that it costs \$25,000 to keep somebody in jail, if one or two members of that family should end up, or one member end up in jail and the other end up in hospital, because Mr. Speaker, of problems directly related to the giving up of hope. If you had one member of that family having to be in hospital for a period of time, and another member in jail, you come to the figure that the Metis Federation is talking about without much problem.

Mr. Speaker, the other kind of programs that were eliminated by this government were programs, in effect, that were in fact government projects, where the government was directly involved. And one, Mr. Speaker, was the New Careers Program, to train people, disadvantaged people, so they would have the opportunity to enter into the workforce. In many cases, Mr. Speaker, the workforce was the Provincial Civil Service. Mr. Speaker, that program, the New Careers Program, under this Minister of Northern Affairs and Manpower, has been cut back 40 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I know, personally, of one situation, a woman in the Community of Cross Lake, providing health service to the community under the New Careers Program. Her position, along with 16 others in that particular program, was eliminated. That is a sole-support mother, and I forget the number of dependents, Mr. Speaker, five or six dependents. The people of Manitoba are now paying more to keep her on Welfare than they paid to have her give the community health services — the Community of Cross Lake health services.

Mr. Speaker, that just does not make any sense. It's just not logical, Mr. Speaker, but this is why we have to call this government a "welfare government", because they will wait until people get into a welfare situation. Rather than assisting them to have meaningful employment, instead make them dependent upon the welfare situation.

Mr. Speaker, we had a situation during the last election campaign, where the Leader of the Conservative Party, now the First Minister of this province, issued a letter to all the Civil Servants in Manitoba, saying that Civil Servants need not fear, because any reduction in Civil Service would

take place through attrition, Mr. Speaker. And that was in the letter of the First Minister of this province, which has turned out to be a lie — a direct, pure and simple lie by the First Minister of this province.

Because, Mr. Speaker, there has been positions eliminated, there have been people fired, and, Mr. Speaker, once again it's the north — northern Manitoba — that takes the brunt of the dishonesty of this First Minister and of this government. Because, Mr. Speaker, most of those positions were in the northern part of our province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I point out to the honourable member that he is playing a little bit with the use of parliamentary language in the Chamber and I would suggest he word his remarks very carefully. Some of the language he is using may be considered to be unparliamentary.

**MR. McBRIDE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The members opposite have not, in fact, debated, have not, in fact, questioned, that the First Minister did say that Civil Servants' positions would be eliminated by attrition only, and that people were fired. And no one has debated that point, Mr. Speaker.

At that same time, we saw the elimination of field positions, of positions to actually assist people in the remote communities. We saw an increase in the central bureaucracy, in the centralization of a number of departments, including the Department of Northern Affairs. Mr. Speaker, in the past, that department had assistant deputy ministers in The Pas, in Thompson, and, Mr. Speaker, those positions no longer exist. The decisions are no longer being made in northern Manitoba. The decisions are being made in Winnipeg, in the central bureaucracy, by this Minister, in a centralized way, without consultation with the people in northern Manitoba, without consultation of the representatives of people in northern Manitoba, and that is what is happening — the elimination of field positions, the elimination of positions of direct benefit to the people in the communities, Mr. Speaker, and the centralization of authority.

So, Mr. Speaker, we see through the elimination of a number of direct projects, such as woodworking, such as a house manufacturing at Cranberry Portage, such as Minago Contractors, such as the special Northern Employment Program — we see, Mr. Speaker, that, combined with the reduction in placements, and the reduction in staff to do placements, by the Minister of Northern Affairs — that combined with the cuts by the Minister of Health and Social Development in the Work Activities Project; that combined with the cuts in the Education, in opportunities for people in the educational field; that combined with the cuts in the Manpower Section of the Minister's department, we see, Mr. Speaker, a direct elimination of 860 jobs.

And yet, somehow, this First Minister can stand up here and say that they are attempting to do something to solve the problem in northern Manitoba. They are attempting to do something, Mr. Speaker. They have started the downward spiral, and now because there is some public pressure, they are pretending that they are not responsible, and that it was not their actions that were responsible.

Mr. Chairman, the Manitoba Metis Federation occupied the offices of Canada Manpower. By comparison with this government, Mr. Speaker, Canada Manpower had been providing pretty reasonable service. There have been some cutbacks in those programs from the federal government, Mr. Speaker, but nothing, nothing like the elimination of jobs, the elimination of economic development that has taken place under the Conservative government implementing a Conservative program in Manitoba.

The main cause, the main cause, of unemployment in the remote communities, has been this government, and in the industrial centre, the secondary cause of unemployment has been the actions of this government.

The other types of programs, Mr. Chairman, that I do not have numbers for, that I do not have figures for, were the kind of developmental programs that were being undertaken by the Department of Resources, to assist the community to build a sawmill to take advantage of the forestry potential in their community; to assist communities to cut pulpwood and sell it to Abitibi, or sell it to ManFor, or sell it where they could to fully utilize the opportunities in their communities; to assist community residents to take full advantage of the wild rice in their area; to assist communities to take full advantage of the trapping and fishing in their community and their areas. Mr. Speaker, there was sometimes outside advice, outside technical assistance, necessary to get those projects going. What has happened to those programs, Mr. Speaker? And I don't have them in my 860 number. I don't know how many jobs were directly created by that. Certainly some of the SNEP programs and some of the other, the pulp cutting, received assistance from that section of the Department of Resources.

What happened, Mr. Speaker, when this Minister became responsible for resources, this Minister of Northern Affairs? That section, the developmental section, was eliminated, done away with,

out, however you wish to phrase it so that that kind of back-up support was not there and not available to people.

So, Mr. Chairman, we see this Minister, in his desperation to try and defend an indefensible position, stand up and say, "Well, with the winter roads for the first time we've contracted with people in the community". Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd have to use the unparliamentary language you already advised me not to use to describe the statements by this Minister of Northern Affairs, Mr. Speaker. Because, Mr. Speaker, the people in the communities were involved in winter roads. Local construction was involved, Mr. Speaker, and how does this Minister think that people got to the stage from being employees, to being foremen, to running it themselves? Does he think that happens somehow by magic when the Conservative Government got elected; that somehow they gained that experience overnight, to become employees, to become workers on winter roads; then to become foremen on winter roads; then to become managers on winter roads and then to have the contract for the communities? Does he think that happened without deliberate planning, deliberate effort, and deliberate plan and design, Mr. Speaker? I'm sure that he wouldn't be that naive, Mr. Speaker.

So we have seen through all of those programs that touched on the lives of people in remote communities, that had begun to break that traditional pattern; that the people themselves wanted to break; that the people themselves were getting fed up with, Mr. Speaker, that wanted to break that pattern of welfare and poverty in the communities; that the people were making tremendous effort and tremendous things were happening, Mr. Speaker.

We talked about the statistics, the elimination of 860 jobs, the elimination of all these projects, Mr. Speaker. We haven't talked about the community attitude, and, Mr. Speaker, that was the most satisfying thing that my colleagues and I saw in northern Manitoba. When a community that had given up and said there is no hope for us, it's useless, came and said: "My God, we're doing a good job, aren't we? Look, we've got our sauna going; we've created jobs in our community". People in Bloodvein saying: "We've got our Bloodvein Foundation going now. We're building winter roads; we're doing construction in the community; we're involved in hauling". When you talk to the people in all those communities where things for the first time had started to happen, to replace the depleting resources of fishing and trapping.

And, Mr. Speaker, I just about forgot the reductions of this government in the special Arctic program to assist fishermen and trappers, because that program has also been reduced, and fishermen and trappers are no longer able to get assistance. Many of them that I've talked to recently said: "My application has been in there for a year and nothing is happening".

So, Mr. Speaker, the rigid application of the Conservative policy taken to the extreme by this Minister of Northern Affairs, has now undermined and turned backwards all the efforts, or many of the efforts that the people of northern Manitoba themselves have undertaken to get off of welfare and get working, to produce for their communities, to produce for themselves and their families; many of those opportunities now have been eliminated, cut, done away with, by the dogmatic application of Conservative philosophy to remote northern Manitoba and to the Indian and Metis communities in Manitoba in general, Mr. Speaker.

And, Mr. Speaker, we have, going back to the welfare dependency of this welfare government, to the increase in court cases, to the increase in welfare, to the increase in hospital admissions, to the increase in suicides, Mr. Speaker. And this government through its wrongheaded policies, through its Conservative philosophy, is directly responsible for the reversal of a positive attitude in employment to a situation of welfare and giving up hope, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The motion before the House is that we go into Committee of Supply.

**QUESTION put MOTION carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Education and the Honourable Member for Emerson in the Chair for the Department of Agriculture.

## CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

### SUPPLY — AGRICULTURE

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Albert Driedger (Emerson):** Committee come to order. I'd like to refer members to Page 9, Resolution 10. Item 5. Regional Agricultural Extension. The Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the committee would be willing to set that section aside, and to permit us to go into the next section or division, in that I would like to discuss something



that I believe is in the public interest of all of Canada, but certainly of Manitoba and where I believe that there is still time to do something about events that have already taken place, but which are very detrimental to this province. It has to do with the need for a positive debate, Mr. Chairman, on the question of where we are heading with respect to the national marketing arrangements in this country. I think that is a very crucial item, very important and it's a matter that needs resolution rather quickly, in that we appear to be stampeding into a direction that is going to cost this province so many millions of dollars in lost opportunities into the future, that I would hope the committee would concur that it would be worthwhile to debate that item now, and that we go back to the other item later.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the member brings up a good point and as he is referring to — I've just had indication from my Acting Deputy that he has received correspondence today on the participation of the provinces in some national marketing plans — if that's what he is referring to. I have no problems with entering into the debate on 6. which we're referring to, if that's what he is referring to. As far as 6. is concerned, (a)(b)(c) and (d) and as far as his alarming the committee of something that we can do immediately, other than debate it, I'm prepared to — after discussing with my staff members — I am prepared to enter into the debate on the marketing part of our department and continue on in that manner. So, we can, in fact, go back to — however, I may refer the member, it is Regional Agricultural Extension. I don't know whether he has any main problems with it. We could probably go through it fairly quickly.

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

**MR. USKIW:** No, Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of debate that we foresee on Resolution 10 and that's why I raised the question. I'm setting that one aside for the moment and getting into Resolution 11. At least if we can deal with the one item on Resolution 11 and then go back if you like, rather than completing the whole of Resolution 11.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Again I don't want to be difficult, but when we are discussing Regional Agricultural Extension, it's fairly straightforward and I can see no reason why we couldn't pass and get into the debate on the Agricultural Marketing later on today. I would like to proceed on as it is listed in the book and if it appears that we are not going to accomplish what we think, we could resolve it. But I would like to try and get the Regional Agricultural Extension done so that we can, in fact, get into the Agricultural Marketing. I foresee no major difficulties. I would just enter into a brief discussion if we do and if it appears as if we are going to get hung up, then I would consider moving into the Agricultural Marketing.

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

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, you know the Minister has suggested that we might move fairly rapidly on Resolution No. 10. From what I know of it, I don't believe that that is going to be the case. We have quite a bit of input to make on Resolution No. 10. If it wasn't for that I would have not made the suggestion that I just made, and that is that we proceed to Resolution No. 11. But if the Minister doesn't want to do that, that's fine.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Well again, Mr. Chairman, the member has indicated some urgency. I've had discussion with my department, there have been a few things that have been brought to the department's attention that I haven't been made fully aware of other than something . . . again I can go back and say that two hours of debate or one hour of debate an hour earlier, I don't think will change a lot today and I would like to proceed through the Regional Agricultural Extension. Again I can see no major problems and I do agree they have a lot of input. If it's to facilitate for other reasons then let the member say so.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** I don't know whether the Minister appreciates the gravity of the issue that I am attempting to introduce. What we have had happen in the area of national marketing is a disaster to Manitoba. It's relatively fresh, new and still reversible and that is the reason why I ask the

to put that item ahead of other items, because it is in that fluid stage at this point. Unless the Minister can tell me that he has already foreclosed the issue, but I would hope that that isn't the case. It has nothing to do with ideology, it has to do with what is in the best interest of the Province of Manitoba from an economic point of view — it has nothing to do with ideology, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Well, Mr. Chairman, again I go back and make the point that we are in Regional Agricultural Extension which would take not as long a period of time as, maybe, I don't know — if he has some contentious issues in there that he feels that he wants to bring forward.

So I again go back and say, I haven't been made aware of any problems that we can't resolve by tomorrow if we were to move through the Regional Agricultural Extension part of the debate.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, it's difficult to lay on the table the information that we have, but I think it might be sufficient for me to point out to the Minister that the statement that he gave to the House today very much makes it an urgent matter for debate. Now, I could have chosen to take this opportunity in the House, but I think it's more appropriate to do it in the Committee on Agriculture, since it is a very important issue within this department. If the Minister doesn't want to do it, that is fine, I am not going to pursue it. He can follow the normal procedure, if that's his wish.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Well, again I go back, and I say, if something more urgent or glaring is brought to my attention in the next hour or two or three, then we can move off and into the debate that he's talking about. But at this particular point, I think we should carry through with the Agricultural Extension.

Mr. Chairman, in regard to the Agricultural Extension, we are talking about the extension staff within the department. We are proposing to employ some summer employment opportunities for potential agricultural people, Ag Reps in particular. We feel that it's important to provide for the extension of the Department of Agriculture an opportunity for new and developing individuals who feel that they would like to enter into that particular type of work within the province.

We are requesting 45 staff man years for that particular agricultural representative part of our department. I feel that the need for an ongoing program to educate the future Ag Reps of the province is very important, plus the fact that we are providing summer job opportunities within the Department of Agriculture for students who are, in most cases, in need of a job, and it seems to work fairly well, has done in the past. I know some several years ago we had an Ag Rep program that allowed training of future Ag Reps to become a part of extension work.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (a)(1) — the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

**MR. USKIW:** Yes, I would like to begin discussing this particular Resolution with the continuation of questions to the Minister on what he is doing with respect to the regional centres of the Department of Agriculture, given the fact that he has admitted in the House that the question of those centres is under review and the question of location is under review; given the fact that he has received correspondence from interested people in the given regions, with respect to his intentions; given the fact that he has replied with such vagueness that it can only be interpreted as a posture of holding back a decision pending the outcome of the federal election. That's really how one could interpret that, in that it is, indeed, at least in eastern Manitoba, becoming an election issue, and he may not want to do things for the moment that would embarrass Conservative candidates running in that particular part of the province.

So I think it's reasonable to ask the Minister to lay the cards on the table, to tell us what he has in mind with respect to the five regional centres, regional offices of the Department of Agriculture so that we can put the issue to rest, or that we can debate it more with a greater degree of accuracy than we have been able to, to date. So perhaps the Minister would be prepared to give us a summary of what he is doing with respect to the regional centre operations and their location, if that is in question. And if it is not in question, then he should say so.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, the member brings up a matter which I have referred to in answer to a question that he has brought forward in the House, and in fact I'm not trying to delay or to do anything that would . . . and let me assure him that the election issue that he refers to as far as the federal government is concerned, I can assure him that any moves that we make within the Department of Agriculture will be for the betterment of agriculture, and the delivery of the services that we're providing. We are continuing on with the regional centre in Brandon, Dauphin — the

five regions that he's familiar with — the other one central region in Portage, we have the Interlake Regional Office in Arborg, and then we get to the one which I'm sure he's concerned about, the one that's located in Beausejour.

I think when we look back at the re-organization of the department, the delivery of the extension work from the department regional offices, that in fact in reviewing some of the history, we find that when it was regionalized that there were recommendations, in fact, to have that eastern regional office in Steinbach. As it was — he's quite familiar with the report that was prepared by a past Deputy Minister, by the department — in fact the decision had been made, I guess, to locate one in Gimli instead of Arborg, and the other one, in fact, in Steinbach instead of Beausejour. The decision to change that, to put it in Beausejour rather than Steinbach, and Arborg rather than Gimli, leaves a question mark, as far as I'm concerned, as the Minister now looking at delivery of programs.

I think it's important that the report that was brought forward has, in fact, had some credibility. I think that the objective was to develop these regional offices somewhere away from the metropolitan centre, such as the City of Winnipeg, in fact, to facilitate more ease of delivery of programs throughout the department.

As far as any change to move from Beausejour, there is no intent to remove an agricultural office from Beausejour. I can assure the member that there would be continued plans to have agricultural representation, a delivery service, in that office.

I can also say that there has been no final decision on the moving of the Regional Director to the Steinbach office, however, I can assure him that it is being considered because of the location of the centre to the total southeast corner of the province. The Regional Director who is now employed by the department does not live in Beausejour, so the town or the area would not be losing, as far as having an employee of government being in that town. I again go back and say, there has been no final decision, but I would have to say that there is serious consideration being given to it. But at the same time, I will qualify that to say that we are going to be continuing on with agricultural service out of the Beausejour office.

Now, as far as the debate of whether it should be in Beausejour or in Steinbach, is one that the member can continually debate. I have good evidence to indicate to me that Steinbach would be a more preferable area in which to locate the central office, the regional office for the southeast region.

Going back to the report, looking at the agricultural area, some of the work that is going to be done in Extension that, in fact, I feel that consideration should be given to it. Again, I go back to the reasonings behind putting these regional offices where they've been put. We have to look at the traffic flows, the amount of trade that agriculture people do in certain centres, and the actual size of the agricultural area in which these offices are located. When you look at it in that light, I would have to say, the decision for the people to recommend, in the first instance, to go to Steinbach, there's a good case made for it. I think that to consider changing it will not deprive Beausejour of any service that they're now enjoying, particularly with a certain number of the — well, I referred to the Regional Director in particular not living in the town, and I don't think that to consider removal of that regional office from Beausejour is going to take away from the development of agriculture in that area. In fact, I feel very much the use of the department's Extension service would be far greater used working out of a centre such as Steinbach.

I indicate there has been no final decision made, but it is being considered in light of the information and the material that has been discussed within the department, and the communities involved.

**MR. USKIW:** The Minister only dealt with the one region and I had asked him what his intentions were with respect to all of the regions in Manitoba. He merely related to the one.

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I guess to say that there would be any change in the regional delivery system, that . . .

**MR. USKIW:** No, no, the regional centres — the location of the regional centres.

**MR. DOWNEY:** We look at the other ones, and that's the one at Arborg as opposed to Gimli, I have not had sufficient evidence presented to me through the department, or through the people of the region, to indicate that it should be changed. The one in Dauphin will continue to stay there, the one in Brandon, and the one in Portage. As far as our delivery of agricultural extension, I would feel that there has been no discussion of any change in those other four areas.

**MR. USKIW:** Yes, could the Minister be definitive about the kind of advice that he received from

his staff, who had been operating out of the Beausejour office, that somehow that location hamstrings the operation of that region. Can he tell me what the department is incapable of doing because of its headquarters being located in Beausejour, and how that would change if it was moved to Steinbach?

**MR. DOWNEY:** First of all, Mr. Chairman, I would indicate that to have two Ag Reps, one for north and one for south, in the Beausejour office, or operating out of the Beausejour office, is in itself a duplication in that particular area.

I go back again to a report that was put together by the department, in discussion with many people in putting the report together, and in fact there was a recommendation, because of the traffic flows, the trade patterns, really sufficient evidence to indicate that Steinbach was the area that it should be located in, the regional office being the office that is the centre for the Agricultural Extension Delivery Programs.

I guess we have to look at the remoteness of the extreme southeast corner, and some of the development, I've been through the area several times, and discussed with certain people, they seem to be very desirous and feel somewhat deprived of some Agricultural Extension service that, in fact, they would probably get with the regional office being located in that particular region. I think it's the accessibility to the farm people, to the Ag Rep staff, to the regional specialists, to be more centrally located, and I think if we looked at a map of that agricultural region, that it makes pretty good common sense to consider looking at the placement of a regional office in Steinbach.

**MR. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I repeat the question, which was not answered. Can he tell me whether his staff have advised him that they are unable to deliver services to the EastMan Region because of the location of the headquarters of that region of this department? Secondly, is he telling me the department was unable to place staff resources in southeastern Manitoba, because the head office is located in Beausejour?

**MR. DOWNEY:** Mr. Chairman, I feel I've dealt with the first part of that question. The need for . . . —(Interjection)— Well, Mr. Chairman, the need for the regional office in that particular area would, as I said earlier, facilitate the delivery of agriculture programs. The proximity of the regional office to support the specialists — in particular when we look at the Regional Director at this particular time, who does not even live in the Beausejour district. So, when we look at the development of a regional office and the supplying of service, I feel it's important that the staff of the department, in fact, be a part of that particular region.

I again go back to the agriculture community which, I've had indication, if he wants to get into specific areas I suppose I could talk of specific names, but it has been indicated by department people in discussion of this whole approach. I don't go think it's fair to mention names of individuals within the department but in discussions with the management of the department, the first thing that was brought to my attention was the fact that there had been in fact a study that recommended the placement of the regional office in Steinbach and not in Beausejour.

The other thing I would have to say, that the only other recommendation that came forward at that time was to place the regional office some place in the proximity of the perimeter highway in the near vicinity of Winnipeg which would be totally unacceptable to the Member for Lac du Bonnet, I'm sure as it would be to me. That, in fact, you would want to place the regional offices in a location which would best service the farm community. That, Mr. Chairman, is why there is consideration being given to the removal of the regional office. I, again, go back and say we are continuing on with agricultural representation in that particular area. We're not going to deprive the Beausejour area of agricultural extension but in fact going to service that area better by the placement of people throughout the . . .

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

#### SUPPLY — EDUCATION

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson):** I would draw the honourable members' attention to page 30 of the Main Estimates, Department of Education, Item 1. Departmental Administrative Support Services, (a)Minister's Compensation.

The Honourable Minister.

**MR. COSENS:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In preparation for the review of the Estimates of my department, I will give a brief overview of the structure and operation of the Department of Education.

This department has two major components, one dealing with elementary and secondary education, and the other which is mainly concerned with the post secondary. In the organization of these components every effort is being made to ensure a continuance of education, first from kindergarten through Grade Twelve and then to maximize the opportunities in the post secondary field through the offerings of the community colleges and the universities. Members are aware of the role of the department as it relates to elementary and secondary education and of the historical delegation of the delivery of educational services to the school-age population of the province.

The Annual Report, tabled in the House just recently shows the organizational chart of the Department of Education. I will comment on that structure and the attendant responsibilities of the various sections in due course.

At this point, I remind all members of the purpose of the existence of both the Department of Education and the School Divisions, namely: the education of children and students resident in Manitoba communities. Beginning in 1958 and extended in 1967, School Divisions have assumed greater and greater responsibility and autonomy in the delivery of educational services to students. Members are already aware of our intent to bring in Legislation at this Session, a revision of The Public Schools Act, which will set out in clear terms the various responsibilities and will do so in light of what is currently happening in our educational system.

It is our intent to assist School Divisions in their efforts to delivery quality education but to do so in a manner which will not undermine the decision-making powers and the responsibilities now vested in School Boards. The Department's thrust will be to give support and to be informed of the effect of that support in the School Divisions and Districts. To enable this Department to deliver that support in an efficient manner, it has been our objective to consolidate the reorganization of the Department. As all members will recall, the amalgamation and subsequent reorganization was begun shortly after this government took office.

During the past year, we have continued to effect organizational changes as portrayed in the chart in the Annual Report, and in addition, to establish a more effective better co-ordinated and more united effort in our operational procedure.

In the school sector, the major sections are co-ordinated by associate or assistant deputy ministers for the purpose of fulfilling those roles and functions designated by Legislation, as well as those which are perceived necessary through liaison with School Divisions, with associations such as the Manitoba Association of School Trustees; the Manitoba Teachers Society; the Manitoba Association of School Superintendents; the Manitoba Association of School Business Officials; and the Home and School Association, to name a few.

The Program and Support Services Division under an associate deputy, has responsibility for four areas: Program Development, Support Services, Student Aid, and Special Projects. The development of curricula as seen by this government is a significant task. While it is generally true that School Boards carry major responsibility for program delivery and implementation, the development of these programs which need to have a high degree of uniformity, a higher degree than was the case in recent Manitoba history, rests with the Department. The Department recognizes the need for professional involvement in this process and will continue to seek out the services of practicing teachers and administrators to augment the departmental staff in program development tasks.

It will be our objective to spell out clearly in the course outlines what the expectations will be for student achievement at the various grade levels so that teachers in the classrooms will be in a better position to structure their activities to meet the required objectives. Within the Program Development section, we will maintain a strong curriculum services component, which will assist teachers and administrators as new programs are implemented, as inservice is required and as updating is bound to be necessary in the various program offerings.

Although Native Education and Vocation Education are shown as Special Program emphasis areas, the development of curriculum and its implementation in these areas will be co-ordinated with the regular curriculum development activities and services.

A new area under Program Development is the Measurement and Evaluations Branch. It is our express purpose to make serious efforts to determine how well the program offerings are serving to assist students in the attainment of the necessary skills and knowledge which they need. This will also be one way in which we will attempt to assess the effectiveness of the program offerings, that is, the curriculum being used in the schools. An earlier announcement has informed honourable members as well as the public at large, that a sample of Manitoba students will be tested this

spring in the area of writing composition and language skills. It is our intent to carry on a systematic measurement and evaluation program. We believe that we must be in a position to assess and as a result of the findings of that assessment to redirect or reprogram so that the desired results may in fact be achieved.

School Divisions in their efforts to deliver quality programs for all compulsory school-age children, need assistance and support in certain specified areas. It is the intent of this government to continue to upgrade within our resources the area of Special Education, and within that the education for the handicapped. We recognize the particular burden often placed on School Divisions who are attempting to offer a high quality service in low incidence high-cost areas, and we are therefore providing for an increase to some \$500,000 in the Special Grant moneys available in the Estimates for that purpose.

It is our purpose to give well co-ordinated support services and to do this with the best professional help possible. Emphasis will be placed on early identification and subsequent effective remediation. We will do this in consultation with parents, teachers, administrators, and trustees, utilizing local resources as much as possible and assisting in the development of those local resources. We are very serious about giving support in this area. We intend to make our programs relevant and they will be given in a professional and co-ordinated manner within the resources allocated to that area of the Estimates.

General assistance will of course continue to be given through the instructional media and correspondence branches, each of which is providing a necessary and useful provincial support base to schools and to students. Included in this general section, are two elements mainly associated with post secondary education.

I refer first to the area of student aid, Mr. Chairman, and to the objectives which we have set for ourselves. Again within the Estimates allocation, it will be our goal to encourage high school students to complete their secondary education and to provide some assistance where family resources are inadequate.

We will assist in the exceptional costs of handicapped students, where these costs are not covered by other programs. We will continue to encourage students in both secondary and post-secondary institutions through bursaries and supplements, where these are considered necessary, and we'll use predetermined criteria for the awarding of any assistance given. Honourable members are aware that student aid at the post-secondary level is a shared activity with Canada through Canada Student Loans.

In the area of special projects, we will continue to fund in co-operation with post-secondary institutions, particular educational needs. These needs and the funding allocated to them will be reviewed periodically so that funds will be directed to priority projects as determined by these reviews.

We have taken steps in the past year to ensure and to develop closer co-operation between the universities and the department in the operation of the various special projects.

The bureau de la Education Francais, Mr. Chairman, has responsibility for the development of programs for the provision of consultative services and for the administration of co-ordinated departmental services in the area of Francais, French emersion and core French. While the funding is carried out in large measure by agreements with the Federal government, the province does carry a responsibility for administration and the provision of qualified staff to conduct the various aspects of the program.

Honourable members are aware, I am sure, that the Federal government is making changes in its financing of bilingual programs. The possible results of these changes are not as yet fully clarified.

I should like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that I announced changes in grants to school boards in late January. I now present that information to all members. The general per pupil grant has been increased from \$260 per pupil to \$307 per pupil, which increase includes the present \$10 per pupil grant for minor capital, the present \$4 per pupil grant for print and non-print materials and the present small schools grant.

The transportation grant, Mr. Chairman, has been increased from \$240 per transported pupil to \$255 per transported pupil. The amounts allocated for equalization grants have been increased by \$2.7 million and will be distributed on the basis of the schedule which I attached to the letter which was sent to all school boards. The grants of \$12 per pupil for print and non-print materials has been increased to \$16 per pupil. The declining enrolment grant and the Northern Allowance grant will be continued for 1979 on the same basis as for 1978.

The present method of calculating authorized teachers in school divisions which have schools more than 3 miles apart has been converted to a schedule basis. This will have relatively little effect on the numbers of authorized teachers, but will provide school boards with a greater degree of flexibility in the allocation of instructional staff.

I wish to comment briefly, Mr. Chairman, on another significant area in the department, namely the research branch, which is responsible for the conduct of research activities, considered essential to give support to policy-making, management and planning activities, but also to assist in assessments of various aspects of the educational programs for which I have responsibility. The main emphasis is placed on practical research, which is useful to the department, to school divisions and to associations which support and assist in educational ventures. A variety of projects have been completed during the 1978-79 year, a number of other projects are now in progress.

During the year, the branch provided research consultation and co-ordination services for twelve survey projects undertaken by the department, by school divisions and by educational agencies. In our efforts to have information that is current and reliable, it is considered crucial that practical research be conducted on a regular basis. For that purpose, an efficient component is operating under clearly defined guidelines and has access to all areas of the department and works in close consultation with all areas. In addition, this division works closely with the research division in the Department of Labour and Manpower, particularly as the efforts of both branches relate to the community colleges.

It is our intent, Mr. Chairman, to be in close communication with the school divisions and districts, not only through our program development and curriculum services, not only through the support services, the student aid section, the special projects section, the Bureau de la Education and the research branch, but also through the very significant role of the administration branch, which includes the whole area of finance. The very significant section on teacher certification and records and the administrative support section. Routine but very necessary administrative services will be provided so that school divisions can be more effective as they deliver local services.

I place great emphasis, Mr. Chairman, on my department's field staff, the external administrative support unit, which is to perform a major role in liaison with school divisions and is to keep me generally informed in all areas of departmental involvement in the field. I want to be informed on the effectiveness of our educational policies. I want to be aware of the degree to which the services this department renders are fulfilling the objectives as set out by the various sections. The field representatives will be in communication with departmental staff and with school division personnel on an ongoing basis relative to all aspects of the effectiveness of the departmental delivery system and the appropriateness of the resource allocation for purposes of effective divisional delivery systems.

They will also be required to assist in policy review, so that inefficiencies in any phase of the system can be removed. In this time of spiralling costs, it is particularly desirable to be able to predict responsibly the space requirements in the various school communities. Our field staff is expected to be knowledgeable of these requirements and to act in an advisory capacity to the public schools' finance board as it reviews division requests for new and/or renovated space.

I should mention, Mr. Chairman, that the work of the finance board and the finance administration sections of the department are integrated for more effective operation and service.

I should now like, Mr. Chairman, to deal with the two main components of the post-secondary sector, the community colleges and the universities. In the community colleges division, it is our intent to maintain a strong skills orientation, but also to offer basic education components as they are required to assist in the skills areas. In an attempt to make all programs relevant, the community colleges division has conducted an evaluation of eighteen specific courses or technologies during the 1978-79 year. Some at all three locations and others at one or two of the colleges.

The colleges division provides evening programs and on the job training in addition to the wide spectrum of regular offerings. To go into the details of course offerings and off-campus location would be too time-consuming at this juncture.

Honourable members are aware that a good deal of the programming at the community colleges is supported through funds from the Federal government and that is shown in the recoveries from Canada. Here the colleges are closely associated with the Department of Labour and Manpower and the Department of Economic Development. I'm pleased to say, Mr. Chairman, that our relations with the Canada Employment and Immigration Commission and our own two departments have always been and continue to be satisfactory and productive.

The colleges and the central administration have established a well-coordinated system which has made possible a very efficient operation. Increased funding is being requested for this year so that more places can be provided where student demand and labour market demand make such actions desirable. I should point out, Mr. Chairman, that as honourable members know, one cannot properly compare increases in support for the colleges and the universities from the Estimates for my department, because there will be a portion of the \$7.5 million provided in the government Estimates for general salary Estimates, transferred to the college division during the year, but there is no similar transfer to the universities grants commission.

The records of employment for community college graduates continue to be high. Through course

advisory committees, the colleges keep in close touch with business and industry to ensure that courses and equipment are up to date and meet the needs both of employees and graduates.

The labour market surveys now carried out in the research division of the Department of Labour and Manpower are both valuable and important here. The colleges benefit also from their association with business and industry through their activities in the Canada Manpower industrial training programs which are co-ordinated by the Department of Economic Development. As I have already indicated, Mr. Chairman, the colleges are successful to the extent to which they tailor their courses to the needs of their students and to the labour market.

Regarding the University Grants Commission, Mr. Chairman, it has been possible to allocate a general increase of 6 percent in the operating grants for the three universities and St. Boniface College in spite of the very real constraints which remain with us. The government is acutely aware of the escalating costs, but must continue to practise restraint here as in all other activities. The universities too are making every effort to come to grips with the problem. Honourable members are aware that the universities themselves set tuition fees; last year it was recommended to the universities that they increase their tuition fees, but no recommendation was made this year. It was suggested to the universities by the Grants Commission that if they should consider increases, they should do so jointly.

It is generally known, Mr. Chairman, that university enrolments will decline in the next decade, and that process is just beginning in our universities. And though it has not begun in the community colleges in part because their enrolments are not so closely related to secondary school enrolments, in some fields in the universities demands for places exceed by a considerable margin the number available, but universities like the community colleges in professional fields relate the number of places to the demand as it exists in society, which may be a wider demand than in Manitoba alone. As I mentioned last year, research activities which are an important part of the function of universities are generally largely supported by grants and other funding directly to the universities. In the previous year, these grants were estimated at \$14 million. This year, they are estimated at \$16.5 million.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the Estimates conclude with the item dealing with physical assets, which means buildings and equipment. The money provided for the colleges relates to their needs in particular for equipment. For the universities, \$2 million is provided for miscellaneous capital, plus \$1.75 million for the University of Manitoba for its centennial project in accordance with previous commitments. Other capital is for construction projects at Norway House, Cross Lake and Hillridge for schools in association with the Federal government.

In concluding my introductory remarks, Mr. Chairman, I take great pleasure in noting the outstanding contribution of Deputy Minister of Education, Dr. Lorimer and his staff of the department, and in expressing my appreciation to Dr. Lorimer, I know I am joined by all members of this House and the people of this province. His expertise and wide experience and wisdom in matters educational has certainly been a great asset, not only to the young people, but to all citizens of this province. I wish to make it abundantly clear, Mr. Chairman, that this department will continue to promote an ever increasing quality education and will monitor the effectiveness of its policies continuously. In this effort to achieve greater excellence we will welcome the critique of our efforts insofar as that critique is genuinely given.

We are in this business of education for the sake of the students and must expend every effort to give the best service possible within the resources at our disposal; to this purpose we are committed, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (b) General Administration, (1) Salaries, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could forgo having the staff come down because there are only nine minutes left until after the supper hour and I can put on the record a couple of questions that we would have after the dinner hour. I was listening with some appreciation to what the Minister was presenting to us until he came to the point that he will entertain all critiques which are genuinely given. He seems to imply that some of them that come from this side aren't genuine.

But, Mr. Chairman, one of the questions that we would ask the Minister to have for us — I would follow through on the question which started last year relative to the staff man years in this particular item under discussion. But in the general area of education, Mr. Chairman, it is our intention to listen to the Minister's policy and position relative to the Estimates and put our position on record when his salary comes up for discussion.

Last year the Minister said that he had not had a chance to read the task force on the reorganization of government services and we assume that by this time that the Minister has had



an opportunity to read it and we would like the Minister, if he's in a position to do so to put on the record what his position is relative to the Task Force Report on Reorganization as far as it pertains to education.

We noticed last year, Mr. Chairman, the Minister's comments as presented in a press release that he had noted a year ago on March 15, that the school system was sloppy and a few other things so we wondered just exactly where he stands as far as the task force report is concerned. For example, the Task Force said on Page 72 of the report that the Task Force supported in principle the Minister's plan to combine the Department of Education and the Department of Continuing Education and Manpower.

However, at that time the Task Force reported, we are unable to obtain connotative information on the reorganization regarding savings in staff and expenditures to enable a complete assessment of their particular plan. So we would assume, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister speaking for the government is in a position to put this on the record just exactly what efficiencies that they have accomplished through the amalgamation of the two departments, other than just the direct administrative costs.

In going through the Estimates in this year of transition, Mr. Chairman, there is a certain difficulty placed on the opposition to trace just exactly what has happened to the various lines and I know that my colleague from The Pas who was interested in post-secondary education will be trying to trace some of these gourmet recipes as my colleague from Inkster had mentioned earlier in transferring appropriations and staff man years to other functions of government.

One thing that the Minister mentioned that perhaps he could be more specific in the future references, when he was talking about Student Aid, he used a phrase which stuck in my mind, to reach objectives we have set for ourselves. Perhaps the Minister could expand on this statement — the objectives we have set for ourselves — and perhaps throughout the department Estimates we can come to grips with some of the wool which has been floating around in the province for the past 18 months, just exactly what the objectives of the government are concerned. Because I think it is incumbent upon the government to put on the record just exactly what they mean when they use such loose terms as, objectives we have set for ourselves. We'll get into Student Aid as an item under discussion doubtless, but we have just finished the Department of Health and Social Development where the government in no uncertain terms has stated to the people of the province that they don't believe in preventative programs as far as social development is concerned, so perhaps this is an area can focus more directly on just exactly where the government stands as far as what a public school system should be doing for the people of the Province of Manitoba.

The Minister referred to a letter that he had sent to all School Boards pertaining to the grants. They were being made available in this fiscal year. I wonder if the Minister could give us a copy of that letter to which he said was attached the grants structure. We have a copy, of course, of his news release which sets forth these new grants and this is one area that I won't make too much fuss about, you know, announcing it to the press in January and the House not sitting until late March because it is necessary for the School Divisions to have some idea of where they are going to stand in the next fiscal year so that they can present their budgets to various municipal authorities who have to collect the taxes.

One other item I would take exception with in the Minister's presentation, he said that the reorganization of this particular department has been taking place since he took office or since they took office. I would just correct him slightly in that it started before they took office and doubtless the Member for St. Johns will be asking questions relative to the point that he raised last year in the disposition of the treatment of the former Deputy Minister and if that matter has been resolved?

Mr. Chairman, the item under discussion, departmental administrative support services really is an item under which we have to understand a bit of the philosophy of the government, what they intend to do, because it is in this area that the funds are allocated which by and large determine the thrust of the government. So that as we get into the line-by-line discussion, I can assure the Minister that all the criticisms which emanate from this side of the House will be genuine criticisms. And hopefully, Mr. Chairman, we can reflect the concerns which have been expressed by many people in the Province of Manitoba as to where this government is going as far as education is concerned.

I referred just a moment ago to the Task Force Report and the Minister in his introductory remarks had said that they wanted to leave to the School Boards the autonomy which they had traditionally had in the province. So perhaps in replying later on, Mr. Chairman, the Minister could report to us in his position relative to the Task Force Report exactly where the government stands with reference to the recommendation of the Task Force on Page 77, that the Finance Board should use Section P 268(4) of the Public Schools Finance Board Act to withhold grant to a School Division

to require more efficient operations and applications of these powers should also be made in cases where special levies at the local level cannot be justified.

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

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. We are now under Private Members' Hour. The first item of business on Tuesdays is Public Bills. The first item under Public Bills — Second Reading, Bill No. 33 — the Honourable Member for St. James.

### SECOND READING — PRIVATE BILL

#### BILL NO. 33 — AN ACT TO AMEND AN ACT TO INCORPORATE BEL ACRES GOLF AND COUNTRY CLUB

**MR. GEORGE MINAKER** presented Bill No. 33, An Act to amend An Act to incorporate Bel Acres Golf and Country Club for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. James.

**MR. MINAKER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Bel Acres Golf and Country Club is interested in accomplishing a share capital reorganization in order to place the club in a more sound financial footing and it is desirable by the present shareholders that they be able to purchase another share in order to accomplish this desire and, at the present time, the Act which incorporates Bel Acres Golf and Country Club provides in a particular Section that no one shareholder is capable of holding, owning or voting on more than one share of the capital stock of the Club.

And it is my understanding that the Club has obeyed all its bylaws in its desire to accomplish this end, and it's also my understanding in talking with the Club, that they are not intending to have control of ownership by a certain limited quantity of members, but would offer memberships to other people who would be desirable to join the Club. However, there aren't enough people wanting to join the Club in order to create this new financial footing that they desire to add to their Club, so it is in the interest of the Club that the Act is being amended so that it will allow one shareholder to hold one or more shares in the Club capital stock, which at the present time, they cannot do with the Bill that was originally incorporated for the golf Club.

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

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

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Adjourned debate, second reading, Bill No. 29. The Honourable Member for Rhineland. (Stand.)

### SECOND READING — PUBLIC BILL

#### BILL NO. 34 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE FATALITY INQUIRIES ACT

**MR. BRIAN CORRIN** presented Bill No. 34, An Act to Amend The Fatality Inquiries Act for second reading.

**MOTION presented.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Wellington.

**MR. CORRIN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, as you and other members will undoubtedly recollect during the debate on the revisions, proposed amendments to The Mental Health Act, I advised both the Minister of Health and Social Development and the Honourable Attorney-General in particular, either that

I wish to engage with them in presenting to this Assembly a bill that would amend The Fatality Inquiries Act. As members present will recollect, it had come to our attention in the month of February, early in February, that a young man had died in unfortunate circumstances by misadventure at the Portage Home for Retardates. There was some consternation and concern on the part of members, I think, on both sides, because it was immediately realized that the death had gone unknown in terms of the public's recognition and awareness of it, and members, of course, present in the Assembly — the death had gone unknown for quite a length of time. I believe at that point, it had been somewhere in the range of five to six weeks and I remember, I suppose to graphically illustrate, how alarmed that we were and why we were so alarmed. I remember, for instance, a media reporter having been advised of the death, making an effort to chronicle it in the catalogues of his newspaper and found that there was no obituary or other notice that he could put his fingers on. I remember very well that he came to me and he said, "That's quite alarming, that a person could die in those circumstances in a public institution and we couldn't find a record of it."

As a result of that, Mr. Speaker, of course, I began to think, in conjunction with other members, privately for some time about a ways and means by which we could establish a proper and appropriate reporting mechanism, and during the debate on The Mental Health Act amendments, I presented what I thought were the bare bones of such a concept to the ministers and members present that afternoon.

Since that time I have had the opportunity to discuss the matter further with Legislative Counsel and in conjunction with him, and through his good office, I've been able to bring before the members this afternoon an amendment which meets with his approval, and by and large, of course, it was drafted by him, and I believe will accommodate the intent of myself and other members in this respect.

Perhaps, before I go too far, for those who are unfamiliar with The Fatality Inquiries Act and perhaps have not had an opportunity to read the bill, I would indicate that presently in the case of a person dying by any undue means, that would include violence or in circumstances that — and I think I'm paraphrasing the actual wording of the act — in circumstances that are unexpected or unexplained or in a sudden manner in a public institution, in those circumstances the Administrator appointed under The Fatality Inquiries Act is empowered to consider all the circumstances. There does, indeed, Mr. Speaker, have to be a report submitted to that person in his official capacity and I believe right now that person is the Director of Public Prosecutions in the Department of the Attorney-General. And, Mr. Speaker, the Administrator, having received an autopsy report is given fairly wide latitude and discretion as to whether or not he, in his official capacity, wishes to have an inquest convened, and that, Mr. Speaker, is of considerable concern to myself, because I believe that it delegates to a public official a discretion that is somewhat undue and probably overly generous, given the very critical nature of the events in those types of circumstances.

I would indicate that this concern is shared by the Chief Medical Examiner of the province. I have communicated with him and in a letter to me, and I'm now quoting directly from the short letter I received from him on the 19th of February, which I'll be pleased to share with other members present. He indicates that — and this is with respect to the death of Malcolm Chenier, he indicates and I quote, "I think in deaths such as this there should be an inquest, in order that the next-of-kin of the deceased and the employees are fully cognizant of all facts," and I would indicate as well, that that position is buttressed and supported by the Director of that particular public institution, Dr. Glen Lowther. Dr. Lowther was approached by media in February of this year and asked whether he felt that an inquest should be convened, and he indicated that — and these are his words as quoted in the newspaper account, "In the light of any accidental death, there should be an inquest." And as I've said, he's speaking as a public official who has a responsibility for this sort of matter within his domain.

So, I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that we approached this from a political point of view. I think it's common sense that there should be no discretion vested in a public official with respect to deaths of an accidental or suspicious nature in public institutions. It should be mandatory and this is what we're asking for. It should be mandatory that an inquest be held and, of course, as all members are, I'm sure aware that entails the Provincial Judge having a public hearing in the locale where the death took place, witnesses being called, having been subpoenaed, they're examined by counsel present. The Attorney-General generally, of course, is represented and conducts the inquiry on behalf of the public.

So, Mr. Speaker, we feel that in order to protect ourselves, not only from well-meaning administrators, because we don't know what the future will bring us, I suppose an individual might be well motivated, but even notwithstanding the fact that a person may be well-meaning, it's possible that they could make a mistake. They might omit to convene an inquest in circumstances where one should have been held, where matters of immediate public interest should have been dealt with publicly and I would indicate that, for instance, in the case of the Chenier death, there was

considerable speculation as to the cause. There was some concern made public about the impact and effects of restraint measures at that particular institution, and whether they might not have caused the untimely death of this particular resident. And, of course, Mr. Speaker, there's only one way to find out and that is through the public inquiry process. I think frankly, Mr. Speaker, that those types of matters are always best held in a judicial element as opposed to being put at the doorstep of some person who performs is obliged to report to a minister, a person who is not, although they may be of an objective frame of mind, they can't possibly be construed to be entirely objective and independent in relation to their employ and in relation to their employers, and in this case, of course, the government. So, I think that in all fairness, we should lift that burden off the shoulders of the public servant, who presently has to bear it and put it where it properly belongs, on the judicial scene.

I'm also concerned, although it's I'm sure not a concern in this particular case and I would note that an inquest has been called with respect to this matter, I would be concerned that one day it is possible, it's hypothetically possible, that we could confront an individual who was somewhat corrupt, somebody who would make a covert attempt to protect his or her political friends, and in so doing try and gain some reward. I'm not suggesting that it's a likelihood, but although it's not in the realm of a probability, Mr. Speaker, it's certainly a possibility and I think again, the public interest deserves that even the possibility, the slightest possibility of that happening be totally eliminated and alleviated.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would indicate also that the bill has a backup provision, I suppose you might call it a backstop. Mr. Tallin and myself were both concerned that there be some sort of safeguard mechanism whereby we knew that members of the public, and particularly members of this Assembly as representatives, could on a regular basis have an overview and evaluate the performance of the individual charged with the administration of this particular act. And so, we would propose an amendment to Section 29(1) whereby the Administrator in his official capacity, would have to submit a written report to the minister each year and that report would detail the deaths of all inmates or residents who are involuntarily resident in public institutions in our province. It would be incumbent on the Attorney-General, by virtue of this particular amended section, to table that particular list in the House on an annual basis, so that all members could peruse that list and become familiar with all the names of those persons who had died, where they had died, when they had died, the cause of death as was attributed by the inquest if that were the case, and if not, if it were a case not involving a death of a person by misadventure, then it would be a question of presenting the report and the results of the autopsy to the House.

Mr. Speaker, it seems common sense and quite logical and rational that this particular amendment would recommend itself to members on both sides of the House. As I indicated earlier, I do expect, I sincerely do expect that the minister's approach particularly, will prefer their favor on this particular measure and will present themselves and make pronouncements very shortly with respect to their support. I would be frankly sorrowfully disappointed if such support was not forthcoming. I say this with some humility, but I know for a fact, that Mr. Tallin, as Legislative counsel, in a letter to the Attorney-General has particularly recommended and commended this bill for passage and implementation by this House.

So I do hope, Mr. Speaker, in a spirit now of non-partisan political amity, that this bill is given favorable response and finds its way to Third Reading as shortly as possible in order that this present defect, this present gap, in our law can be rectified as soon as possible. Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

**MR. BROWN:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Roblin that the debate be adjourned.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** We now move on to Proposed Resolutions. Resolution No. 5. is presently open. Debate ending at 5:30. Are you ready for the question?

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 5 — MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I think there is a fundamental position separating the government and the New Democratic Party here, and that is that it is my impression that the government is attempting to sustain and retain a low minimum wage and that they believe that

in so doing, we will have a better society. That is their fundamental starting position. They believe that with low wages, you will have more business and more profits and better conditions for the majority of Manitobans. Mr. Speaker, I see it as exactly the opposite, that a high minimum wage is an example of a higher culture and a higher society. So I think there's a fundamental difference that our party in power moved towards continual revisions of the minimum wage in a belief that this would result in a higher standard of living, and therefore in a better society, a better socioeconomic system.

I think it was Franklin Roosevelt, although I could be mistaken, who contended that the fundamental question in judging a society was how one treated, how society treated, the old, the sick, the poor, and if it wasn't included in that particular statement, I would say the weak. Because I believe that when we consider the people who are less fortunate in society, you certainly have to put first and foremost in that category, or let's say within that category, people who are, as previously mentioned, old, sick and poor, but you'd also have to put in the unemployed as being among the unfortunate, those on Welfare, and the people who are on the minimum wage.

Because, Mr. Speaker, they are at the bottom, and for the working poor, they are definitely the bottom line. You can only do better than any of them do. So we find ourselves in a situation now, where, for almost three years, moving towards three years, we have had a frozen minimum wage. And, at the same time, we've had tremendous increases in inflation and this, of course, has been to a large extent the result of tremendous escalations in the price of food.

I might say at that point, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that the federal leader of the New Democratic Party has chosen a very strong position when he says, that if you want to know what this next election is all about, you should go into the kitchen, and you'll find out right there, in your own kitchen from your wife, that that is the fundamental problem in terms of inflation. And when you look at food bill rises over the past few years, it's really very shocking. I suppose many members of the assembly are not that attuned sometimes to what it costs, other than they pay the bills and groan and moan when they are confronted with ever-increasing food bills. But, when you get down to individual prices, the women are the ones who do most of the shopping, and are the ones who have a best handle on that.

Well, my friend from Wolseley says this is discrimination, and I assume by that, he wants me to use that —(Interjections)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. May I suggest to all honourable members they allow the Member for Elmwood to complete his remarks. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, here I am making, not an impassioned speech, but it's a cool a logical argument, and I'm exciting some of the members of the Tory backbench.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Wolseley says he wants to know of cases of malnutrition, and I would say that that would be a very good comparison, namely, a dietary comparison. It would be very interesting to have somebody, as we used to see not too long ago, members of the media sometimes used to go on little, what shall we say, assignments, for example, of attempting to live on a pension or salary. It would be very interesting to revive that, and have somebody from the media — not the Member for Wolseley, Mr. Speaker, who's overweight, and could definitely live for several weeks off of his stomach alone . . .

**MR. WILSON:** What have you got against overweight people, for God sakes.

**MR. DOERN:** Well, I have nothing against people who are overweight, Mr. Speaker. Some of my best colleagues are overweight. Some of my colleagues are rather healthy specimens. But, Mr. Speaker, if you took some one today and asked them, particularly a member of this Assembly, who is receiving a reasonable wage, not an excessive wage, but a reasonable salary, to attempt to live or manage on the minimum wage, I would say we would virtually find it impossible. We would not be able to pay rent, car expenses, etc., there'd be nothing left over upon which to live.

And I'm saying that if it's not a case of malnutrition — I didn't say that, the Member for Wolseley was trying to make a point along those lines. I'm saying, all you would have to do would be to compare the diets of people who are on the minimum wage with people who are on the average industrial wage, or who are business and professional people, and it would be like night and day. It would be a comparison of India, on one hand, and North America, on another.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I am not that acquainted with prices, although I do some shopping, and am somewhat familiar with prices, but I can remember a few years ago, a humorous incident which sticks in my mind, and therefore is a good example of the sharp increases in food prices, when somebody put an ad in the paper for a car, an American company, some dealer, put an ad in, I guess, that he had a Cadillac for sale for 10,000 bananas. And some witty type went out and

bought 10,000 bananas — it was a very clever response — trucked them down to the dealer, and presented him with so many tons of bananas, which at that time had a value of 10 cents apiece. And so, for \$1,000, being sharp and rising to the occasion, that person was able to purchase a car for \$1,000, where it was worth \$10,000.00. And the dealer realized that he had been sort of out-manuevered and that it was a clever device, and he produced the car for that purchase.

Mr. Speaker, what was once 10 cents only, I think, three or four years ago, is now up to 40 cents a pound. I think it even goes up to 43 cents a pound, and 35 cents a pound, for bananas. When you go into a supermarket and buy food, and when you buy fruit, if you buy cantaloups and honeydew melons and things like that, it's a major decision to decide whether to buy one of these things. All of these things are terrifically expensive today, and, last, but not least, the price of meat.

**MR. WILSON:** I thought you were going to miss it, Russ.

**MR. DOERN:** Yes, I wouldn't miss it. I'm always very hesitant about talking about this, because I don't want to incur the wrath of the Member for Gladstone and others, because, although the eating of meat is, sort of, as Canadian as can be, there is still a medical trend to encourage people to eat other kinds of meat products, like poultry, and also to eat fish. But I would say that the average person has little choice, and the person on minimum wage would have little opportunity at all to buy meat, Mr. Speaker. How can any one go in and buy ham, or buy some of the finer cuts of meat? They're relegated basically to hamburger, and hamburger, of course, has skyrocketed in price as well.

Well, one of my colleagues says, when it comes to meat today — I think there's a lot of truth in this — it's now delivered by Brinks. The Brinks Company rolls up and comes out with 100 pounds of some carcass, and if you look closely at their holsters, there's a salami in each holster, in case of trouble.

Many pensioners, Mr. Speaker — I recall reading this in the paper not too long ago, and the government will have to answer for this — are now on a diet of what is called "tea and toast" — something warm that goes into the stomach, fills up the stomach, gives the illusion of having eaten something substantial, but in fact all it does is fill one's stomach, but it does not satisfy.

Mr. Speaker, we've had some interesting statistics put before us. I, too, would add a few. But I say, in concluding on the food portion of what is relevant to this particular motion put by the Member for Logan, that the food increases alone have been in the double-digit range and have tremendously eroded that \$2.95 which has been fixed in place for the last couple of years. So, if we are only standing still, if the objective of the government was to stand still, then they have failed in that regard. If they are attempting to reduce the standard of living for people at the bottom economic rung, the working poor, then they have succeeded. And I'm sure that on their own account they have succeeded, because they have forced the people at the bottom rung of the economic ladder to tighten their belts, whereas people higher up are able to manage. And I guess if your original starting belt is 46 inches, and you take in 2 inches, it's probably not too difficult. But if you're a 28 inch waist to begin with, and you take in a couple of inches, then you are suffering as a result.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that without a minimum wage, you would have some serious exploitation in our society. And I have a feeling — I would be interested to hear some observations of members of the government — I have a feeling that the government position is even more extreme than it appears, in that they would probably like to see the abolition of a minimum wage; that they don't feel that a minimum wage is necessary. Let the market determine where that particular minimum amount of money should be. I believe that that is, if not the position of the government, at least a philosophical position, and an economic position of certain members of the government, because it would follow, from what they say, from what they think, and from what they do, in various departments.

Mr. Speaker, I recall reading in the paper about ten years ago an article which I found quite horrifying of some manufacturer in Chicago who was paying people to work for him 25 cents an hour. This was an ongoing situation that had been going on for a number years with X number of employees, and the minimum wage then — I'm not exactly certain what it was, but let's just say for the sake of argument it was \$1.50 or \$1.75. This person was paying 25 cents an hour. I could be wrong in terms of the city. It could have been New York, but it was one of those two major metropolitan areas, and I say that that kind of thing, which, of course, has happened in history, would happen again.

We've had minimum wage laws, we've had laws about minimum age in terms of employment, and so on. My colleague from Flin Flon was a miner. If he has an opportunity to speak in this

debate today, or some time when it comes up again, I'm sure he can relate stories, either from his own experience, or if not from his own direct experience, . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member has one minute.

**MR. DOERN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure he could relate stories from the history of mining about the children working in the mines, etc. And we used to have a colleague who preceded my colleague from Logan, who was a Welsh miner, and he would make these speeches about the old days in Wales, and some of the horrible things that happened.

So, Mr. Speaker, just to make a few other comments. At the other end of the scale, you have what can only be described in comparison in human terms as the vulgarity of the salaries made by top executives. I don't like to deal in magic formulas of 2-½ or anything like that, but I say that if people at the bottom are making \$2.95 an hour, when you have people at the top earning over \$300,000 a year, there must be something out of whack in the system.

And I give you some examples from two years ago, taken from the Financial Post, where at that time the top salary earner in Canada was a Mr. N. V. Davis of Alcan, and he was earning \$388,000 a year. Now, that's good money, that's good money. The Premier of this province makes, I guess, \$35,000 or \$36,000 or times 2, and that was worked out by my colleague to \$36 an hour, at \$72,000.00. This is over 5 times that, so this would be about \$200 an hour — now that's good money. And then the salaries go down to Massey Ferguson at \$371,000 — not Jim Ferguson but Massey Ferguson. C.P. pays their president \$330,000, and so on, and at the bottom of this list of 15 or 20, we have three people from Alcan who are all getting \$210,000, \$217,000.00. Mr. Speaker, it's quite obvious that if you want to get ahead in this world, you should get on the Alcan Board of Directors, because they certainly pay big money.

So, Mr. Speaker, I conclude on this point, because I gather I only have about a minute left, that out of 40,000 people in Manitoba who are earning the Minimum Wage, 10,000 I'm informed are head of household. Now that is something the government would have to answer, because they are always saying to us, every time we have a debate, they always say, "Do you expect that to be a sufficient income for the head of a family?" And they seem to be oblivious to the fact that there are 10,000 Manitobans who are in that position, who are trying to live — maybe 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 people are trying to manage on that.

Mr. Speaker, I think there's a need for some action immediately, because it's long overdue.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Flin Flon. —(Interjection)—  
Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Roblin.

**MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE:** Mr. Speaker, I bow to the Honourable Member for Flin Flon. He was on his feet ahead of me, so I'll gladly bow to him.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. BARROW:** Mr. Speaker, I just thought it would be fair to take the debate from one side of the floor to the other. I'll gladly concede the floor to my honourable friend, if he wishes to speak. Evidently he doesn't want to speak, Mr. Speaker, and I don't blame him, because anyone who wouldn't consider an increase in the Minimum Wage almost shows the policy of that side of the House.

I admire my friend from Wolseley with his efforts to raise the \$3.00 meal tax to \$5.00. With all his faults, and he has many, Mr. Speaker, it was a good gesture. And I admire my friend from St. Matthews, who was going to give 25 cents. —(Interjection)— I also get a charge, Mr. Speaker, when he says, "In my youth. In my youth I taught school, in my youth I did this." You know, you'd think he was 80.

But, Mr. Speaker, I can speak as one who can go back into youth and worked for minimum wage, or less, and I'd like to give you a little bit of an idea of what it was like when this country wasn't as affluent as it is today. I'd like to go back to the coal mines, Spring Hill, Nova Scotia, in Northern England where that old song that you hear the Negroes sing, "Sixteen ton and what do you get, another day older and covered with sweat." I worked in those conditions, Mr. Speaker, and I'm very proud of it today. I spent 18 years in those places, and the Leader of the House said, "Show me one man on that side of the House who got his hands dirty." Well, I'll be one of those people who got my hands dirty, Mr. Speaker.

Where I was brought up, Mr. Speaker, my Dad went to work at 12 years old, he was 12 when he started in the mines there. When I went to school in northern England, your education was finished

at 14, and that was your destiny, was the coal mine. The hours were long, conditions were bad, it was very akin to slavery, and you never quite got out of debt. The company owned the house —(Interjection)— farming, I admire all farmers — nothing but admiration for farmers. But anyhow, Mr. Speaker, you worked 6 days a week, 14 hours a day, and you never had enough to go around. Mr. Speaker, I missed that.

We left England, came to Canada, and settled in Spring Hill, and they raised the age limit to 16, but 40, 50 years prior to that, the age limit in those mines was 12, 12 years old, 12 year old kids, and when they had a fatality in that family, Mr. Speaker, the oldest boy was expected to take over. He took over the responsibility for raising that family, at 12. They had carbide lamps in those days, and they were expensive, so these kids didn't have lamps, they worked their 10, 12 hours in darkness. They had accidents, and the ambulance they had was a wagon full of straw, hauled by two horses, that's how they got them home.

They had no compensation, Mr. Speaker. If a miner got hurt and he didn't have a boy 12 or over, he just relied on the generosity of his neighbours to carry him through, and they survived, Mr. Speaker, and there's no need of it today. I was fortunate, I started at 16 years old, and my rate at that time was \$3.40. We went for higher wages, Mr. Speaker, and we walked the picket line for 6 months — pardon me, \$3.40 a day, not an hour — and after six months' strike, we won it. We were increased to \$3.53, and then as I got older, Mr. Speaker, and married, and a child, I had to make more money, so I went contract mining.

A contract miner, Mr. Speaker, is not like a contract miner in these mines. He just gets what he earns. For one ton of coal loaded at the face, with a pick and a shovel, under tough conditions — oxygen was lacking — it was brutal work, and they paid us 95 cents a ton. That same ton of coal, Mr. Speaker, sold for \$22.00. This is what happens when corporations or governments have control of working people. —(Interjection)— Governments with minimum wage, yes, yes, certainly.

Mr. Speaker, what does the minimum wage do to people? They try to tell us it's kids working people who maybe have retardation problems. Well, let me tell you there are a lot of families where the main wage earner is earning the minimum wage, and to bring up a family, Mr. Speaker, on that wage is impossible. And the people who are clever or smarter, in my area, they go on social welfare or have addition to it; but the people who have pride, Mr. Speaker, I know a family in Flin Flon who live half the week on porridge, because they can't afford to meal three children on minimum wage. And yet they say it's not necessary to raise it.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if I've made any points or not, but I feel the minimum wage should at least be raised . to the extent that my colleague for Logan said.

The last time I spoke on this, Mr. Speaker, to illustrate it I used a chocolate bar. That chocolate bar, Mr. Speaker, when I was a kid was 5 cents; last year when I spoke on this it was 25 cents, they cut the bar down by a third; this year, Mr. Speaker, it's cut down a little more than a third, and the same chocolate bar is 30 cents. This doesn't bother the people on minimum wage, because they can't afford to buy chocolate bars. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Roblin.

**MR. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to speak on this Resolution until the Honourable Member for Elmwood stood in his place and made an allegation about the Premier, which is an untruth, a lie, about the Premier and the money that he earns, and the amount of money that is supposed to be contributed to him. Mr. Speaker, it's a strange thing about the New Democrats, they tell these untruths over and over again, and then finally they start to believe them. I remember when I was a child, if I told an untruth often enough, Mr. Speaker, I finally started believing that it was the truth myself —(Interjection)— and it's very strange how they can warp certain little things around, such as the moneys that the Premier is apparently getting from some outside money tree, out in front of the building out here, or nobody knows where, but the Honourable Member for Elmwood knows where he's getting it. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it's typical of the socialists, they don't understand, and they warp the truth around, tell half-truths and quarter-truths, and finally they believe it's a fact themselves. Mr. Speaker, it's very very typical of our friends across the way.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution is a very very interesting one, and the Member for Elmwood's speech and the Member for Flin Flon certainly are valuable to the debate and contribute something, but it's not going to solve the problem. We have today, I would say the minimum wage in this province is about the middle of the road, so supposing we raise it to the highest. Let's put it higher than anybody in Canada, raise the minimum wage \$2.00. What's going to happen? Supposing we do it, what will happen? Is that going to solve the unemployment problems in this province? Mr. Speaker, never. Is that going to solve the problems of double digit inflation that we're facing in this country



if we raise the minimum wage \$2.00? I suspect not, Mr. Speaker, I suspect it's going to create a worse problem than we have today. Let's say, Mr. Speaker, who is going to pay this money, is it the government, is the Member for Elmwood going to pay this extra money out, is it the companies that's going to pay it out, is it the federal government that is going to pay it out, is the province going to pay it out, are the unions going to pay it out? Who's going to pay out this money?

Well, let's be sensible about the thing. To hear the Member for Elmwood talk, you'd think we could just go out in front of this building and pluck money off a tree, and raise the minimum wage. And by raising the minimum wage, Mr. Speaker, what's it going to do?

Let's take a classic example of the Ralph King theory, and I heard the Member for Churchill on television one night trying to solve that one. The Ralph King theory, who operates basically at the minimum wage, but people in his employ earn far in excess of the minimum wage.

Let's take the former Premier's theory, the 2-½ times 1 theory, the old 2-½ times 1, is that going to solve the problems of this Resolution, or the unemployment problems in Manitoba, or Saskatchewan, or Alberta, or Ontario, by using the NDP 2-½ times 1 theory, Mr. Speaker? Never, never. —(Interjections)— They come out, sure, looking beautifully across the way with this drummed-up socialist dream, that by raising the minimum wage we're going to solve the problems of these people today who are on the minimum wage. It's not going to solve it, Mr. Speaker. It's not going to solve the problem of the Member for Churchill who brought the groceries into the store by raising the minimum wage ten cents. Not at all. Mr. Speaker, it's a strange thing. It's a very strange thing. Mr. Speaker, profits are of an important part of every enterprise and aspect of any enterprise in this province, Mr. Speaker. Companies can't survive very long if they lose money. You know that and I know that.

Mr. Speaker, it's especially true that wages are an extremely important part of a worker's existence. I agree with that. I agree that every worker should get a good wage. I have no quarrel with that. But due to the problems that we have in this country today and the economic structure of this country, where are we doing to get the money from? Can we just sit here as 57 MLAs and dictate to the working force and the employers of this province and Canada by us manipulating the minimum wage, we're going to solve the problems? We're going to create more problems than we solve, because what happens once we raise the minimum wage 25 cents or 50 cents or \$1 or \$2.00? What does that employer down the street that's running a little factory do? Right away his products, he can't sell them, because he's priced himself out of business, and yet by a legislation or by resolution in this Legislature, we've got to dictate to him and tell him he's got to up his prices two or five dollars and price himself out of business. Mr. Speaker, I don't see that we have that right. I see that we should entitle to a fair wage and a reasonable wage, but by raising the minimum wage is not going to solve all the problems that the members opposite keep espousing day after day. It's going to create more problems. It's going to lay some people off. There's going to be people laid off work if we raise the minimum wage 25 or 50 cents, as sure as you sit across there, there'll be people laid off. Absolutely there will. Because I know lots of small businessmen in my constituency. I know lots of small businessmen in this city that'll have to lay their help off if we increase the minimum wage 25 or 50 cents an hour, because the dollars are not there to pay him, unless the Member for Elmwood's going to pay it or the unions are going to pay it, or if the government is going to shell it out.

And we should put all our cards on the table when we're debating this matter. Money isn't that easy to come by today. This province certainly is not a wealthy province, by any standard of imagination, Mr. Speaker. We all know that. It's very difficult for an industry or a business to compete in this province with the American market to the south, the international markets, but by raising the minimum wage, you show me some way that that is going to solve the problems of the worker that's on the minimum wage. It's not. It's going to — sure, for a couple of hours, and then what happens? He's out of a job, or his neighbour is out of a job, so we've got a worse problem. I suspect it is — it's certainly a very difficult time with double digit inflation and with the high unemployment rate we have in this country today. It is a serious problem, and a very serious problem. We only had to look at the number of people in our galleries today, the Metis people, to realize what serious matters there are. But by raising the minimum wage 5 or 10 or 15 cents an hour is not going to solve the problem, I assure you, Mr. Speaker. Not at all.

I feel sorry for the man today that's enjoying a minimum wage and has a family at home. I really do. The socialists think that they're the only people that have compassion. They think that they are the only guy that has a heart for the little guy. I got a very interesting communique out of that right turn, and I hope the members opposite have all purchased a copy of that; tremendous publication, by the way. It's a fantastic book to tell where the socialist philosophies have all gone so wrong in the old country today, and where Madam Thatcher is going to be the next Prime Minister in England.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not standing here today and trying to say that the problem is the fault of the worker either. The minimum wages are certainly a matter that we have to debate and discuss here, but let us be darned sure we know what we're doing when we're passing these resolutions and not slip, putting myths and dreams into the records of this province, about what this is going to do, unless we are sure of what we're talking about. Mr. Speaker, where does the problem lie? Where is this minimum wage? Is it the right; is it the problem of all Canadians? Is it a problem around the world today? Could we solve it by ourselves in Manitoba by raising the minimum wage 15, 25 or 50 cents?

Mr. Speaker, I know there are employers, there's trade unions today that seem to believe that the money seems to grow on trees, and if you've got more money, the whole world will tick around and everybody will go home happy. The system doesn't just work that way, Mr. Speaker. It does not work. By passage of this resolution, I suggest that — will all Manitobans go to bed happier at night? Will the guy that's getting the minimum wage if we increase it 15 or 20 cents, will that solve all his problems and pay off all his debts? I suspect the next day, if he happened to be working in a grocery store, the prices on the shelf in that grocery store will go up right away. Because somebody's got to pay it. Who is going to pay that money? As sure as we're sitting in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, if the clerks in the grocery stores today and the minimum wage in those stores goes up 15 or 25 or 50 cents an hour, the prices on the shelves in that store will go up the next day. It's inevitable. Well, where is the money going to come from? Is the Member for Elmwood going to run down and pay those people after we increase — no sir, Mr. Speaker. It's got to come out of the profits from that store. It's got to come out of the pocket of that employer.

And Mr. Speaker, why do we consistently bring this resolution before us and kick it around? And I know it was fine when we were sitting over on the other side of the House and kicking the government with the same resolution, framed basically the same . . .

**MR. DOERN:** You weren't serious.

**MR. MCKENZIE:** No, not serious, of course, and the Member for Elmwood isn't serious. But I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that to listen to members opposite, I suppose they believe that if we make as much money as possible that all the problems are going to solve themselves and that all these things will go away and everybody goes to bed happy at night with a pocket full of money. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that there's a lot of problems besides this resolution in this province today that we should be dealing with and tied in with at the same time. What about the production rates of this province? Would you be prepared to add, if we upped the rate 25 or 50 cents an hour, that the production of that worker should increase as well? —(Interjection)— Certainly I agree with that. I believe that we should have better wages for the minimum wage workers, but I'm trying to find or grasp some way, Mr. Speaker, where we can get that money to pay that worker. What about overtime rates? Should we have more overtime for these people that are on minimum wage, and let them work longer hours —(Interjection)— Well, the times the Member for Flin Flon was talking about, we used to ride freights; I used to work 12-16 hours a day. It never bothered me. It never hurt me. I'm in good health today. Hard work never hurt anybody, or long hours of work. Mr. Speaker, we work in this Legislature here long hours and if anybody should be ill, it should be the 57 MLAs, but I don't think we look abused because we work overtime, Mr. Speaker. I don't think it hurts us.

And of course, Mr. Speaker, what is the main purpose of a worker? What is the main objective of a minimum wage worker, Mr. Speaker? Naturally, he wants the highest possible wages. Anybody who's a worker would be a fool if he didn't want it. He wants a sizable wage increase as often as he can possibly get it or earn it. He wants as many fringe benefits, naturally, as is possible. He wants more overtime, I suspect, for all the overtime he can get. He wants all the statutory holidays that he can get, and I suppose there's a lot of other benefits that he's entitled to, but Mr. Speaker, we have to revert back to that square one. Where does this money come from? It comes from the profits. It comes from the profits of the employer.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder, is it really true that the meaning of life and happiness, of living, depends more and more on higher and higher wages? Are people happier? Mr. Speaker, I suspect that there are other ways that we can approach this resolution than the way it's being dealt with, with all kinds of suggestions being offered, half truths, quarter truths, statistics coming back and forth. I certainly see the need for a minimum wage and I look forward to the day that the Minister of Labour is going to increase it, and I suggest he will, but I want him to put it on the record before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, that by increasing the minimum wage in this province, whether we increase it 15 cents, 25, 50, or whatever this resolutions puts before us, it's going to create more problems than we had before, and it's not going to solve the problems that are elucidated day after day by members opposite, the problems of the minimum wage worker. It's not going to solve his problem

at all, Mr. Speaker. I suggest it's going to create more problems and make it more difficult for the man that's earning the minimum wage.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The hour being 5:30, when this item next appears on the Order Paper, the Honourable Member for Roblin will have seven minutes. The Honourable Government House Leader.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Pembina, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply will be meeting in the Chamber to consider the Estimates of the Department of Education, and the Estimates of the Department of Agriculture will be considered in room 254.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House adjourned until 2:30 Wednesday afternoon. Committee at 8:00 p.m. tonight.