

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Friday, March 16, 1979

Time: 10:00 a.m.

**OPENING PRAYER** by Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell):** Before we proceed, I should like to draw the honourable members' attention to the gallery, where we have 35 students of Grade 11 standing from Pierre Radisson School under the direction of Mr. Koswan. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable member for Radisson.

We have 40 students of Grade 4, 5 and 6 standing from St. Adolphe School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Hancock. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Springfield.

And we have 10 students of Grade 5 standing from William Osler School, under the direction of Mr. LeGrange. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River Heights, the Minister of Government Services.

We also have 30 students of Grade 7 standing from Warren Elementary School, under the direction of Mr. Boyd. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

On behalf of all the honourable members, we welcome you here this morning.

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

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

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

**HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel):** Mr. Speaker, I want to table the report of the Commissioner on the terms of reference extended by Order-in-Council 767-78 on the Nelson-Churchill River Systems Hydro Inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, there is a fairly voluminous appendix or appendices that goes with this, and although there are sufficient copies of this distributed, of the report itself, the appendices I have arranged to have lodged in the Library for perusal there. They are presently being copied and should be in the Library today.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister responsible for Manitoba Telephones.

**HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Annual Report of Manitoba Forestry Resources Limited for the year ending September 30, 1978.

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

Before we proceed with the Oral Questions, I have a note that there's a group of people from Kiev in the Speaker's Gallery as guests of the Minister of Tourism and Cultural Affairs. We welcome you here this morning.

Oral Questions.

## NON-POLITICAL STATEMENTS

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

**MR. BEN HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Speaker, if you would permit me to make a brief non-political statement pursuant to your welcoming of a number of guests to your Gallery. In the name of the Members of the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker, I wish to welcome our guests from Kiev, Ukraine. (Mr. Hanuschak then welcomed the Kiev guests in Ukrainian).

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

**MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief non-political comment as well. In view of the fact that tomorrow is St. Patrick's Day, I think it would be only fitting for us to pay respect to all the fine contributions made by those of Irish ancestry to the Province of Manitoba. Having had a grandfather of Irish ancestry I must admit I have some particular leanings in that direction, so I would hope that the House could pay tribute to the fact that tomorrow is St. Patrick's Day and the day of the Irish.

### ORAL QUESTIONS

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, can the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources indicate to the House what action, if any, his department, or the Clean Environment Commission intend to take in regard to the complaints that have been received by the Clean Environment Commission, I believe, in his office pertaining to the dumping of radioactive materials in the north end Treatment Plant?

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

**HON. BRIAN RANSON (Souris-Killarney):** Mr. Speaker, in detail I would have to take the question as notice to see what immediate recommendations there are, but, we are in general investigating the whole question of hazardous wastes as was discussed in my Estimates, but I will take the specific question as notice and respond later.

**MR. PAWLEY:** The minister may wish to take this part of the question as notice as well and advise whether or not the Clean Environment Commission would be intending to hold a Hearing pertaining to the complaint which it has received from the Municipality of West St. Paul?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

**MR. RANSON:** Well, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the Commission holds a Hearing, of course, is up to them within the purview of the Act.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the same minister. In relation to the problem that occurred yesterday in Easterville, can the minister report now, does he intend to meet with the residents and fishermen of that area to negotiate some of their grievances?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**MR. RANSON:** Mr. Speaker, I have been in touch with the President of the Indian Brotherhood, Lawrence Whitehead, and with the President of the Manitoba Metis Federation, John Morrisseau, this morning and I had been in touch with them previously regarding this situation with the Fishery at Easterville, and the question was in fact under review prior to any sort of incident taking place yesterday. I have had ongoing consultation with Mr. Whitehead and with Mr. Morrisseau, and I expect to have further consultations with them.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, in addition to meeting with the Presidents of the MIB and MMF, does the Minister intend to deal directly with the residents and fishermen of that community or at least provide some assurances to them that their grievances will be looked after and be dealt with, other than through these two organizations, but that they themselves in their own community would have some direct contact?

**MR. RANSON:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the honourable member's announcement this morning, he could perhaps assist in reviewing the Unemployment Insurance Regulations, because I am advised that this is really a problem that has to do with unemployment insurance and not a problem that deals directly with Fisheries. .

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge with a final supplementary.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm always ready to help the Minister in any way I can, and

in any capacity I can, but he didn't answer my question. Does he intend to undertake any direct discussions or negotiations with the fishermen or residents of that area?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I can only reiterate that my people were in fact undertaking discussion yesterday, and that I have been in continuing contact with the President of the Manitoba Metis Federation and the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood, and I have met with them this morning.

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

**MR. RONALD McBRYDE:** Mr. Speaker, a question on the same subject to the same Minister. I wonder if the Minister would be willing, along with his colleagues, to meet directly with the community representatives, to talk about the overall unemployment problem in that community?

**MR. RANSOM:** Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a question that is quite apart from the one under consideration at the moment, and in any situation where we have a request to meet with a community and talk about some proposals that they might have for development, then we're quite prepared to do that, and as a matter of fact, with this very community last September when there were some grievances raised with respect to the operation of the Forebay and the Grand Rapids Dam, and the problems that arose from that. I personally went to the community and met with the leaders there, and looked at their problems, and we're attempting to deal with some of them now. So I think that we have demonstrated our willingness to meet and have reasonable and rational discussions with people.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, since the question of overall economic development and unemployment is not apart from the present problem, I wonder if the Minister and his Cabinet are reconsidering their decision to eliminate the employment program called the Easterville Harvesting Company are they willing to reevaluate their decision to close that operation?

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

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister and his department are considering a proposal from the community of Easterville to create additional employment in the trapping industry by developing a number of lakes to improve trapping in that area. Is the department actively considering that proposal from the community of Easterville?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not personally familiar with the plan to which he refers, but we have the expertise and the programs in my department to deal with management of the resource. That certainly is one of the approaches that we support, is the management of the resource that can in turn provide a viable industry. The resources must be there in order to do that and if there's a proposal that deals with management of fur bearers, then we will be actively considering that.

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

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Education. In view of the fact that the Minister has taken the liberty to announce some details of his programs outside the House, as his government has a reputation of doing, will he now assure the House, and through it the people of Manitoba, that the education program offering Ukrainian as a language of instruction will be universally available in the forthcoming school year to all who may wish to enroll therein?

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

**HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli):** Mr. Speaker, that particular program was announced in the Throne Speech so I'm sure all members are well aware of it and, of course, it was announced that it is a pilot program and will be offered in some three localities. The idea that it would be universal at this point is not one that we've envisaged with a pilot program. We're looking at three pilots, in fact.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, will the Minister then confirm or deny the statement that was made a couple of days ago that the program may be available to other school divisions who may be interested in offering it?

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, the purpose of pilot programs, of course, is to launch a certain type of program and to test it out and see how it works, how it is accepted and after the pilot has been completed, it would be our hope that we would be able to make the program available throughout the province to those areas where people express some need and some wish to have the program.

**MR. HANUSCHAK:** Yes, a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, and, again to the Minister of Education and I'm not asking for any assistance from the Minister of Economic Development in answering the question which he had volunteered.

Will the Minister assure the people of Manitoba that the admission requirements for enrollment will not differ from those existing under the present Public Schools Act?

**MR. COSENS:** I don't anticipate any problem in that regard at all, Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. PETER FOX:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the forecast by the Retail Council of Canada of a further 13 percent rise in food prices and since it has already risen by 17.4 percent in the last 12 months, can the Minister inform us what his department will be doing specifically to minimize this increase?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**HON. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris):** Mr. Speaker, if the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs will be undertaking any action whatsoever it will not be in isolation; it will be in conjunction with departments across the country and the Federal department. I don't think that anything useful can be achieved by one province and one department acting in isolation. It is an effort that is required across the country.

**MR. FOX:** I thank the Minister for his answer and the fact that he does appreciate this is a complex question. Knowing the Minister to be compassionate, I wonder if he would consider talking to his colleagues to get an increase in the minimum wage as soon as possible so those people at least won't have to suffer so long.

**MR. JORGENSON:** I have been talking to the Minister of Highways about this matter for a long time.

**MR. FOX:** I thank the Minister for that answer as well. I wasn't aware that the Minister of Highways was the only one who was compassionate in respect to minimum wages. Would he also speak to his other colleagues so that we can get an answer from the government, at least the people that are waiting, on minimum wages, that they will have a chance to have an increase?

**MR. JORGENSON:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, we'll be doing that.

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

**MR. WILSON PARASIUK:** Thank you. My question also is directed to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and relates to the rapidly increasing prices. I would like to ask him if he's setting up a special group within his department or within the government to pull together statistics and be a watchdog on price increases in Manitoba because the Statistics Canada data isn't broken down that detailed for Manitoba and I think that the Manitobans and especially the government should be aware of what the price increases are in Manitoba?

**MR. BLAKE:** Ask your question and quit making speeches.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Mr. Speaker, I will ask my question if I wouldn't be rudely interrupted by some member on the back row there. I would ask if the Minister if he would set up a group to determine

what the price increases are in Manitoba and what their effects on Manitobans are?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated to my honourable friend previously, we have been doing that for some months. As a matter of fact, one of the first suggestions I made to the department was that we do endeavor to monitor those prices, to have some idea of where the increases are coming from and I note — not that I intend to take any credit for it — I note, Mr. Speaker, that in the latest Consumer Price Index, although the price has risen considerably across the country I note with some small satisfaction that the increases in Province of Manitoba is less than it is on the average across the country.

**MR. PARASIUK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary to the Minister. If his department has, in fact, been collating Manitoba statistics on Manitoba price increases, would he please table that information with the members of the Legislature and the public so that they can be aware of what work the Minister has done in this regard?

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, the Consumer Price Indexes from the Manitoba Bureau of Statistics are available to my honourable friend. What I am compiling is information for my own use within the department by the departmental officials.

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

**MR. PARASIUK:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Would he indicate whether the Manitoba Rent Review Board has sent out notices or given information to tenants outside of Brandon and Winnipeg informing them that they do have an obligation, if they wish to file a complaint regarding decontrolled departments outside of Brandon and Winnipeg under the Act before April 1st, and that their complaints will not be received after April 1st. Will he ensure that the board does notify tenants outside of Winnipeg and Brandon of that right under the Act?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure just what method has been used to advise people, or tenants outside of the cities of Brandon and Winnipeg, but I do happen to know that some of them seem to be aware, because we are getting calls from various points across the province, and they're being dealt with.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the last question. During the last session of the Legislature, the then Minister of Consumer Affairs indicated that the decontrol of rents outside Brandon and Winnipeg would be carefully monitored and evaluated by his department. Would the Minister of Consumer Affairs now table the results of that monitoring and evaluation insofar as the impact of the decontrol of rents outside Brandon and Winnipeg?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Mr. Speaker, I shall have to check with the department to find out if the information that my honourable friend refers to is available.

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

**MR. WILLIAM JENKINS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is also to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Can the Minister inform the House whether his departmental officials are monitoring the fresh vegetable and fresh fruit prices in Manitoba stores to make sure that the proposed, and the announced decrease in the import duties on these commodities are being passed on to the consumers of Manitoba.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

**MR. JORGENSON:** Yes, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. JENKINS:** Could the Honourable Minister also inform this House when the one cent subsidy on the price of milk is proposed to be removed, as was announced last year by the then Minister of Consumer Affairs? Per litre, for a start-up.

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I understand what my honourable friend is talking about. I wonder if he would mind repeating that question.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Would the Honourable Member for Logan care to . . .

**MR. JENKINS:** Yes, Mr. Speaker. Last year when the Manitoba Public Utilities Board' I believe it was, allowed the increase in the price of milk, they also allowed start-up costs for the metrification of milk. I believe it was one cent per litre, which was supposed to be removed after one year. Can the Minister take as notice whether that one cent is now being removed, or what?

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I shall have to make some enquiries to find out if that statement is true.

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

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, a question to the Acting Premier. In light of the critical unemployment situation in northern Manitoba, particularly in the remote communities, native communities, is the government reconsidering its decision to eliminate the Special Northern Employment Program?

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice because the Minister of Labour and Manpower and the Minister of Northern Affairs will have some information with regard to that program when he returns.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I would then ask the Acting Premier if he could advise whether or not the government is reconsidering the expansion of the Special ARDA Program in order to assist fishermen and trappers in northern Manitoba?

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, Mr. Speaker, these matters are under review and, to some extent, they have been spoken to this morning by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources in relating the problems of the last few days, and particularly yesterday, in one community and are being reviewed in context with the total picture.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, will the government re-establish the function of the community economic fund in order to provide financial assistance to native persons in order that they may, themselves, become involved in private business in northern Manitoba?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, any re-entry into that forum for creation of projects and work would not be on the same basis as the prior operation of the CEDF, but the total question of job opportunity is being examined by the Ministers involved in those areas, and particularly the Minister of Northern Affairs.

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

**MR. JAY COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for Renewable Resources. Since Easterville is only the tip of the iceberg when it comes to serious concern about unemployment in northern Manitoba, could the Minister indicate how many forestry projects have been started in remote communities since his government took office, and can he further indicate how many have been eliminated by his government?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, those sorts of things, I would have thought, would have been well discussed in the Estimates of my department, which were before the House for the last two weeks.

I am sure that there are programs within the forestry operations of the department which will be carried on in the north, when those programs indicate that there is likely to be some reason for carrying them on, in terms of being able to establish viable industry or to create long-term opportunities within the industry that do not exist there now.

If the honourable member is referring to projects that would involve the expenditure of money, for example \$70,000 to build a log cabin that's worth \$20,000, then we're not contemplating those projects, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. COWAN:** Yes, a supplementary to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister reassure the House in specific that the Cross Lake sawmill operation will not be closed down because of lack of commitment to economic development in northern Manitoba by the Conservative Government?

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, there is no lack of commitment to economic development. It's some of the uneconomic developments which have been questioned.

**MR. COWAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A final supplementary to the Minister: Can the Minister inform the House as to how many workers are now being employed at the Pakwagan logging operation in Wabowden?

**MR. RANSOM:** Well, Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member knows, that particular operation is not one that is being operated by government anymore, and I don't have that information available. If the honourable member would like me to inquire and report on the employment that continues in the three or four companies that the government divested themselves of, then I would be happy to undertake to get those figures for the honourable member.

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

**MR. RUSSELL DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Acting Premier, who, as an engineer, should have some appreciation for the Winnipeg Construction Association's statistics that there is now 33.8 percent . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, order please. May I point out to the honourable member that the Question Period is time for questions, not for statements. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I thought it was a statement of facts that the Acting Premier was an engineer. Mr. Speaker, in view of the Winnipeg Construction Association's statistics that there is one-third unemployment in the construction industry . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Will the honourable member please ask his question? This is not a time for a statement.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to debate on a point of order, but I think it would be in order to do that. In view of the shocking unemployment in the construction industry, as reported, will the government now proceed in tendering some of their needed public requirements?

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, the member is correct in that there is an unemployment problem in the construction industry. Construction starts are down significant and a great deal of it, perhaps most of it, is in the housing starts a great deal of the problem lies in that particular area. Government has announced that they will be pressing on with a number of programs, and the member can be sure that as far as the provincial government's activity is concerned that we will certainly be holding up our end as far as providing job opportunities through construction projects. But with the massive slowdown, and particularly in housing, I would say it's highly questionable that the provincial government will be able to take up the slack with projects that it undertakes. So we

may have a problem that will continue for some while until adjustments, natural adjustments, take place.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a statement made recently that the provincial government this year, in total — and again, there will certainly be more information available during the course of the Budget when the Capital projects are outlined — but in very rough terms, the province will be probably, in total, involved through its Crown corporations and through direct spending, somewhere in the order of \$550 million in Capital.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. May I suggest to the Honourable Minister that he make his answer as short as possible? The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, then, based on earlier government statements that the government was optimistic in the fact that they expected the private sector to fill the breach, is the Minister now admitting that the private sector cannot, and has not, in fact, filled the breach caused by a pull-back in government construction?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, the private sector element, in particular in manufacturing, of course has done that in the last year. The number of manufacturing jobs are up 7,000 out of 63,000 from a year ago. The same is true — not to the same extent, but to a large extent — in the service industries. The agricultural industry is doing well. The one weak spot we have is the one the member has mentioned, which is in construction, and a great deal of that is due to the fact that housing starts are down and building permits are down, and that's a pretty good indicator. So there is going to be an adjustment problem.

But I can repeat again that the provincial government will be pressing on with its construction program, which will come forth over the period of time and will be outlined as the budget progresses. Mr. Speaker, the member probably has another supplementary, but I do have one other question I wanted to reply to. I'll wait in case he has.

**MR. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Minister's answer, but I ask him whether he has any concrete message in terms of specific announcements of public works or housing to give the construction industry at this time, in view of the high unemployment, and in view of a 12 to 18 percent projected unemployment figure in their peak season in the summer. Are there any specifics that he can provide us with?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Speaker, I've indicated that this will come forward. I've given you in ball-park terms what the government's total program will be, capital program will be for the year, and part of that will certainly alleviate the problem, but I'm not trying to suggest it's going to solve the problem, because there has been a major let-up in the amount of housing starts. And that's not peculiar to Manitoba, it's right across Canada.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm on my feet, the Member for St. Johns asked me a question on February 23rd with regard to the Tritschler Inquiry Commission, and I indicated that I had forwarded to the Commissioner his questions to the Commissioner, and I have a reply for him and I'll table the reply for the member.

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

**MR. THOMAS BARROW:** I address my question, Mr. Speaker, to the Acting Minister of Manpower or the Minister of Mines. It doesn't really matter because I don't expect an answer to them anyway.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. May I suggest to the honourable member that questions should not be satirical or ironical and he should be careful in couching his language. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. BARROW:** Could the Minister concerned tell the House how many people, and mostly native people at Cranberry Portage are still employed at Athapap Building now the government has got rid of this employment-creating project. —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon?

A second question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Acting Minister, or whoever, tell us whether the program placing native people in the mining industry — started by the NDP government, God bless their souls — are continuing at the former levels. And is the company really putting an effort into this program, or are they so short of miners, they're scraping the very bottom of the barrel?

How much of these programs have been cut back to suit your restraint program? Thank you,



Mr. Speaker.

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

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I'm going to have to inquire of the honourable member who his speech writer is.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. May I point out to all members that the same rules apply to the answers as apply to the questions. The Honourable Minister of Mines.

**MR. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member repeated one question that was similar to one that had been raised by the Honourable Member for Churchill, and I had undertaken to get information and respond to the number of people employed in those losers that the government divested itself of. The employment program at Hudson Bay is going apace, Mr. Speaker, and it's important, I think to realize that the program of course is required not only from the point of view of trying to integrate the native people into the work force, but that the company is in need of employees as well, as was evidenced by the fact that during the past summer, they found it necessary, despite the unemployment situation in Manitoba, to have to go to Newfoundland to recruit people to work.

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

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I accepted a question from the Member for Fort Rouge regarding the reduction in the size of the teaching staff in the urban area. I didn't have the figures with me at that time, but I would like to provide them for the member now.

In those divisions, wholly or partially in the city of Winnipeg, we are seeing student enrollment decline of some 1,625 students for the fall term 1979, and an accompanying reduction in the number of employed teachers of some 113. I don't think that is surprising, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the trend that we're seeing in our society of declining school enrollments. It's something that our studies indicate will continue until 1984, and at that point there will be a levelling off, although it is anticipated that high school enrollments will continue to decline well into the 1990s.

I would just add one other point, Mr. Speaker, to allay the fears of the Member for Fort Rouge. The pupil-teacher ratio in the fall term 1978, in those divisions wholly or partially in the city of Winnipeg, that particular ratio was 16.6 in the fall term 1978. The pupil-teacher ratio in the fall term 1979 will be 16.6.

I could also allay the fears of the Member for Fort Rouge that I have no indication that any of those reductions will affect special education programs. The very reverse is true, Mr. Speaker, that we are seeing an increase in the number of people, staff involved in those particular areas throughout the province.

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to respond to another matter that the Member for Fort Rouge brought before the House in regard to bus safety. He made reference to a federal report, I have investigated that particular report a little further, although we have not received it in Manitoba, we have talked directly to Ottawa to get the details of this particular report. It was based on 1974 and 1975 statistics, Mr. Speaker. It indicated that of all the provinces studied, that Manitoba had the best record in this regard. —(Interjection)— The Member for Fort Rouge quoted figures, I believe something like 50 percent of bus accidents were due to driver error. The table shows for Manitoba that some 38 percent were in this category but he did not mention —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Just on that point of order it would appear that the answer is of such a nature that it would be much better if the Minister of Education saw fit to table his report. It's hardly the time for speech making.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please. —(Interjection)— Order please. The Honourable Government House Leader on a point of order.

**MR. JORGENSON:** On that same point of order, Mr. Speaker, what my honourable friend now is attempting to do is precisely what we have been saying for some time, that if my honourable friends want information, then they should be prepared to listen to the answers. What they're concerned about, Sir, is that they might get the answers and that question should have been placed

on the Order Paper in the first place. If my honourable friends don't want long answers, my suggestion to them is that they place those questions on the Order Paper or they get them during the Estimates. Questions of that nature are out of order at this period of time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a point of order.

**MR. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that if the opposition is expected to ask short, direct questions, then the government should be expected as well to answer in a short, concise style and if elaboration is required that goes beyond the answer, then the Minister is certainly quite welcome to table that elaboration.

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

**MR. JORGENSON:** May I suggest, Sir, then to my honourable friends that perhaps what is needed is to distinguish between those questions that are more properly asked in the Estimates or as Orders for Return as opposed to those who are asked during the Question Period. And, if my honourable friends want a clarification, that we're perfectly happy to accommodate them. The rules should be applied.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Order please.

**MR. JORGENSON:** The rules should be applied, Sir, and I find it rather interesting that honourable friends opposite, that although they want the rules to be applied on this side —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The points of order raised by both sides of the House are very valid points indeed and I think they should be listened to by all members of the Chamber. The Honourable Minister of Education completed his answer. The Honourable Minister of Education.

**MR. COSENS:** I had a couple more points on this, just for clarification, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the comments that were made —(Interjection)— May I proceed? The 38 percent, or the percentage that the Member for Fort Rouge referred to implied that all driver error was bus driver error and the report that he referred to did not in fact imply that. It included all drivers who were involved in accidents so where you had 30 percent of buses involved in accidents, it was not necessarily the bus driver. It could have been another driver in another vehicle who was in collision with the bus. So, I think that distorted that particular picture. I wanted to clarify that point, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. I think the Minister's answer is a fairly lengthy one and perhaps he can add to it some other day. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will try to keep my questions short and direct.

Is it not true that now the Minister has had a chance to deliver the report, that the following statement was made in that report: "The high incidence of bus driver error indicates the need for more discriminating selection of school bus drivers as well as the development and implementation of more effective driving training programs." And, is it not also true that the Province of Manitoba neither has any standards for that kind of selection nor does it provide any standards for driver training or likewise? Are those statements not also true? —(Interjection)— Well, if those are the statements reported, I'm asking the Minister of Education now that he's had the opportunity to read it; are those statements not contained in the report and does it indicate that some action is required in the Province of Manitoba?

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

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased that the member has asked that question because it gives me the opportunity to provide the information without the type of reaction that we get from members across the way when we provide the facts.

The National Research Safety Council statistics for 1978 for every million miles travelled by buses, indicate that the average for Canada for accidents per million miles, is 20 accidents per every million miles with buses.

For Manitoba in 1978, Mr. Speaker, it was 2.5, which I suggest in itself indicates that the program that we're carrying on is quite effective. Mind you 2.5 is not as good as zero but I would say that

is rather an enviable record.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister doesn't seem to catch the point. I'm asking what program —(Interjection)— well, he is pulling statistics out and we all know that statistics can be used on any side of those arguments. I'm asking him that in light of a report that indicated that even if only 38 percent, which is far too high and unacceptable, is the cause of accidents, what is the requirement by the Department of Education that school bus drivers go through a proper selection procedure and receive standards of training that would require them to meet those standards and proper standards? Is it not true that the Department of Education does not have any such program or any such standards?

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

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, I regret that I did not bring with me the manual that was issued to all school division transportation directors last fall in this particular province regarding the training of bus drivers. And that particular manual I will provide to the Member for Fort Rouge for his particular edification.

**MR. AXWORTHY:** The final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

We now know that there is a manual. What we do not know is whether there is any requirements or standards that school divisions must meet and the fact of the matter is the Minister is not prepared to either accept that there is no such program or take steps to put it into an effective program that would set provincial-wide standards for the selection of drivers and their proper training.

**MR. COSENS:** Mr. Speaker, we have licensing requirements, there are training requirements; these people are retested periodically. What more does the member want? And we have an enviable record in this province, better than any other province in Canada. —(Interjection)—

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. The time for Question Period having expired, proceed with Orders of the Day. The Honourable Government House Leader.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**MR. JORGENSEN:** Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the Minister of Highways that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty. .

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

### CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

#### SUPPLY — FINANCE

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Albert Drieger (Emerson):** Resolution 47: 1(a) Minister's Salary—pass — the Member for St. Johns.

**MR. SAUL CHERNIACK:** I do not yet have a copy of the transcript of yesterday's Hansard, but from March 13th I have a list of questions that the Minister agreed to respond to. I don't know whether he wants to do it in his sequence or in any other sequence; I don't care, for myself, what sequence he uses.

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, the staff has presented quite a number of replies here. I think what I'll do is I'll just distribute these. Maybe I better keep a copy myself, so I can have a look at them while they are being distributed. Some are for the Member for St. Johns, and the Member for St. Vital. This may not be all the questions, there are still some to come.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is it the wish of the Committee to peruse the information first and then proceed, or . . . ? The Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I am looking at two that I have received so far. One of them I'd like into the record; I haven't read it but I know I'd like it into the record, so I wonder if it could be read in. That's the one dealing with the \$6.3 million invested income.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, can we refer it to be included?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I am informed that this information can all be put into the record. Would that be adequate? The Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** No, that's all right. I don't need it read aloud to me but I'd like the time to peruse it now, so that we can see whether there is anything that follows from it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is it the intention of the committee to have all the information that has been received transcribed into the record?

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, from my standpoint I don't know; I haven't seen the information yet. I can only indicate it as I read it. Either it all goes in, which may be a waste, or we have to give him time in which to make that kind of a statement. Firstly, I suppose, it's up to the Minister to decide whether he wants it in the record or not, and then if he doesn't and we have certain pages that we want in, we would have to ask to have it put in.

**MR. CRAIK:** I think the easiest way, of course, is to . . . because they are pretty complete, I think they could go in as is. The answer is self-explanatory. Either or not the answers are easy to understand, I would think might be open to some question. But as far as getting it into the record, there is no difficulty in presenting it as is.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Would it be the desire of the Committee to have a 5 or 10 minute recess while the information is being perused? The Honourable Minister.

**MR. CRAIK:** Perhaps the Member for St. Johns and other members might want to proceed with questions while he is perusing it.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I'd like to hear what other members have to say, so I would not like to think that there will be discussion of one item and reading of another, concurrently.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is it then the suggestion to have a recess of approximately 10 minutes?

**MR. CHERNIACK:** We can do that. Is that all right?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Committee agreed? (Agreed) Committee is recessed until 11:35.

Committee come to order. Under Resolution 47: 1(a) Minister's Salary — the Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the information given to us so far. I, personally, have questions to ask on each of these, and I'm just wondering, with some sense of order, how we should handle it. We have agreed that all of this would form part of the record. I'm wondering if it wouldn't be more logical that we . . . I don't know whether it would be put into the record as an appendix or in the Hansard itself. If it goes in the Hansard itself then maybe it would be best to put in each reply and then the discussion related to it, in some order. So can we find out whether it will be in the appendix or not?

**MR. CRAIK:** Do you want it as an appendix?

**MR. CHERNIACK:** No, from my standpoint I would advise that we deal with each reply, put it into Hansard, and then discuss it, have the discussion following the printed reply and then step to the

next reply, print it and deal with the discussion. I am suggesting that.

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, for instance, Mr. Chairman, if we simply say we're going to deal with the Member for St. Vital's question regarding Highways Account 15(5)(b) and the answer is contained in the text here, at that point, it would be entered into the record as the answer.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** And then the discussion.

**MR. CRAIK:** Yes.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I think that would look best, in reading Hansard in the future, to be able to see how the replies came. And if that's acceptable, then I would have one more suggestion, again chronological — if we put these in in the order in which they appeared in the Hansard of last Tuesday, so again there will be a relationship between this discussion and the one that they will be giving of the Committee. I don't think it matters much, but I think it's more orderly; that's the only . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** To the Members of Committee, I am informed that where there is a table involved, it comes at the end of the discussion. Is that agreeable? I understand it gets printed as an appendix. The Member for St. Johns.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, that's fine, Mr. Chairman. I think what we want to do is to have the answers, deal with the points raised and pass them. I don't really think it matters very much but where it has to be an appendix we can refer to the appendix.

I happen to have the order in which these questions were asked. If you want to follow that order, okay, and if for any reason the Minister, because of staff, wants to change the order, that's okay with me too and I'm sure it is with my colleagues. )

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Proceed.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** / All right, Mr. Chairman. Then if you like we can deal with the item which appeared on page 934, the repayment of the \$30 million debt due to the federal government. (See Addendum No. 1.)

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

**MR. CRAIK:** This is the same one that's referred to in the 1977-78 account?

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Yes.

**MR. CRAIK:** I wonder if we shouldn't be leaving that and discussing it under the Accounts because we're supposed to really be discussing 1979-80 here and this is two years old accounts.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, we are not now discussing the fact that the debt was set up on the books as an account payable. What we are dealing with, in my estimation, is how the department has in this current year dealt with this debt and the answer that we have here is that repayment is being made in the current fiscal year. Now, we're talking the Minister's Salary and that means his administration of his department. Therefore, I would like to, and it won't take very long, clarify how this is being repaid. It states: "Is being made in the current fiscal year." It then says further: "That the federal government has made deductions from regular monthly installment payments and repayments will be completed."

I would like to know how the mechanics are being worked. It is shown now as a debt of the province. That is now, I mean, in the March 31st, 1978 account it is shown as a debt of the province. From the last paragraph of this answer it would appear that it is not actually being paid by money transferred from Manitoba to Ottawa, but rather Ottawa is deducting income payments which it owes for the current year. Therefore, I'd like to know just how the mechanics are worked. What is the bookkeeping involved in this?

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the method here of deductions was a method suggested by the federal government and that it's as indicated in the last paragraph.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what is the bookkeeping involved, just simply how is it being recorded month by month as a repayment of a debt. I'm not questioning the manner; I want to know how it's being recorded.

**MR. CRAIK:** It's deducted from the revenue receipts that we receive each month.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, the records of the government must show a receipt of a certain sum of money from Ottawa. That is a receipt. Now, there's an account payable shown on the books of the government. How is that being adjusted? Is it being shown now as a monthly receipt, because it has to be Journal entry. There's no money actually changing hands. I want to know how is it being recorded? It's a bookkeeping thing that can't be too complicated.

**MR. CRAIK:** I agree with the member. It's a bookkeeping thing. I gather we receive it as a gross amount and reduce it by an entry that reduces the liability month by month. I'm told, Mr. Chairman, that it comes in as gross revenue indicated each month, and then the deduction is made and applied against the liability.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I am guessing then from that answer which can't be exactly right, it doesn't come in as a gross amount. I am guessing this way that if . . .

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, it's recorded that way.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Ah, so that if, let us say — and I have to use hypothetical figures — if the Federal Government should be sending \$5 million and should be deducting \$1 million a month, then it would send in \$4 million and the bookkeeping of the government, would it actually pretend that there was a receipt of \$5 million, or would it say there's a receipt of \$4 million and there is a chargeover, or a credit given, a credit to the liability, the existing liability, as if there were an extra million dollars assigned out of our — is it a Trust fund where that money rests? — and then is shown as a receipt from our own bank of a different account of \$1 million?

**MR. CRAIK:** It shows as a revenue of \$5 million. We make a deduction of \$1 million and apply it against the liability. Mr. Chairman, might I suggest here, we're going to have great difficulty trying to do this sort of thing in Committee. I think if the member's willing, we'll sit down and do it with the Provincial Auditor or with the Deputy-Minister and the accounting staff so we can put it out on paper.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, it'll take quite a while before I'm prepared to meet with this Minister outside of the formal Committee, especially in any hallways, so that I think we're near the end of this series of questions and I would much prefer it to be on the record.

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, we don't have to meet in hallways.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, the Year End Statement will show certain revenue from the Federal Government. A correct bookkeeping account, as I see it, on a cash basis, and I'm assuming that in spite of the various accruals that have been set up we're still operating on a cash basis, that it should show revenue from the Federal Government under Equalization and Personal Income Tax and Corporate Income Tax, X dollars, in this case \$4 million, transfer from Account Payable \$1 million, Total so much, but I am concerned that the accounting for this current year which is about to end will show the actual moneys received from the Federal Government and, in addition to that, a transfer from the previous year's Account Payable to this year's having been paid, so that the true transaction will show, and I'm not saying that it will be untrue to show it as gross but then I suppose it would have to be footnoted and I would like some understanding. If it's not shown the way I'm saying, then it must be shown, I believe, with a clear-cut footnote and explanation how the money came in, that it wasn't actually in cash but that there were book entries as well. Now, can we get that kind of an undertaking and then I can leave this question.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, I understand that a footnote will be shown showing how much was taken off the revenue and applied against the liability.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I think the wording should be how much was added to the revenue and taken off the liability.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, I really think that probably, since he's dealing with a matter that's already before the Public Accounts, the Public Accounts is really an easier form to discuss some of these details in than the formality of this Committee, that if there are any further questions we can deal with it there. I think the amount that the member's referring to is contained in the current Public Accounts on Page 26.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, that's the Auditor's Report, that's not the foot . . . or is that the footnoting to the Financial Statement? Yes, it is. And what the Deputy-Minister is making clear is that there will be a similar kind of footnoting to this current statement which will show that this amount of \$30 million-plus was a transfer from an account payable into the revenue side for this current year and was not actually received in cash from the Federal Government. That's the point I want to make clear. Okay.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Inkster.

**MR. SIDNEY GREEN:** I'd like to ask the Minister whether there has been any indication as to whether the amount that we have guaranteed CCIL, which I believe of a \$15 million amount our share was \$1.8 million, whether that has been called or whether it's indicated that the company is not going into further deficits and therefore the amount will be repaid by the company.

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, my information on that is not very current because there have been some meetings going on very recently on it and I can't tell the member exactly what the position is right at this moment. The guarantee still applies and must apply for a certain period of time. There hasn't been any offer on the part of the company that they've got into the position where the guarantee could be lifted.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the company, although improved, showed additional losses as reported in the newspapers this year, would it be fair to assume that the company is not in a better position to pay this year than when they borrowed the money last year? They've had additional losses over the last year.

**MR. CRAIK:** I don't think you can draw the conclusion that they are not in better shape just from that statement.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. The Minister had misinterpreted me. I didn't ask whether the company is in better shape generally as a company. I asked with respect to repayment of this \$15 million, that last year they needed it, and needed it fairly desperately. Over the year they have lost additional money so they would be not in less need of the \$15 million this year than they were last year.

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, I can get some information for the member. I can't be very specific about it at this point in time. I know there have been some meetings very recently and I can perhaps come back to him with some information.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, would it be fair to say that if this was an account on an investment company's books or if it had been advanced through the Manitoba Development Corporation it would show an additional loss, this year, of approximately \$1,500,000 for the whole \$15 million which I'm figuring interest at the modest rate which 15 years ago would have been considered usurious at 10 percent and that the indebtedness of the CCIL on the basis of that guarantee being called would now be \$16,500,000 or a million and a half loss additional on the \$15 million and approximately \$180,000 \$1.8 million on our and would it not have to be shown that way on our books according to our financial accounting scale where we have to put aside the money when we make a guarantee, that the money would now be \$1.8 million plus \$180,000.00.

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I didn't follow all the member's arithmetic but the money has to be earmarked but it's different. I think that there's a suggestion there that it's an interest free loan, equivalent of . . .

**MR. GREEN:** No, I haven't said it's an interest free loan. I've said that we have guaranteed them

to the extent of \$1.8 million. That when we guarantee we have to set aside that much funds as a guarantee. That that amount of money set aside last year would be \$1,980,000 this year.

**MR. CRAIK:** My reaction is no, but let me inquire. No, Mr. Chairman' if there's no money laid out, I don't think you can — they'd have to show on the books, the guarantees have to show on the books at \$1.8 million and I don't see the logic in it changing from that \$1.8.

**MR. GREEN:** Isn't our exposure now the amount that we would have to pay if CCIL does not repay the money? And CCIL presumably got the money from the bank, we guaranteed \$1,800,000, if CCIL does not repay the bank, we will have to pay the bank plus interest. Is the financial world changed, that no interest is now payable?

**MR. CRAIK:** Let me check it and see.

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, would you? I believe that our exposure would now be \$1.8 million plus interest at approximately 10 percent for one year.

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, I'll check it.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister whether he had any knowledge that the figures of reduction in staff as presented to the Legislative Assembly by management committee or that were used, and which were obtained from management committee last year in the House were disputed by his department who said that the management committee figures are approximately 300 higher than those figures which would be given by your department because management committee was not including certain staff, that management committee excluded shift employees, hourly paid employees and a number of other employees and that actually the reduction in staff from November 4th, 1977 to June 16th, 1978 was 454 people. That's from November 4th, 1977 to June 16th, 1978 a reduction of staff, that is people paid by the provincial government was 454 people. And that that information is the information which would be obtained from Finance Department if we asked the question of the Finance Department.

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't recall the figures that the member's talking about. The only numbers I do recall dealing with, at one stage of the game, was where our Estimates were a difference of about — and I can't tell the member even when it was because I haven't dealt with these figures personally; I haven't had any high degree of involvement in the speculation that has been going back and forth as to the actual numbers — but I do recall at one time sometime in 1978 looking at figures from Finance indicating under a certain categorization a number of 1,500 or thereabouts depending on what you include in the reductions.

I am more inclined to think that the statements put out by the Civil Service Commission are the most effective ways, because there are going to be different methods of calculating.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to you that your own department indicated to you that the management figures were incorrect, also strongly recommended that you and the Minister responsible for the Task Force be advised that the numbers that were produced by Finance Committee, which showed that the reduction of staff between November 4, 1977, and June 16, 1978, was 454 people, which was about 300 lower than numbers provided by Management Committee of Cabinet, and, Mr. Chairman, I think are somewhat lower than those figures which were given to the House; that that information was made available to the Minister; that there was no attempt to correct the figures that were given to the Legislature; and that the figures that the Finance Department would produce today, which are the actual figures of people being paid, are lower than the amounts that are produced by the Civil Service Commission and they are lower than the amount that would be produced by Management Committee and have not been given to us because they are more accurate than those produced by the Civil Service or by Management Committee; and that that information was made available to the Minister and that we have not had the Finance Department's version of this so-called restraint reduction in staff, which, in my opinion, amounted to really reducing people in Northern Affairs and in northern Manitoba from the payroll. I gave an estimate last year that the figure is probably closer to between 400 and 600 and I, Mr. Chairman, suggest that if the Minister will go through his records he will find that the Finance Department said that as at June 16th the actual reduction from November 4th was 454 people. And I would ask the Minister to go through his records to see whether that is not correct.



**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, the member has made a number of statements there. I don't agree with a number of them, and on the rest of them I can advise him that I have never had any high degree of involvement or interest in the establishment of figures. And the appropriate place to obtain the information is through the Manpower Department, through the Civil Service Commission.

**MR. GREEN:** Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the Minister look at a memo from M.G. Anderson, Comptroller, to Charles E. Curtis, Deputy Minister of Finance, wherein these figures are given and wherein it is strongly recommended that the Minister of Finance and the Minister responsible for the Task Force be advised of these numbers.

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, give me the memo date and we will have a look at it.

**MR. GREEN:** August 11, 1978.

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, I want to tell the members that, to repeat, the information that he is referring to is not information that I have any recollection of, nor do I have had any particular reason to have had the information raised.

**MR. GREEN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I am now telling the Minister that he should check his documents to see whether this information is given, to see whether in fact it was strongly recommended that the Minister of Finance and the Minister responsible for the Task Force be given these figures, and to see whether he was given the figures and, if not, why not. And if he was given them, why did he not correct them?

Mr. Chairman, we have had a senior and long-time civil servant being requested to resign because he gave misleading figures to the House. We have also had the peculiar situation of an Inquiry being set up where one of the main contentions is that a program, a Hydro engineering program, went up from an estimate of \$50 million to roughly \$120 million in three years — and I'm talking about Lake Winnipeg regulation by itself — and the estimate on the Inquiry has gone up from \$150,000 to \$2 million in one year.

I'm asking, Mr. Chairman, whether the Minister will set up an Inquiry, a Commission of Inquiry, to examine into the increased costs of the Inquiry Commission?

And, Mr. Chairman, I offer to serve as the Commissioner, and I offer to serve without fee, as a service to the people of the Province of Manitoba.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, the figures that are bandied about . . . I think it's incumbent upon the government, after having tried to make the case strongly that there has been a significant decrease in the number of civil servants. Last year I recall the Minister of Finance — I can find chapter and verse for him, if he doesn't recall — on two separate occasions, as I recall it, entertained the suggestion that print-outs be provided so that we could actually see where the civil servants were. Because in the final analysis, the information is available from who the cheques are issued to, the whole megillah, as far as civil servants are concerned — temporary, term, permanent and all the rest of it, contract — and the Minister last year did undertake to provide that information, as I recall, and to date we haven't got it, I don't know why; a year has gone by. But I'm sure that everyone is confused on this. The government has tried to make a strong case and has failed, but I can see no other reason for the Minister not fulfilling his commitment that he would provide these print-outs so we could actually compare staff man years to staff man years, because every person that's in a slot in the government is assigned a staff man year position. And if we had these print-outs available, we could resolve this situation, because the government has not made their case and I think it's incumbent upon them to provide this information to the Legislature.

**MR. CRAIK:** One set of dates that were used, November 4 to June 16, although I don't know what all was included in the count, I do know that the year over year count is probably your most accurate way, because you go get a bulge in the summertime. But as far as the accurate statistics are concerned, the most accurate place for those to come from is the Civil Service Commission. —(Interjection)— Well, you know, I have never had cause to take the time to have to deal with that except at Estimates Review time. During the normal course of the year, I do not have an involvement, I do not have time to be involved. At the time when we do Review Estimates, of course, I am very much involved. But if you want information, the most accurate place to get it from is through the Civil Service.

**MR. BOYCE:** Mr. Chairman, I have to disagree with him, and I don't suggest that the Minister is not a busy person, but nevertheless, as one of the Ministers of the Crown, he is one of the ones who has, in the House and outside the House, made this case and I would disagree with him. That the most accurate place to assess this is where the money is paid out, and Finance Department is in the best position to analyse the numbers of people who have been paid, rather than through the Civil Service Commission because the lag time in the Civil Service Commission themselves — there's many a slip between cup and lip — and the people who are steered in a particular direction sometimes fill a position, sometimes they don't, so that in the final analysis the most accurate comparison is through the print-outs which are available, and we're not asking the government for a costly analysis; this is information which is extant in the Finance Department, I'm sure. So the most accurate place to look for information is in the Department of Finance, those people who have actually been paid month by month over the last couple of years. The government has made the case and they're unwilling to prove it.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I am disturbed about the impression that has so far been left on this table and that is that there was some kind of memorandum given to the Deputy-Minister and the Minister disclaims knowledge of it, and it leaves it in a very awkward position and I have too much regard for the Deputy-Minister to let it hang like that' and I'd like the Minister to confirm that information given to his deputy is information given to him and that he was therefore aware of it.

Now, he says he has no recollection of it but I think that he ought to inform us about that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Inkster.

**MR. GREEN:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, and when the Minister has obtained that information I would like the Department of Finance —(Interjection)— Oh, I thought he said he was going to look. Mr. Chairman, I thought he was going to look for our benefit. I didn't know that he was going to look just because he wanted to look, though the Minister said yesterday that my friend, the Member for St. Vital, didn't use the available and they weren't available until the evening. My friend now has yesterday's — what do they call them — blues or something? It says that, "I wanted the amount of revenue coming in at each of those two different rates for the last three available years." Now, I suppose somebody could make a case that there's some guys over there who are New Democrats and they inserted "available" so that the Minister would look bad, but that's what my friend, the Member for St. Vital, said, "the last three available years."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to ask the Minister, I'm going to ask the Minister whether he would obtain for us, based on his statistics of who is getting paid — who is getting paid — not the Civil Service Commission which deal with a lot of people who don't deal with everybody because there are a lot of people who are employed by the government who don't go through the Civil Service Commission — howsoever, I want the number of people who are being paid by the government between November of 1977 and the next year which is June the 16th of 1978, and I would like, Mr. Chairman, the same figures as to how many people are now being paid in the private sector who used to be employed by the government. We had tremendous expressions of success by the Minister of Economic Development that his program had succeeded employing thousands of people — and I say thousands, with an "s", plural — in the private sector that we didn't do. All of those people are being paid by provincial funds. They should be added to this list of people who are on the Provincial Government payroll. How many people are we paying in the private sector, and by the way, the numbers will increase, we're going to start paying people in the private sector who are on the staffs of accounting firms and they will be shown as a reduction on our staff.

But let's take the Employment Program alone. The Conservatives say they employed many more people in the private sector than we did. Therefore, any reduction in their so-called Civil Service figures which I say is questionable, and we've never yet been given figures which mean anything, will be more than offset by the number of people that the public is paying in the private sector. Now, of course, my honourable friends will justify that. They will say, "Somebody is being paid by the government and working in the private sector, he's being productive. If he's working in the public sector he is not being productive." If we put that person to work for the people of this province in beautifying parks, in doing litter clean-ups, in working for recreational centres, in working in hospitals, in working for municipalities, that is unproductive labour.

If it is a private sector occupation, and that person is employed in dishing out hamburgers or

massaging bodies, or doing any number of things that are done in the private sector then they should be paid for by the public because those are productive people. I would like the figure as to how many people the Conservative Government is paying that are working in the private sector because that figure will more than offset the so-called reduction in Civil Service employment that is being paid for by the people of this province.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)(a) — The Member for St. Vital.

**MR. D. JAMES WALDING:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. While we're still on this matter and before we leave it, the Minister gave me an answer to a question that I asked about the number of warm bodies on the payroll. He in fact gave me more information than I asked for. I really didn't ask for a breakdown of each part of the department. I just wanted the total for it, and I notice that it says at the top, Department of Finance Status of Permanent Positions as of January 1st, 1978 and January the 1st, 1979. I'd like to ask the Minister if these figures include all of the people on the payroll of the Department of Finance as of those two dates or are there any other individuals that were working but were not included as permanent positions? (See Addendum No. 2.)

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

**MR. CRAIK:** There's about eight in the Tax Credit office that are temporary.

**MR. WALDING:** Is that for both tiers, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. CRAIK:** Just about the same.

**MR. WALDING:** I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the Minister or one of his staff would be prepared to take another look at the payrolls for that date, those two dates, and give us the actual number of persons paid.

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, it would be 306 — last year plus eight, and 301 plus eight this year.

**MR. WALDING:** Can I then take those as the definitive figures or is it possible that there may be other term contract or . . . ?

**MR. CRAIK:** I understand we can get that.

**MR. WALDING:** Thank you.

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

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I want clarification. Is the Minister going to inform us whether or not he was made aware of the contents of the memo which was referred to by the Member for Inkster?

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

**MR. CRAIK:** Well, I've already answered that, Mr. Chairman, and I don't think I really have to reiterate to the member, with the hundreds of memos and things that you handle across the desk I have no recollection whatsoever of this particular memo.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** That answer's clear. I asked whether he will be prepared to look into whether or not he had that information.

**MR. CAAIK:** Well, I thank him for his advisement. I may have a look at it, if it's an internal matter I may not take it any further. I think the place to look for this type of information is from the Civil Service Commission.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** The concern I expressed earlier was the communication between him and his deputy, and the fact that I think he left it appear as if his deputy had information which he did not receive, and I thought that that was a matter of concern. So it's not a question of getting the information, it's a question of whether or not the minister had the information.

**MR. CRAIK:** There's a very good chance that it may have come across my desk. I can just tell you for the third time that I've absolutely no recollection of memos and I think the member to again repeat knows, that of all the things that go across the desk in one day that he'd understand that.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I certainly understand that there's no doubt that many memos come in and are dealt with, either by filing or by some action taken. What I gathered from the questions of the Member for Inkster was that there was a substantial discrepancy between figures supplied by his department and figures supplied by another branch of government to the extent where it was felt that this great discrepancy should be drawn to the attention of, I suppose it was the Task Force, and therefore it would be relevant to know whether the minister, having that kind of knowledge and recommendation, acted on it? I think that's the question. But then I guess he doesn't know.

**MR. CRAIK:** I haven't even seen the memo. I don't know what you're talking about.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Since the minister says he has not seen the memo and he doesn't know what I'm talking about, I was asking whether he's prepared to ascertain whether or not he had the memo and did act on it in accordance with the recommendation, and is prepared to inform the Legislature about that?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, the member's talking about an internal memo. I'll have a look at it and decide what I want to do.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** That's clear. The minister may or may not inform the Legislature about his action, if he received and was made aware of the memo.

I want now to move back to the schedule that the Member for St. Vital referred to as to status of permanent positions, Mr. Chairman, I'm looking at the substantial variation in the Comptroller's Department between the approved and the filled positions; 20 in number on January 1, 1979 being the difference which is over 20 percent understaffed. Now I'd like to know the extent to which that is part of a staff freeze, whether that is a direction that has to do with restraint, or whether it is the inability to obtain and retain employees for the Department of the Comptroller?

**MR. CRAIK:** It means there is a particular problem in that Division in attracting qualified people, and I mentioned this last year. We had seven positions in the one category alone that we were attempting to attract and at one point we had attracted two only, after substantial effort. So we are having some difficulty attracting people with the proper qualifications in that division.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, from that answer I infer that there was no freeze and no attempt not to refill positions because of government policy.

**MR. CRAIK:** Well certainly, in terms of a freeze, there has been a general approach to screen pretty hard on the filling of positions right through the government, but in this particular division for a number of these, I don't know how many, we could probably find out how many, it's been quite the opposite. We've been working very diligently to try and attract people into the spots.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, then my inference is correct, that there was no attempt to freeze the employment in the Comptroller's Division, at any figure less than 92?

**MR. CRAIK:** Well no, Mr. Speaker, there's probably some of both there, you know, the category we're looking for here that we're having difficulty getting and we would like to fill, are the people with CA type qualifications, but obviously those aren't all in those qualifications. So there would be some tendency to try and hold up on the others that would not apply to those in the CA category. In other words, the division itself is not made up entirely of the same type of personnel.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** How many of the 20 unfilled positions were CA positions, or CA-type of positions?

**MR. CRAIK:** I think there were about 7 that we were attempting to fill.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** I gather then that 7 CA-type were not, could not be recruited, and the difference of 13 would be other than CA-types and that there was a freeze on them?

**MR. CRAIK:** Yes, apparently though in the key tape operators, there is a very high turnover in that, and where you're in a group that you have a very high turnover you'll see a larger than normal gap between approved and filled positions. Well, in that professional category there were nine as of January, the calendar year-end. Well, at present time, there are nine in the professional category, that would be in that category we're attempting to fill.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Has there been an effort made to contract out that work to accounting firms?

**MR. CRAIK:** No.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, concurrently, I'm assuming about the same time, although I'm not quite sure of the exact time but this nine seems to have continued for quite a period more or less. The Provincial Auditor was not hiring staff and it happens, I think there were 11 staff not being hired by him because the government wanted to shift from staff to contract. So that the problem that the auditor told us was that he believed he would not require these additional people because he was going to be asked to shift to contract, which was apparently a direction of government, and yet the government in this case was unable to hire people that the Provincial Auditor wasn't trying to hire. Is that correct?

**MR. CRAIK:** I understand that the Provincial Auditor in the same category of people has had difficulty as well.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, we're back at it again. I say that the Provincial Auditor said that he did not try to refill the positions because of government policy, and that's why I asked this question. I think we referred him the other day, and possibly he's had occasion to look at the Committee Report on Page 192 of February 2nd, when Mr. Ziprick was asked, "Why didn't you hire more staff, you had the budget for it, and you had the staff complement." Mr. Ziprick's answer was the government wanted to shift from staff to contract. And then I asked, "Why didn't you replace those that left?" And the answer was, "Because I was told the shift was being made and I would get assistance on contract basis. As a matter of fact, I pointed out in my report that we were short staffed and I would probably be getting assistance on a contract basis." Now, is the minister saying that he has been prepared to let this department operate with insufficient Chartered Accountants or Charter Acc-Accountant-type of people because of his inability to obtain, to recruit for it, and let that go on for a year and more? Is that what this minister is saying?

**MR. CRAIK:** Mr. Chairman, there's a real difficulty, you know — and the member's at it again, trying to cast aspersions and what-not — to get qualified people now almost out of university, you're talking about \$30,000 a year. And we're in that type of competitive market. It's very, very difficult to recruit.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Chairman, I believe it is difficult to recruit if you don't pay as much as the market demands then you can't recruit, and it seems to me that a free-enterprising government should be quite prepared, as I would be, to pay a proper return for the kind of service I need based upon the people who are available. And to say that Chartered Accountants are too expensive for the government means that this government is not prepared to staff its department with competent people, who are prepared to do the job at the price that they cost. Now, how long are we going to be understaffed in order to accord to somebody's concept of what should be paid to a specialist? Now the government, our government, the Conservative Government, have been paying medical people more than they've been paying Deputy Ministers because they know that they've got to meet the market.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Gentlemen, the hour of 12:30 having arrived, I am leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 this afternoon.

#### SUPPLY — HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

**MR. CHAIRMAN, Mr. Abe Kovnats (Radisson):** I would draw the honourable members' attention to Page 46 in the Main Estimates, Department of Health and Community Services. We are on Resolution No. 63: Item 2, Administrative Services (a) Financial Services (1) Salaries—pass; (2)—pass; (a)—pass; (b)(1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS:** I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, this format has been changed quite a bit so I guess you'll have to be patient with us. We are now on Personnel Management Services. Right? I'd like to ask the Minister, there was a reduction of staff here from 14 to 3 and last year they had, out of these 14, 3 of them were vacancies. Now the Minister is asking for 11 and a vacancy of 1. It seems to me that there should be a bigger reduction than that, Mr. Speaker, because the role here is providing Personnel Services to the department in the recruitment and there doesn't seem to be any recruitment going in at all.

Selection and Evaluation of Staff, it doesn't seem that that is done, and evaluation and classification of positions; we've had a wholesale change and it seems that the only reason, or the main reason is if you were a supporter of the former government. You don't have to evaluate that very much. It seems quite obvious. So I don't know that this seems to be a place where we could cut down. We don't need all this staff when there's no evaluation, nobody hired, the way this is done because it's certainly not on merit. I think that we had a proof of that yesterday in the discussion on the Estimates, so I wonder why we should approve the 11 at this time, especially when there is 1 that is a vacancy. There is a vacancy. Maybe this could be reduced to at least 10 which would give him ample time to do their work, there's way less. The Minister and everybody tells us that there's supposed to be way less civil servants, way less staff, so it seems to me if you've got somebody, if there's a vacancy we shouldn't have to vote on this. This should be reduced to 10 and that might save a few more dollars.

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

**HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry):** Mr. Chairman, in response to the points raised by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, I would just point out that we're talking about 4 vacant positions, 2 of which have been vacant for some time. It's the elimination of those 4 positions which is selected here. Two of those were Administrative Support positions; they were not professional positions, they were stenographic positions. With respect to the audio visual technician we're not involved in audio visual training at the present time and as far as recruiting goes, we still are recruiting and we still are hiring into the department, and the basic function of this particular staff in the Personnel Management Services Branch is an ongoing review and assessment, not only of personnel but of programs, and also the development of staff resources and staff training. So that, considering the size of the department which, I'm sure you'd agree, is substantial, there is sufficient to occupy the personnel that are assigned to this particular branch and we don't feel that any further reduction is justified, not at this point in time.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Did I hear my honourable friend say that this is where programs were being evaluated. I don't think that's the case but I think the Minister said that. I wonder if that was a slip of the tongue.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, to clarify, programs with relation to personnel and to staff training.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (b)—pass; (c)(1) Salaries—pass; (2)—pass; (c)—pass; (d)(1) Salaries—pass; (2)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Well, this is program review and evaluation. I would imagine that these are the people that are recommending to the Minister, that are studying the program, that are more or less deciding or recommending to the Minister — explain the details of the program; for instance, how many people should, you know, the level of care if need be, and so on. And I wonder if this would not be the right spot for the Minister to tell us, to explain exactly how those programs are looked at. For instance; the people that are looking at the Dental Program, and comparing the Dental Program as performed by the department and that also of the dental profession because we know that some of them were removed from the program that the government had under the former government and that now this is given by the dental profession.

It seems to me that if these are the people that this might be the time for the Minister to tell us in what direction the government is going, what the programs are, because I very sincerely don't see any direction at all. I must say that. The Minister made a point yesterday of announcing quite a few things, or certain things that were either frozen or shelved when they took office and now they're bringing back. There's nothing new, it's piecemeal. It seems to be that if somebody complains a little more well, then there's a change. And then, even the Minister is trying to take credit for that. For instance, where an Order-in-Council where they were asking for an increase in the personal

care rate at a certain date and another increase later on, and we couldn't find the Order-in-Council, finally that came out and they said that shows that we're flexible and that we change our mind. Well, that's a joke — either you planned right . . . I'm not saying that people can't change their mind, but you're doing it and two days after you're changing your mind. It seems that there is not the right kind of planning, it seems to be just political. What is the best thing to do at this time? And there seemed to be lot of kite flying, to see what the reaction would be, and this is what the criticism — this is where we accuse the Minister of lack of leadership. Where are we going? I think that the people should know.

Now, the Minister has said cost first and need after, and he's saying when we have the money we will bring in programs. But in which form? Will it be those that yell the loudest that'll have the program? Are they going to be announced or is it the same thing that's been done for a few years now, you lead people to expect the worst, you let rumors go along that this program is going to be discontinued, the people are so afraid and then finally you give them less. You reduce but you don't cut it all together, they seem to be happy, and the Minister then stands up and says, well I've been doing a good job of getting the people satisfied with what they're getting.

But that's not program, that is not giving us the leadership in what direction we're going. You know, all of a sudden there's a program that's announced out of a clear blue sky, while others are being reduced. We talk about one, the alcoholic unit treatment is closed because we want to do something else and then we're losing a program there, and that is a good program, but why are things like that done? Is it just a question of priorities? You have so much to spend, you're going to spend so much and then you're going to see what politically is the best thing to do, or you're going to see where there's more people interested in a certain program, or you're going to close your eyes and just stick a pin in a paper and see where you hit. What is the method? How are you arriving at the policy of this government? Because there is no policy. There's no policies at all; there's announcements, as I said.

I want to know what kind of system are we doing? Is there such a thing as a Ministerial Policy Committee or call it what you want? Does he sit down with his group and see what they have and can they speak? I would imagine he does that but there's no more, I think this was discontinued, the Policy Committee. How are these things arrived at? Does he try to prepare some programs and then present them to the Cabinet? Or do the Cabinet map out strategy or a list of programs that they will try to do? How did they look at this construction, our five-year plan, that the Minister said was irresponsible? And all of a sudden he announced in the Throne Speech and not too long ago, the 13 programs, or the 13 different units that they will construct; well, that's very reasonable and that's what the people can afford.

Is it just a statement? Are we supposed to keep on taking a statement forever, as the Bible, and we open anywhere and that's it, that's what the Minister said and that's finished? How do you choose these programs? How do you decide? What is coming next? Have you a certain amount of money, or is it a certain percentage that you're going to use in that or what? And, for instance, when you decide that this must be a big study, are there people with the commission that are going to look at the program and say that the hospital, when the hospitals come in and say, well, we want 5 percent or 6 percent, or whatever it is, who decides that it's 2.9? And what do they base themselves on? Are they just political hack, or are they people with experience that are looking at the service, and trying to eliminate the frills, if anything, but at least to make sure that the service and the care is still as high as it has been in the past? I think that this is probably one of the most important items in this Department. I think we would like to know how these decisions are arrived at, and when we can expect, and the people of Manitoba can expect, not just a piecemeal program, depending who are good boys, to see what they're going to receive or the kind of policy that the people can expect and the kind of programs that the people of Manitoba can expect to receive.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I agree with my honourable friend that this is one of the most important parts of the Department and it represents one of the most important functions in a field like health and community services. I want to assure my honourable friend that if some decisions appear slow in coming it is because we have attempted to consult exhaustively, Sir, with the community and with the professionals and with the consumers involved before making decisions, which have an impact for every single, individual Manitoban, as most health and community services policies and decisions do. The honourable member was a Minister of the Crown and was Minister of this same Department. He's fully aware of the range of challenges that face a Minister of Health and Community Services and his colleagues in the Cabinet in this field. He's fully aware that they are intricate, involved challenges in most cases, that involve, if I may use the term, a wide number of interest groups. Groups that have legitimate ambitions, legitimate concerns of their own, and which don't always dovetail with their interests and concerns of other groups across the spectrum.

As a consequence, there is an enormous amount of consultation and discussion and exchange of opinion that must be taken, and undertaken.

This particular section deals with the development and evaluation of programs and programming concepts in an advisory capacity, to the Minister and to the various directorates of the ministry. It is really a support function, which operates in support of the individual directorates themselves and in support of the minister and the ministerial management team, which could be described as a General Policy Committee. There are other policy committees which function in support of this branch and of the minister's office in this field in addition to the branch itself. There is, for example, the Consultative Committee, that exists between my office and the Manitoba Medical Association. There is, for example, a sub-committee of the Manitoba Health Services Commission, which deals with conceptual issues in an advisory way.

I would say for the information of my honourable friend, that some of the issues that are being worked through and distilled at the present time, are issues on which neither I nor I suggest he, would want to act unilaterally and without the best of advice. Some of the projects that this branch, for example, the Program Review and Evaluation Branch, has recently been studying and have recently produced, are a program review of the Manitoba School for the Retarded. A report on the use of volunteers, which serves as the basis for the initiative we're taking in the volunteer area announced in the Throne Speech and the Estimates and a review of departmental legislation and the honourable member knows how intricate and involved that field is. Some projects in process by this Branch are, a Program Review of Continuing Care, an inventory of income transfer payments done in support of the Minister of Finance and the Department of Finance to help develop the White Paper on the whole spectrum of income transfer payments and there's some 26 of them in existence in Manitoba at the federal-provincial-municipal levels, and it doesn't take much imagination to grasp the involvement and intricacy of that field and approach some support work to help prepare the inventory and a Program Review of Community Mental Retardation.

Another project that we had, two other projects that we have under way in rudimentary fashion, but not really in full gear yet, Sir, are the review of the whole guest home situation in Winnipeg and Manitoba and an examination of the future course that the government should be considering in the area of personal care homes when it comes to division of operation as between proprietary and non-proprietary operators.

So those are some of the very complicated and very sophisticated subject areas. And there are many others among the challenges facing the government on which my staff and I, my ministerial staff and my Cabinet colleagues and I need responsible documentation and information and conceptual thinking and statistical backup and general advice in order to develop papers for consideration by Cabinet in order to develop government positions. That essentially, represents the primary role of this particular Branch along with its ongoing role of measuring and evaluating all Programs already in existence in the department.

The honourable member raises the question as to why are the things that are being done right now being done. What is the reason for them and what is the reason why others haven't been done? That, I think, is the answer, Sir, the fact is that they're complicated and he knows it. The fact is that they're particularly complicated in an economic climate, in an economic condition, not unique to Manitoba, not unique to Canada, but unique to the whole North American continent that demands that we husband our resources more carefully today than perhaps it was necessary to do in more affluent years in the past. So that adds an additional complicating dimension to the work at hand, and I rely on the Program Review and Evaluation Branch to play an important, a very important advisory role in that capacity. But the member need have no fear that there is unilateral action taken in any of these questions or any of these issues. What action is being taken is a result of that kind of continuing study and consultation.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, on this section Program Review, I wonder if the minister could indicate whether the Review of the volunteer situation in the minister's, what he calls his new thrust — I'm not sure what that is — whether that Review would be available to members on this side of the House?

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, when we come to that area of the Estimates, I'm prepared to discuss it completely and fully.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Mr. Chairman, the minister just said that this section was the one that done the



Review. I wonder if this is not the appropriate section to deal with that, or if it's not, then I'll certainly take your guidance, Mr. Chairman, and if you would let me know which section so I could be prepared when it comes up.

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Speaker, we're not at that point yet. What we're discussing here is the rationale, the reason for and the function of the Program Review and Evaluation Branch. When we come to the field of volunteers and volunteerism and initiatives being taken in that area, I'll discuss it. We will, at that point, be looking at General Purpose Grants which is 9. 3.(s) in the Estimates. Mr. Speaker, excuse me, in our Estimates Book, I'm sorry, it comes under the Social Services and Community Health Division which is Division 3 and under Division 3 it's Item (s) which is on page 50.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** I thank the Honourable Minister. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, does this Program Review and Evaluation function include the evaluation or review of the effects that some of the other departments programs are having on his department, specifically on the increased costs of welfare, hospital, all other kinds of social services when other Programs are eliminated? Does this Section review that kind of situation?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Not directly, Mr. Chairman, but there's certainly has been and continues to be the opportunity for liaison between departments in that way. The primary mechanism for doing that now is the new Standing Committee of Cabinet named by the Premier some months ago, the Standing Cabinet Committee on Community Services which involves and includes ministers from half a dozen departments with inter-related Program and Problem areas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate whether that specific item, the Committee itself and the Budgeting of that Committee appears in the Estimates at all, where we have to discuss it with each minister that's on that Committee as their Estimates come through?

**MR. SHERMAN:** It doesn't appear anywhere in the Estimates, Mr. Chairman, because there's no budget for it. It's a Committee that was struck, that consists of five ministers including the Minister of Health and Community Services and can second to it for discussion purposes and of course any other Members from the Treasury Bench, or in fact, any members of the government caucus, plus office staff back-up with no budget attached, so the question that the Honourable Member raises could only be answered by my responding that he would have to raise that question with the individual ministers.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I wonder where the staff for that function comes up, or does staff come on a basis from each department or is there a staff that deals permanently with that Standing Committee as he calls it?

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, there's no staff as such, Mr. Chairman. We determine meeting dates, we determine subjects that are to be on the agenda, and based on the subjects that are on the agenda the determination is made as to what particular advisors, deputy ministers and other advisors from individual departments should be there and what advise should be distributed to them ahead of time so that information can be compiled and available for the meeting. The Honourable Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, since the Minister has indicated that this section does do some liaison with the other departments and it would appear to me from the Minister's comments to be the section that would provide some input into the standing committee. It might be worthwhile for me at this point to make some recommendations to the Minister of Health and Community

further to the comments I made last evening about the effect on the Minister's department, the effect on the Minister's programs that this section is reviewing, of other actions by his colleagues and by this government. And, Mr. Chairman, I think that the Minister should be well aware and members of this House are well aware of the firm fixed definite relationship between the program changes of one department, by the program thrust of government and the effect on this particular department and its review of its own programs. Because, if another department takes an action then the program review of this department will see the effect of that action on the programs of this department. I'm assuming that they will evaluate at least the effects that it's having on this particular department.

And, Mr. Chairman, this committee then should serve a very important function, although I'm not sure that is the way it is structured, organizational structured that it can serve an important function if it doesn't have staff and if it doesn't have a senior Minister who, in fact, can give some direction to other departments. Then what you have is the departments each running off in its own direction and you don't see the effects that it has on the other departments, and in this case, on this department.

And, Mr. Speaker, I think that it's being increasingly accepted in the social services and in the medical services fields that there is even a very distinct relationship between the social services or the state in fact of the society or the culture in terms of medical health. And that is that most medical problems are related to psychological and emotional problems. That there is a definite connection between that situation.

So, even when you have an example o., a community program cut where unemployment increases, we can definitely see the effects in terms of the increase in the abuse of alcohol, the increase in the court cases in that community, the increase in the incarceration in our institutions of people from that community, the increase of child abuse and the necessary intervention of government in the case of child abuse. We can also see, Mr. Chairman, I think, an increase in the admittance to medical facilities, to health care facilities because of happenings in the community that are not directly related to medical problems or medical situations. But, as the Member for Churchill pointed out, the long term effect of stress in a community or an occupational group or the stress with unemployed people will certainly show up in the hospital admittance and the requirement for medical care or in the alcoholism and all the other related social disfunctions that I think I showed fairly clearly last evening. Many of these social disfunctions can be related directly to the policies and programs of this government .

And therefore I would hope that the Minister would attempt to have that kind of influence on his colleagues. Mr. Speaker, this is a broad-ranging influence that he needs to have if he has any influence at all, because for example we took the example of Easterville; the Minister of Resources is heavily involved there in terms of what happens in that community. The Minister of Northern Affairs is heavily involved in what happens in that community. The Minister of Manpower is heavily involved in what happens in that community. The Minister of Education is heavily involved in what happens to that community although some of those functions like the New Careers positions that were eliminated have been now transferred to Manpower. But in general, the Minister of Education relates to that project. The Minister of Cooperative Development is related to that community, because one way that the unemployment problem was dealt with in the past was through Winter Works Program to improve the fisheries so the fishermen could in fact work at upgrading their fishing facilities between seasons and avoid the kind of a situation that we now see facing that community when there is no option.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that this program review and evaluation should point out to the government in general — now, Mr. Speaker, I know that the Minister doesn't have that much effect on the First Minister but perhaps if the First Minister could be shown in strictly economic terms the effect of some of the programs on the increased cost to this department, perhaps if he could use this section of his department to gather those statistics and those figures — look, when you eliminated Minago Contractors by employing native people, what has happened to those people that were employed there? How much more is it costing the department of Department of Health and Social Development because of that? When the government eliminated the Easterville Harvesting, what effect is that having on the cost to this department? If the Minister — I don't think it would do him much good to present in humanitarian terms to the First Minister the effect — if he could just show the First Minister in economic terms the effect. That is, the budget of this department is going to have to increase more than it has been increasing to take care of all the negative effects of the other programs that are being cut or eliminated, especially in the remote communities.

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the Honourable Member for The Pas' point is well taken. I would say to him that that is being done. In fact, that is not only done at the community services committee level but it is obviously what Cabinet and what government is all about. It's done at the Cabinet level. His point is well taken with respect to the specific problems in the North. I know that he speaks with sincerity about those problems. I will assure him that that subject matter will be on our agenda.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. SAUL A. MILLER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. . I noticed the title has been changed in the last year. Last year it was referred to as program review with the same description. This year it is called program review and evaluation. So, I assume that they're doing somewhat more than has been done in the past, but I have to assume that. —(Interjection)— Well, I hope it's more than just a new title. It's review and evaluation. Well, my colleague suggested maybe it's called P.R. I would hope not. I would hope that the change was made because in fact they are doing somewhat different than in the past, it's not just a departmental review, and perhaps because the reference the Minister made to the fact that there's now a Cabinet Committee. I find it interesting there's now a Cabinet Committee dealing with this because I recall the fanfare with which the old HESP committee was eliminated almost immediately after they took office. And here we are, a year later, with a new title, it's true, it's not called Health Education and Social Policy Committee, it's called something else. But they realized they had to come up with some structure to get an overview of the various programs which do link because — and I'm sure the Minister has heard this term — continuum of care. The fact, as my colleague from The Pas pointed out, all of these programs to peoples do link up, they interrelate, they have to interface and if you try to operate them quite independant of one another they will fail. They will fail because you have to address the problem from all the various facets, the angles, rather than just try to look at it as if it's a single-faced coin.

So, Mr. Chairman, if in fact they're doing evaluation and program review, I have to ask the Minister whether in fact it was this group that evaluated and reviewed the Work Activity Programs that were in existence and it was their considered judgment and opinion that the Work Activity Programs should be eliminated. Could the Minister answer that? Is this the area, is this the committee or is this the department, the branch that made this recommendation?

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** It was indeed this particular branch, Mr. Chairman, and we're talking here about the Program Review and Evaluation Branch. We're not talking about the Community Services Committee of Cabinet, we're talking about the Program Review and Evaluation Branch of the Department and I presume that is what the honourable member is talking about. It was indeed this branch, this program policy review and study group that studied at length and in depth and over a considerable period of time the subject of community health centres. They did it in concert and in conjunction with the directorate of our Employment Services and out of that came forward some suggestions and some proposals to government. They were not proposals to eliminate Work Activity projects and I wish to challenge the contention of the honourable member on that point. Nor has the government advanced any proposals to eliminate Work Activity projects. What we have advanced is a rationalization of programs in that area because they needed it. Not only did they need it from the point of view of human development results, but they needed it from the point of view of financial security. Those program areas were slipping into a category which endangered the cost-sharing support of the federal government.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for The Pas.

**MR. McBRYDE:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would be willing to make that review available to members on this side of the House?

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** No, Mr. Chairman, I was asked that earlier in this session. That's an in-House review, it's an in-House report. I'm certainly willing to discuss our rationale and our reasons for advancing whatever proposals we are advancing and may be advancing in the community health centres field when we reach that item in the Estimates and certainly those positions that I'll be putting forward will be based on that kind of information and, in part, on that review.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

**MR. MILLER:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister says that the Work Activity Program has not been eliminated. I was under the impression that he made a statement in the House to the effect that in fact it was being rationalized, I think is the term he used. I'm not quite sure, and I wish he would explain when he rises, what he means by rationalization. Is it going to be cut back? Is it going to be cut down? Are the number of people being taken in going to be reduced? Is the activity generally going to be scaled down? Is that what he means by rationalization?

In the Annual Report of the department itself for the calendar year of 1978, on page 24 for the benefit of the staff, but I'm sure they know it; they wrote . It says during the past 12 months, that's January to December 1978, the projects have provided services to 735 individuals of whom 215 still remain on the project. Of the 520 who have left the program, 520 out of 735, that is — which is a high percentage — 224 were placed in employment, and/or enrolled in training programs at community colleges. A substantial number of the remainder were referred to other resources for treatment or personal development. A number have written the grade equivalency determination tests, upgrading their educational standards to a grade 12 level which assists them in getting jobs or obtaining high levels.

Mr. Chairman, the Work Activity Projects was something that was started in Manitoba and , in the years following, was copied by numerous provinces across the country. And, for the world of me, I can't see why they not only should be left but why they aren't being expanded.

The Work Activity Projects made it possible for certain kinds of people, with certain disabilities, whether they be cultural disabilities, social disabilities, language disabilities, what have you, or emotional disabilities, to in a sense, enter into a sheltered workshop field and to develop, some very slowly no question, but to try to develop them where they can go out and acquire some skills and after acquiring some skills get a job in the community and contribute to the community.

The alternative is simply to say, look it's too expensive, it's costing too much money, it's not working all that well, the skills they acquire aren't that great, we'll just forget about it, and let 'em go on welfare. Now that is a way of doing it, that's a dollar and cents accountant's way of doing it, you know, what is the cost benefit in terms of straight dollars and cents. But it overlooks the fact that we, I'm sure and I would hope the minister would agree, that we have a responsibility to try and make people as independent as possible, to have them contribute in even a limited way as much as possible to the society and community in which they live rather than simply be the recipients of welfare. Everybody says too bad, they really haven't got it, you ca't fault them entirely though, so society will keep them. But if there's any hope at all of getting these people to be even partially functional, it is through the kind of, and I refer to this as sheltered workshop activities whether it be the Pioneer Project at 185 Smith Street, whether it be the Programs in Camperville or Amaranth or what have you. They are doing something. There's a spinoff effect from what they're doing and to the individuals involved, it's their one chance of somehow getting into the mainstream even if in a limited way, the mainstream of our society.

So, Mr. Chairman, when the minister said that it's been rationalized, it sounds to me as if there's a change and the change will be a diminution of the Program, a limit to the Program, a scaling down of the Program, perhaps less people getting in, or maybe be more selective in who they take in to try to get a higher cost benefit in the sense that more will graduate successfully from the Program and a certain number, therefore, will be cut off and simply sit on welfare for the rest of their lives. So, Mr. Chairman, from the department's own analysis of the Program which indicates a very good success rate considering the people who have to go in to such Programs, I would think that the government should want to support this kind of a Program. It helps people to help themselves in the long run and I'm sure the government and the minister can't quarrel with that particular philosophy. But they need the support of what I consider a sheltered workshop. They need that support. Without it, they weren't able to make it before and they're not going to be able to make it now, nor in the future. So, Mr. Chairman, I ask the minister to please explain what he means by rationalization. What does he envisage in this coming year in the number of people who will be taken in? Is it a scaling down so that what you have is a Program on paper, is a facade of a Program, but like many other programs, they don't cut it off entirely, they simply leave it there as a Program that they can show to people that it's being operated, but in fact, its effectiveness is so limited that sometimes it's a wonder, it's questionable whether it's being left simply as PR, or whether the Program will have any meaning in the future.

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, with respect I am fully prepared to debate and discuss the Work

Activity Projects under Item 3(q), but unless you direct me to deal with Item 3(q) now, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that it is in order to get into a debate on Work Activity Projects. We're talking about Program Review and Evaluation.

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

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the lecture that the minister gave us a while ago about what these people were supposed to do, but the minister again is not coming to grips with the question that I've asked. First of all, and it's ironic to see how a couple of years and a change chairs can change the thinking of some people. When the present minister was thinking on this side at the particular item, in a very nice way, he told me that we should have restraint and this was one area that we should have restraint and I can quote the page and so on and felt that he wasn't making an accusation, but that could be a bit of empire building and this is why, I made the remarks that I did earlier. Now, at that time, I was asking for 9, a staff man year of 9; it went to 12 last year and now it's going to 10.

Now the minister has stretched things and he's talked about these people, and I'm sure that a lot of things they thought they'd never hear about. They're not that many people, and there is a staff, a big staff at the Health Sciences Centre to talk about personal care home and so on, so this is words again. We're not coming to grips with what I want.

Last year the minister also told us that this group was not responsible for the any restraint programs. Now, we want to know what Programs, how they make their recommendations. This wasn't answered. The Minister told us last year that they weren't responsible for the restraint program. That wasn't their job, that that was the Minister and Cabinet that decided. Last year, we were told that they did work with Spivak Task Force. Of course we found out that I think some of the people were questioned for about 15 minutes and that was it in such an important thing as this department where the Task Force spent about 15 minutes with some members of the this Review Committee and that was it, so Mr. Chairman, we want to know. The minister did not answer, how does he meet with them, is there such a thing as a Policy Committee. Another question that I would like to see answered is that just before we left government in 1977 we had set up an inter-departmental committee. Now I'm not going to pretend that we had met, we were just setting it up. I'd worked with my colleagues at the time and they'd answered that they would go along with it. I'd like to know if that Committee is functioning. I'm not talking about a discussion, I know the minister talks with his colleagues but I mean a Committee with support staff and so on.

Now, the Committee that we'd talked about was to do with the subject dear to my friend's heart and we were talking about fitness and there was an inter-departmental committee of the minister and staff of the Department of Education, the Tourism and Recreation for the Community Recreation, and also the Director in Fitness and Amateur Sport which was in the department at the time and the people in charge of Nutrition, and these kind of things and, in other words, the minister, the present minister often talks about fitness and the good life and the change of lifestyle and that's exactly what this committee was going to do. Talk about it. It's no use the department talking about fitness and spending money on fitness when the Department of Education is not involved. For instance, you're talking about lunch after schools but there's vending machines with junk food in every school. This is something that should be looked at. You know some people are talking about oh, we should bring in lunch after schools and hot lunches, and the people of Day Care were talking about that and they might eat the hot lunch and then they go and stuff themselves with doughnuts and drinks and chocolate bars, and that, Mr. Chairman, I don't think is something that we should encourage. —(Interjection)— Yes, my friend just finished his doughnuts, he tells me. So, Mr. Chairman, there's another thing I think the minister said this group is not responsible for the restraint but what do they do?

A lot of these programs were already finished, were waiting on the shelf as I said before, for instance the Hearing Aid Program was all developed. Now, I'm not taking anything away from the minister himself but I am saying well these people didn't have to work very hard on that.

Now what does the minister do once he gets these reports. Has there been any policy — there might have been, I'm asking this now, I didn't see the announcement, there's so many announcements in this department. Has there been anything on the O'Sullivan Report on nursing? I never heard anything about it. What about the Saunders Report which the minister has had for a long time. This might come now that a group is trying to get walk in and walk out abortion clinics in Manitoba. It might be that we should see what this Saunders Report is, what is going to be done.

I know the present government doesn't have to be bound by any statement of the previous administration, but when we set the Saunders Committee it was felt that we'd have people representing all the people of Manitoba and to see, to see — there was no commitment to say

that we would have a policy on family planning, but to see if that could be done with even all the change and the different outlooks of different groups and different religious groups and so on. But we haven't heard anything about that. Now, are they the ones that are suggesting — now my friend said they have nothing to do with restraint, but are they told — and this hasn't been answered — we have so much money and then, you know, this would be a very valid point, but you know, this is a government that said restraint first, cost first and need after. But does the minister or Cabinet say to these people, "Well we only have so much money." This would be the natural thing to do for anybody. Or do they suggest some programs even if that doesn't come from the minister or the Cabinet. How do they operate? That's what I want to know. Were they told well, you're going to look at priorities, or were they told well, bring any programs that you have and we'll pick and choose. I think that this is an important thing. Now, yes, I would be anxious, are they the group that are evaluating?

Again, I ask the program on Denticare. Now I want to say to the minister that I want to play ball with him, we know there's an item Denticare and I don't want to start discussing the program at this time. I'm just asking because we're talking about the people that are looking at these Reviews. I want to know if they made a study, if they evaluated anything, is the minister satisfied that records are kept, our records are kept on these programs because we have a program that is still functioning under the old regime with the staff, with civil servants and doctors, of the dentists employed by the department, and then part of that was taken away from them and was given to the Dental Association.

Now, do we know the utilization? Was that given, is that being studied? I want to serve notice that we're going to ask these questions, and too often there's some questions, may be not that many, some questions that we asked and we were promised, and we never received anything.

I want to remind the minister that I should have now, I should have the formula of the financing from Ottawa and when we are talking about Review, I think that's important. In nearly every item we got recoverable from Canada a certain amount. Well, that doesn't mean too much to me. I asked the minister and I know he has that, he has to have that. It shouldn't have taken this time. I should have it right now. I want to know how much money was received from Canada for the department. I know that some of it didn't go through and it's still cost-shared. I want to know that. I want that enumerated.

I also want to know where there's bloc funding. I want to know how much money we received from Ottawa in the last 3 years under the old system of cost-shared, under the system of bloc funding because that is the only way, meaningful way. Mr. Chairman, I think you would be the first one to recognize that we can have a meaningful exercise and we can see what is being spent, the amounts don't mean a thing. You know, I received two answers to a question I posed last year. I asked if that money was earmarked for Health. And the minister told me, one minister told me yes, I don't remember which one, and the other one — and I'm not referring to the Minister of Health and the Minister of Finance — told me no this wasn't the case. And we want to know. We want to know how much money is spent. So I would expect, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the minister will see that I get that, at least Monday, for when we go back into Committee of Whole to discuss his Estimates, because there is no way an important thing such as that should not be given to the Members of this House, to see how much money comes from Ottawa, is it earmarked, and how much comparison from last year? We want to know, also, and we will want to know to see if the province — the provincial government — how much money they are spending on health. We're not talking about the money that comes from Ottawa. We want to know how much money they have put in. Do they match it, like it was done before? I think that this is an important thing.

But you know, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that I have received a single answer to any of my questions. There was a lecture telling me that I understood, that I was sitting in that spot before and I understood how these people work. I know what research is, but the Minister told us that they had nothing to do with restraint and that I can't understand. Well, yes, I can understand, this is exactly what we have been saying, that they are guessing. They are guessing; they have nothing to do with restraint. They are not saying . . . Does the Minister have any figures on his programs? Do they know how many people they serve? I am talking about diverse programs now, and when there is something cut off how many people are involved. It seems to me that it's all guess, a guessing game — what is popular. And after flying kites, of course, after saying, well, we're going to raise the per diem in a personal care home on March 1st and then in June or something, saying that

**MR. SHERMAN:** We didn't say it. We didn't say it. We only said it would go up on April 1st. We didn't say it.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** You didn't say it; you just wrote it down.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Yes, and we rescinded it.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Well, of course, you rescinded. That is flying a kite; that's exactly what I'm saying.

**MR. SHERMAN:** What are you talking about flying a kite? We never said it. How can you fly a kite if you don't say it?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** You did fly a kite. You announced that you were going after a first raise.

**MR. SHERMAN:** We announced a raise on April 1st, and that is what we announced.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** That's right; that's right. . You sat on this Order-in-Council, which was duly signed; you sat on it . . .

**MR. SHERMAN:** We rescinded it.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Just a minute, you sat on it; you announced that there would be one increase and the reaction that you got, then you rescinded it; that's flying a kite.

**MR. SHERMAN:** That's not true; that is not true.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Well, what is true?

**MR. SHERMAN:** That decision was made prior to that. We never . . .

**MR. DESJARDINS:** You know, you're saying that, and you're saying an awful lot of things. And, all right, I'm not going to call you a liar but that doesn't mean that I'm going to say that I believe all these things.

**MR. SHERMAN:** You better not call me a liar because I'm telling you what happened.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Well, all right, but I don't believe you. I don't believe you.

**MR. SHERMAN:** That's your privilege.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I don't believe you. If you did that thing, then you have no planning and there is something wrong with this Review Committee. If you can come in one day and pass an Order-in-Council that says, "This is what we're going to do", and . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please, on a point of order, the Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**MR. BARROW:** Can we hear the speech without these rude interruptions?

**MR. DESJARDINS:** No, that's all right; he entitled.

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

**MR. DESJARDINS:** I don't mind, Mr. Chairman. Sometimes it saves time. The Minister is explaining. Well, I'm not the one to decide, you are and the Members of this House, but the Minister is just doing what I've done hundreds of times, so I can't complain.

Mr. Chairman, I say this is exactly it. You don't go ahead and prepare an Order-in-Council — and I would imagine that you thought about this Order-in-Council. This is exactly what I want to know. Now, somebody must have said to somebody, "We're going to have an increase." Now, either the Premier of this province directly said to the Minister of Health, "Bring in a program. I want more revenue coming in from the personal care homes", or the Cabinet, after discussing it, decided that this would be done. Or the Minister himself thought, which is his duty, to see what revenue he can get and how much expense when he is looking and preparing his Estimates, and he said, "This is what we need." He would present that to the Cabinet. I would imagine that before doing that, if there was any kind of planning, he would have his Committee — these people that are

paid — to look at it. Probably the way to do it would be to look at other provinces, what this has done, to see how much money is left after he has increased . . . All that must be taken into consideration.

It's not a joke. You don't go into Cabinet and present an Order-in-Council and then next week change it. What kind of government is that, if that is the way they deal? Now, this must have been looked at and studied, and studied in Committee and studied in Policy Committee and discussed with the Minister of Finance and discussed in Cabinet before they passed it. Then they pass it.

Now, why did they . . . ? They sat on it for a reason. Why did they sit on it? Why did they sit on it? They sat on it for a reason. It was passed in Cabinet, and normally these things go through. So they sat on it because they weren't sure. Why weren't they sure? Why did they pass it if they weren't sure? Because they wanted to see what the reaction would be from the people, the same as when we dealt with day care last year; the same as with community clinics; the same as many others. And that might go sometimes; we're politicians and we're not going to be naive. Of course, we try to keep on the pulse of what the people want.

These actions in this government are all by flying kites, and I can go back in practically every item and them saying, "No, we're not going to change that." And then there has been a bit of pressure. Well, maybe, and then there was some change. And the patterns seemed to be the same, especially earlier. Now it's going to wear out pretty soon and I say to the Minister, it's not going to be so easy to keep the people quiet. The people are going to revolt. There has been a lot of fear in the public. The hospitals were afraid to cross the Minister, or cross the Conservatives, because they would not have anything approved. The staff of different departments have been really scared because they didn't know what was going on; they didn't know if they were going to keep their jobs. Even the union of the government employees felt the same. The nurses felt the same. You know, not too long ago we were trying to find nurses and now we're sending them away in a most unfair way. We're putting a load that is most unfair on these people.

Now, I am saying that I want to know how this thing works. Now, if the Minister can tell me the story of this Order-in-Council, why they said, "This is what we're going to have and in a few months we're going to have that." They never said it. Why did they sit on it? You know, they passed it, and they weren't too sure, because they sat on it. It wasn't filed immediately. It wasn't filed, and it was just when the pressure came in, boy, didn't they do their work.

Am I taking too much for granted when I say that they must have discussed it with this committee; they must have checked with other provinces; they must have checked to see about the inflation rate and they must have checked to see how much that left for every patient, and there must be a reason? Why did they change their mind? I'd like to know. Why did they change their mind? Did they find out something that they didn't know before?

Now, if the Minister can say, "Well, this was unforeseen, this is what we found out", then I'll accept his explanation. But if he can't tell me why they did it . . . And what guarantees that they're not going to do it? I hope that after speaking the way I am that they're not going to do it. I am going to help . . . Of course, I am going to be accused of breaking the classes and maybe telling some people when they're being shafted, and I'm not supposed to do that; I'm not supposed to rock the boat, but I am going to do it anyway, Mr. Chairman, because I think it is my responsibility. I think that this is what we're here for.

But this is exactly what I want to know under this. The Minister, a while back, a few years ago, sitting on this side, said that the government never knew what they were doing; this was just empire-building. These were words that I can find in Hansard of 1977. Then we were told last year that they worked with the Task Force and we found out that there was 15, 20 minutes spent with the Task Force, that's all. I know that they had somebody working on the Task Force — one person — but that's not necessarily all these planners as a committee. That is not that.

Then the Minister said that they had nothing to do with restraint, so therefore they are not asked where should we cut. Now the Minister said that they're doing, with many other groups . . . I know that they're not doing it, that it's done either at the Health Sciences . . . Well, maybe at the Health Sciences Centre, but mostly at the Manitoba Health Services Commission and in other areas.

So, you know, the Minister still hasn't told us how they formulate their policy in that department and that government — how they formulate. Do they instruct people to look at a program or are they left free to go ahead and think up something and be self-starters and say, "Here; this would be good," for the approval of the Minister and then the Minister, if he likes it, will bring it to Cabinet. Is that the way it's done? Or are they told, "Just these programs."

And once they've got a program, what is done with it? Isn't that the group? Would they then study . . . ? I know when I was the Minister I had them look at the committee on north-end ambulances, and we brought a decision immediately, but I haven't heard anything on the O'Sullivan Report or the Saunders Report. No, it's right; we've heard so much in this session that they are



co-ordinating their thinking, and they're looking, and they're monitoring. I want to know when they quit doing that what happens, and I want to know are we going to have an idea of how we are going to progress. Is the government saying, "Well, all right, we are going to restrain. No new programs all of a sudden." There was a new program. That is odd to me. I'm not criticizing the program; that is one program we were looking at and I'm talking about hearing-aids for the children. But I am surprised at that, because there is a government that's saying restrain, that froze the construction of personal care homes that they said that we didn't have enough of, that did all these things that are adding more for the per diem rate whenever they can. And I'm not knocking them for that, but all of a sudden there is one new program. Is that a well thought of program? Are we going a certain direction, or is that just a political deal to say, "We have something new?" How can you, when you say we're going to have restraint.

Now, if the Minister can tell us — but they are very careful — if they can tell us of any program they didn't like when they took office . . . Some of them said, "There are too many civil servants." Oh no, they didn't . . . All the programs, every single program, was good. I think there was one last year that the Minister . . . Was it on the Alcoholic Foundation or . . . I don't remember; it was more in my colleague, Mr. Boyce's, in Correction or in the Alcoholic . . . But anyway, there was one program that they didn't like. But what other programs? And before the election and during the election these people said "We're not going to cut any of these programs. If anything, we will expand them. They will be bigger programs." And that hasn't been the case.

Now we're told . . . And you know sometimes people make mistakes and they might say, "Well, we haven't got the money; we were thinking too big and find we have to cut them." But if you have to cut one, why do you start another one? I'm not knocking the program. I'm not knocking the program. This is one thing that we had ready to go and we held on because I was afraid of the financing coming from Ottawa. I didn't know what we were going to get. I knew and I think that probably there is more money now. I will be very surprised if I'm wrong, that there is more money available now than there was a while ago, but eventually, in ten years, there will be less. And you have to be careful of that. You can't start a program because you have got a little more money. You've got to realize that in ten years it's going to be difficult because it's bloc funding.

I admit all of that, but I'm saying that if this government is dedicated to restraint, there should be a way of doing it. Then we can argue restraint or no restraint but now we can't argue because everything is done piecemeal. There is no pattern. No, the Minister didn't stand up, like was done under the previous government, and say, "Here, I am giving you a five-year program." Now, of course, we're going to monitor. There might be some minor changes. He might be doing that year by year. I think that's what he's doing. —(Interjection)— Oh yes, maybe day by day. He stood up and they announce \$50 million more in health care capital projects, including 122 beds in personal care homes.

There was something that I read on that that I would like to find here. There was some statement; I can't find it. I'm not going to delay the work of this committee. There is no doubt that I will find it later on, but all of a sudden it was just like the Bible, and that's finished; don't argue; this was something that was right.

Last year it was these crazy Socialists that were throwing money, like he told us in his statement of yesterday. He didn't accuse us, but you can read between the lines. You can't just throw money at people. If that's an accusation, he should make it clear, to tell us where we threw money, and if it isn't, why say it at all? You know, even a child knows that. This is just verbiage. In 1976 I announced programs for a certain amount of money over a certain period, over a five year period. During the restraining period that we had, during the restraining period we stretched it a little more. We said all right, we're going to do something, it might take six years, but we had a program, and something might have happened, I mean, these weren't all constructed, there was no guarantee that all these things — there was a guarantee, there was an announcement — but we weren't caught in the bind that under no circumstance could we back out.

We did the same thing in the Dental Program. The Minister announced there's new Dental Programs this year. That's not new, this is what we announced. They were doing certain things last year and they took it away from that and gave it to the dental profession, and I hope that we're going to have the comparison and the information when we get to that program because there's one that I've said last year, and I say again, that they're killing — that they're killing just to satisfy an election debt, just to pay off an election debt. That's exactly what's happening. .

But, Mr. Chariman, we want to know how you proceed, how you plan. What can the people of Manitoba expect? Is that asking too much from a government, what the people of Manitoba can expect? Do they have to just wake up every morning to find out anything new in the Health field, what's cut off, or where is it going to cost more? Is that what we're waiting for? Is that the

kind of leadership that we're going to get from this Minister in that Department, or will we know? Will there be more Personal Care Homes, less Personal Care Homes? Will they forget the program altogether because it's not every province that has it? Are they going to have free billing? Are you going to have extra billing, flexibility in billing in the Medicare Program? Oh, it's going to be another \$25.00 for Pharmacare. Pharmacare was a program that was working well. I've had a lot of complaints about this increase. All of a sudden there was an increase of \$25.00. Now, how much will that bring? Now, is that \$25.00 — are we taxing these people so we can bring in the program of hearing aids? I'm anxious to find out how much that program of hearing aids will cost. I don't think it's a very big program. Did we steal from the Pharmacare Program to be able to say, well, we've got a new program going? These are some of the goodies.

You know, when this government took over it was tough at first and they went for restraint, and everybody thought, oh, they're doing a good job, they're responsible people. They wanted to achieve that. And it was misunderstood in many ways. The restraint was only on certain people, certain class of people, people with so much revenue. That's ail. There was no restraint on the upper class at all and the main thing, the first thing, even before studying. . . You know, when the Minister stands here and in this pious statement, we don't want to hurt the old people, we don't want to do that, and you don't know how much I suffer because of this, and what they've done, their claim to fame in their first Session was to take the Succession Duty off and then the Minister can challenge us and laugh at us and say, "Here, look at what we did." This is what he did this year during his Throne Speech. You know, well, how do you reconcile the two, Mr. Chairman, how do you reconcile the two? We want to know.

Now, you know, if you have a principle you usually stand up and defend these principles, and it's clear the people . . . it's a good point and I wish that you would understand that, and if your main priority it to see the people in a certain class get a better break at the expense of somebody else, well, defend that. Defend that, have the guts to defend it. Don't hand all this malarky to the people and then be mad because the opposition are bringing things out in the open and we are trying to divide the classes. We're trying to divide the classes. You know, it was just in the old days of the south of the United States when you're talking don't rock the boat. You can't think of anything else. Don't rock the boat. You know, they had the good niggers, like I said yesterday, and the bad niggers, and those who were educated too much. You'd have to put them in their place. They had to be docile. You know, you could slap them on the head and tell them how good they were but they had to take whatever you gave them and lick your boots and that was it, and if he raised hell you sure got rid of him in a hurry. That's exactly the way it was going.

Now, this is what we want to know. What is going to happen? During the campaign or the last Session the now Premier, himself, said, "We're not going to cut these programs 99 . . . " not 99 — I'm not going to exaggerate — I think he said 85 percent or 90 percent were brought in by Duff Roblin, which wasn't the case at all but that's what he said. And he said to the public that they would have more Personal Care Homes. They said that when they were on this side of the House — more Personal Care Homes. That was the beggest thing, the last Estimate that I had to go through. That's where I was chastised the most. It was under the Personal Care Homes by the then critic of the . . . we don't see him during these Estimates. He's not here. I don't blame him. He'd be embarrassed to tears. But this is what he wanted, more Personal Care Homes, and we announce a five year program and all of a sudden it was excess, we were wasting money. We were wasting money. And this is where it comes now.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know all the planning and, you know, the Minister can tell me that's my business. I'm going to do this internally. Okay, he can answer to the people of Manitoba. We want to know how this is done because right now we can't see anything else but day to day announcements, flying kites, being on every side of every issue, leaving the door open every time the Minister gets up . . . at any question he's never said no once in this House. "I want to warn you", it's the same thing. You know, you could press a button and the answer would come out. That's answer No. 1, that's (b) and that's (c). You know, my door is never closed. That's usually the way he starts. "I sympathize with these people. I want them to know there's not that much money in the Estimates, or no money in the Estimates, but we're going to look at it." When there's nothing in the Estimates and he knows that nothing will be done.

You know, if you're dedicated people and if you feel that the only thing is restraint, well then, say so, and the Minister should come . . . it's going to come back to haunt them. He went around and saw all these people, made a lot of speeches instead of running his department . . . well, his P.R. is his main thing, and he always told them maybe. He never said no to anybody, and if you have a restraining program you have to say no, it's too bad, but no. And that isn't being said and the people are guessing. I thought a while ago, well, they're going to start hard and then, like many a government come the election, the last year, the last year and a half, they're going to start making statements. But I think they went too far. There won't be any credibility at all. They've pushed

against the wall now and it's going to be hard to change that image. They wanted to have a certain image. They are getting an image of not caring for the individual like I said yesterday.

You know, you have the First Minister that made sure before he came back in politics he wanted — and I don't blame him for that, he has a family and he has to take care of them — but he should think of the other people.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The honourable member has one minute.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** All right, Mr. Chairman. So I'm saying that he made darn sure that he got his over \$30,000 a year before he came back in politics, and then he lied about that because he said that wasn't the case and then he confessed that that was true. All right. I'm not — you know, that's his duty. He has his first responsibility to his family. But what about the other people? We heard yesterday this guy was fired because, you know, he's a good man, I agree he's a good man, but we couldn't work with him so he's fired. He doesn't count. I don't think that they're that mean. I don't think that they really understand what the situation is or, you know, they say, oh, this is a good thing but then they're blinded. They have these blinkers and the only thing is restraint and we said that we'd save money. No matter what, we've got to make cuts, and they have no idea where to make these cuts. So this is why they're making these announcements and doing day by day and changing their minds.

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

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I recognize that my honourable friend is doing his role, playing his role, doing his thing in the Opposition, but he is one who insisted yesterday that we proceed with these Estimates on a line by line basis. I ask you more rhetorically than anything else, Mr. Chairman, whether we're now back on Appropriation 62: 1(a) the Minister's Salary. We have heard from the Member for St. Boniface a virtual recitation and repetition of his speech yesterday during the initial statements that were made from this side and from the other side of the House on this department. He has ranged over virtually the whole area of Health and Community Services. We're supposed to be addressing the Item of Program Review and Evaluation. He will attempt to rationalize that by saying that this all comes down to programming. It does not come down to the Program Review and Evaluation Branch. Such subjects, for example, as the spectre, the illusion, the fiction of fear that he raises with respect to hospital staff and other personnel in the health field in this province, where does that come into Program and Review and Evaluation? Such items as his continued underhanded, scurrilous, and despicable references to my leader and to a fiction relative to my leader; where does that come in to Program Review and Evaluation? So I just ask you, Sir, I'm prepared. . . I'm prepared . . . Mr. Chairman, . . .

**MR. DESJARDINS:** On a point of order, I'd like to know, I'd like the Minister to point out where I talk about a relative of the leader. When did I ever mention any relative of the leader? When? I didn't even come near that.

**MR. SHERMAN:** Mr. Chairman, I said a subject relative to my leader. A reference relative to my leader. Mr. Chairman, I'm fully prepared to debate my Salary Item now. I'd be happy to spend the next three days debating my Salary Item, but let's not then come back to it and do it at the end of the Estimates. The Member for St. Boniface suggested yesterday that we get off that exchange of general statements and get on to item by item examination. He's brought up the question, the subject of Pharmacare. There is an Item in the Appropriations on Pharmacare, I point out to you, Mr. Chairman. He's brought up the Item of Financing in the health field generally. That also comes under the Commission, although I would suggest to him that if he's that interested in obtaining the kind of answer immediately that he wants, I can't give it to him. He can get it from the Minister of Finance whose Estimates are on just down the hall in another Committee room. He can go down there and ask the Minister of Finance for the breakdown of Federal cost-sharing and the breakdown of Federal funding.

He has raised questions relative to a number of issues and items which are all covered by specific appropriations under here, and to respond to all of them is going to take me the half hour that it took him to launch into them and I don't think that that is in keeping either with the intention of the Estimates examination or the request that he made yesterday that we get into Item by Item examination.

As far as the Program Review and Evaluation Branch is concerned, Mr. Chairman, I've explained, and I know he had to leave the Chamber for a minute — he might have gone down to the other Committee — but during that period I answered the Honourable Member for The Pas and explained

to him the nature of the Community Services Committee of Cabinet. The Member for St. Boniface has asked me whether there is an inter-departmental committee and how does it function. I explained that to the Member for The Pas, his colleague. He can obtain that information from him or read it in Hansard. I don't think I'm serving the purposes of the Committee by repeating it all at this time.

He has raised the question of whether this Program Review and Evaluation Branch was integral or fundamental to the task force, and the answer is no, Mr. Chairman. Certainly there were one or two people from various aspects in departments of government who were seconded to the task force. There is one sitting in front of me at the present time who was seconded to do some work for the task force, but the Program Review and Evaluation Branch as such was not a component of the task force.

The Program Review and Evaluation Branch works in support to the Program Directors and the Minister's office in this department, and they do not cover every area of Health and Community Services and Corrections, Planning and thinking. They're not the clearing house through which everything goes. The primary planning in this government is done by the Cabinet. That is the primary mechanism for planning and discussion and exchange, the Cabinet in concert with the Caucus. Next to that comes the individual Cabinet committees, such as the committee on Community Services which I described to the Honourable Member for The Pas. Next to that come a number of consulting and advisory groups of which the Program Review and Evaluation Branch is certainly an important one, but there are the others that I mentioned in my response earlier. There are also obviously unofficial and ad hoc kinds of committees that are established between, for example, my Deputy Minister and certain people and certain disciplines in the field, pursuing certain subjects. The Associate Deputy Minister, Dr. George Johnson, in concert with other medical and nursing personnel, pursuing certain subjects. All of these people work in a continuing consulting and program examination capacity, distil down the subject matter of their conversations and their exchanges of views, put things down on paper in the form of reports to the Minister, and at that juncture, in consultation with my senior officials, the decision is made whether a paper should be prepared to take to Cabinet to be studied and discussed at that level.

As far as restraint is concerned, the decisions relative to the budget and to financing are made by Cabinet. They're not made by any of these groups, any of these committees, they're certainly not made by the Program Review and Evaluation Branch.

The Member for St. Boniface asked me whether we have to say to them, well, when you're looking into this subject, there's only so much money. The answer to that question is, no. In fact I would suggest, with confidence Mr. Chairman, that members of the Program Review and Evaluation Branch, members of every other branch of this department, members of every other branch of this government, and in fact all Manitobans, are aware, consciously and responsibly now that there is only so much money. We don't have to tell them there is only so much money, they know there's only so much money. There's only so much money in Manitoba; there's only so much money in Canada. We all have to cut our cloth fairly carefully. They don't have to be reminded of that.

They undertake these subjects from the conceptual point of view, from the question as to whether the thing is desirable, whether it's acceptable, whether it's needed and necessary, whether it's going to serve a useful purpose, whether the up-side is greater than the down-side. Whether, for example, it's of value to the people of Manitoba in the long run to re-introduce at a fairly significant and competitive level, proprietary ownership and proprietary operation into the personal care field, the nursing care field.

I don't have an answer to that yet, because the Member for St. Boniface knows as well as I do that it's not an easy question. He and I could sit down in the Members' Lounge and we probably could come to a fairly quick conclusion on it. I think that he and I agree in the area of health and community services on a great many things. I don't know what our conclusion would be on that particular point, but I'm just suggesting that in a good many cases, he and I could come to a good many quick conclusions on that. But you can't do that when you're dealing with one million people, and he knows it as well as I do.

Take the question that came up this week of the proposed centre for reproductive studies that is being proposed by the Head of Obstetrics and other obstetrical and gynaecological people connected with the Health Sciences Centres. What is the easy answer to that one? I mean, he might have a strong view one way or the other. I might have a strong view one way or the other, it doesn't matter what my view is or what his view is, only insofar as we represent a miniscule percentage of the people of this province. What he and I have to know, before either one of us would take an action that was going to affect all one million Manitobans, is what does the majority of Manitoba want? What do they feel about it? This is what we're trying to work through in these examinations of programs and policies and concepts, and the Program Review and Evaluation Branch helps us substantially in that, simply by talking to people, by examining things, by researching, by looking

for the kind of documentation that is available from other jurisdictions, as well as our own, but particularly from other jurisdictions, because in many of these areas we have no guide posts of our own to go by.

And then they produce an overview, not related to money, the Cabinet will make the decision about the money. The Minister of Finance and his colleagues in Cabinet have the responsibility to make that decision. What the Program Review and Evaluation Branch and these other consultative groups have a responsibility to do is to present the full subject, as fully as they can with an overview in conceptual terms, so that some perhaps reasonable and responsible conclusions can be distilled out of that to take to Cabinet for a discussion. I presume that's the way most democratic governments work, that is certainly the way this one works.

There is no responsibility on that branch for restraint or for anything related to the fiscal limitations and the fiscal responsibilities and challenges that the people of Manitoba face today.

The Member for St. Boniface has said that I had made reference to the fact that in the past there has been an inclination to assume that most problems in the health, community services and corrections field, and I certainly include the corrections field, can be solved, at least if not in the main, by at least substantially by throwing money at them, and that this government doesn't intend to work that way. I did make that statement —(Interjection)— yes, I did make that statement and I repeat that statement and I will debate with my honourable friend on that subject. That hardly comes under Program Review and Evaluation, which is not concerned with money. But I can certainly cite examples, if the Member for St. Boniface wants them, of what I consider to be gross extravagances in the fiscal and financial area undertaken by the previous government, and I will do. And I'll either do it during my Estimates or I'll do it during the Budget Debate. I promise my friend, I will do that. And he and I will debate it. That hardly comes under this — or we'll debate it on my Salary. And I'll start on my Salary at 2:30 this afternoon if you want me to, Mr. Chairman, but we're supposed to be discussing Program Review and Evaluation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Member for St. Boniface raised the subject of the O'Sullivan Report, for example. Yes, certainly we take reports of that kind and refer them to study committees, consultative committees. They're not necessarily the Program Review and Evaluation Branch; that branch can't handle everything in the area of thinking and planning and policy, there is too much. I gave him some examples of what they're doing. I don't know whether he was in the other committee at the time, but I listed 6 to 8 specific complicated projects that they're engaged in.

There are innumerable other subject areas that have to be examined as they come forward, and they never cease to come forward in this area, as he knows, and we use other people, other resources to examine them. For example, with respect to the O'Sullivan Report, we have had a committee that has involved the Deputy Minister of my department, Mr. Ron Johnstone, the Deputy Minister of Education, Dr. Lorimer, or the former Deputy Minister of Education, Dr. Lorimer, various other departmental officials of that calibre and status, examining that report and producing out of it a number of recommendations and positions that could be put to me and the Minister of Education and those who were leaders in the formulation of the task force for further consideration so as to refine a recommendation to go to Cabinet. At that point in time, I can't guarantee him what's going to happen in Cabinet; it will go to Cabinet and Cabinet will think about it, and worry about, and make a decision about it, maybe even change the decision before it finally comes out and is formulated as a policy in this field in this province.

He's asked about the Family Planning Report, I have commented on the Family Planning Report. I commented on it at the time it was issued. That doesn't say that it's dead and buried forever. We have had, in fact, a group looking into the conclusions of the Family Planning Report. Those things come forward to me —(Interjection)— not this group, no, —(Interjection)— well, my honourable friend says, how do I know if you've got 28 different groups —(Interjection)— he might have had a number of different groups himself. This branch can't do it all. I use my . . .

**MR. DESJARDINS:** What do they do? What are the other branches, that's what I asked you when I first got up. How do you proceed in evaluating and policy, and you still haven't answered that.

**MR. SHERMAN:** I am answering it, I think I have answered it. It may be done by my Deputy Minister and some other Deputy Ministers in the government, it may be done by the Consultative Committee existing between my office and the MMA, it may be done by a sub-committee of the Health Services Commission board.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** Where does it come together?

**MR. SHERMAN:** It comes together through my Associate Deputy Minister and through my Deputy

Minister, in a management team that we have established in our department.

**MR. DESJARDINS:** That's what I want to know, your management team.

**MR. SHERMAN:** A management team that consists of six persons which meets weekly in my office.

**MR. DESJARC DINS:** That's what I want to know.

**MR. SHERMAN:** That's where it comes together, Mr. Chairman. That is where it comes together and it is out of that that these concepts go forward to the government for consideration. I believe that that's all one can ask of anyone working in the consulting and review and concept area, because the field is so diverse and so broad that we have to use all these various resources. But they are collated finally in front of the management team, in my office, which is not very much different, I think, from a policy committee that my honourable friend employed when he was in the same position of responsibility.

As far as coming to hard and fast conclusive decisions, we're coming to them as quickly and as reasonably as we can, Mr. Chairman, but I repeat, we do not intend to rush in and make unilateral decisions affecting everybody in the province until we have satisfied ourselves that we've done the necessary research and we've got a consensus that represents the best interests of the majority of the population of Manitoba.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The hour being 12:30, I am now leaving the Chair to return at 2:30 this afternoon.