

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Tuesday, 27 May, 1980

Time — 8:00 p.m.

GRIEVANCE MATTER Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the 4:30 adjournment hour I was attempting to demonstrate that the facts do not support the argument put by the Honourable Member for Transcona in his contention that the collective bargaining process cannot work in situations such as the present one at the Health Sciences Centre because hospitals, in this case, the Health Sciences Centre, have no room to manoeuvre.

Mr. Speaker, as I was pointing out at 4:30, I believe that a very fair and reasonable and competitive offer has been made by the Health Sciences Centre, measured in terms of the kinds of wage settlements that have been achieved recently in Manitoba by the Manitoba Government Employees Association, among others, and by the equivalent agreement that translates itself then to professional terms in the fee schedule reached between the Manitoba Medical Association and the government for the next two-year period.

Now I'm prepared to concede that there well may be those who don't agree that the position put by the Health Sciences Centre in offer to CUPE is fair and is reasonable as they would like to see it. That is a legitimate argument, legitimate case. It's not my job to offer an opinion on that subject or in that debate, but in the terms of the context of wage settlements, with which we feel Manitobans are capable of coping and which we feel Manitobans are capable of managing and handling at the present time, Mr. Speaker, and in terms of comparisons in the health field generally and other fields, I believe that that is a reasonable offer. Some 20.6 percent over two years, 22 percent in some categories and an employee dental plan which was offered in the second year. I don't think that that reflects a position in which it can be argued that the Health Sciences Centre has no room to manoeuvre and the collective bargaining process cannot work.

Further to that, Mr. Speaker, although I concede that the situation is urgent and I concede that the issue is important, I do not concede at this juncture that the government should intervene in the free collective bargaining process which is going on. Talks, discussions, negotiations are continuing in this strike situation. If patient care, safety or health is threatened, if patient lives are threatened, I assure you, Mr. Speaker, my perspective and position will be different and I will urge upon my colleagues that the government take action to safeguard the lives and the health care of Manitobans under threat in a strike situation. That has not occurred as yet. Of course it's early in the work stoppage situation. No one knows what the next 24 hours or the next week or the next period of time may hold. But I want to assure the Honourable Member for Transcona, that

we are certainly prepared to respond, as a government, to any threat to the life and safety of patients. Provided there is no such threat, we believe that the collective bargaining process should be permitted to take its normal and reasonable course and that there is no cause for government intervention.

That is the situation at the moment, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the seven or some other health facilities in the province where strikes occurred this morning, where strikes got under way today. My information is that in all cases the situation is under control and there is no immediate threat or difficulty. There is, of course, the constant additional consideration where the Health Sciences Centre is concerned, being the major referral centre for the province, and we are maintaining a round-the-clock watch on that situation and will act as we deem fit and necessary as circumstances unfold.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, just for your guidance, could I ask whether I have five minutes or 15 minutes? The Honourable Member for Transcona had 40 minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: Pardon me, I'm in error, it's 15 minutes.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the percentages are comparable with those as I've said, that have been awarded in other areas, and we have to keep in mind, sir, that we are dealing with a community as a whole and with an economy as a whole and I think it is only responsible and only incumbent on governments and oppositions alike to consider that the ripple effects of wage settlements can have ramifications and present difficulties for a society far exceeding what might have been anticipated at the time that an initial settlement with one individual bargaining agency was reached. If we find ourselves in a position where the hospitals, in this case the Health Sciences Centre and related health centres, are having difficulty in meeting, through their budgets, the offer that has been made to CUPE at the present time, I can assure you that that matter will be dealt with at the level of the Manitoba Health Services Commission to ensure that such offers as have been made can be met and can be honoured. Whether the search to find a settlement must go beyond the parameters of the present offer obviously it's not for me to say and only time will tell, but I do not think that the case put by the Honourable Member for Transcona is an accurate one on the evidence of the mathematics that are on the table at the moment.

Mr. Speaker, some collective bargaining units and collective bargaining organizations and some individual commentators have commented on the fact that I have said in the past that I believed it was desirable to pay our doctors well and if possible to move them up to fifth place in the comparative

Tuesday, 27 May, 1980

rankings across the country. I don't back away from that statement. That is still my ambition. But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that if anybody in CUPE or in the government or in the opposition or anywhere else is laboring under the delusion that our doctors are in fifth place in the national rankings, I want to disabuse them of that.

We inherited a situation in which, for a number of reasons, not the least of which were the AIB constraints, in which we inherited a medical profession that in terms of relative income earning opportunities was in about ninth place in Canada and I made it my business and this government made it its business, and I must acknowledge that we were not opposed by the opposition in this approach, to raise that level of comparative ranking for our doctors, and the recent fee schedule agreement does that; but it does not, Sir, put them in fifth place in this country and it's going to take us some time yet to get there and it's going to take us some time yet to get there in terms of other sectors of Manitoba society and the Manitoba economy. And it's certainly going to take us some time yet to get there for service workers and support workers in the health field and they might as well know that. We are not in a position to elevate them to fifth place in the rankings, in one jump, in one leap. They deserve a catch-up assist, they deserve better wages. I have pointed out that they are being offered better wages, they're being offered a catch-up opportunity. There will remain after that some distance still to go and we will continue to work on that distance and to work on closing that gap. Certainly it's our objective, I think all of us, to see Manitoba first in all things in this country, but being realistic, Mr. Speaker, in terms of our population, to see us in fifth ranking in many of these comparisons and in many of these indices, but it's going to take us some time to get there.

Mr. Speaker, the Member for Transcona said that he had found a situation, or we are now confronted with a situation where morale is serious, if indeed even existent, in large sectors of the health workers community particularly in the field of support and service workers. I want to assure him that this situation is neither new nor is it particularly characteristic of Manitoba. I want to assure him that one of the first exposures to and experiences in discontent and low morale that I encountered as Minister, was with this same component of health service workers and support workers represented by CUPE at the Health Sciences Centre and elsewhere.

In 1978, Mr. Speaker, they let me know in no uncertain terms how discontented they were with the low ranking to which they had fallen in comparative terms across the country in recent years, including those years in which my honourable friends opposite represented the administration of this province. So this is not new. We have a health worker community in this province that feels, legitimately, that it has fallen behind in comparative rankings, that it is underpaid, that it deserves to be elevated in its wages, and we are working to do that and we will achieve that. But it is not new, it is not exclusive and it is not typical of the administration of the current day. It has been abuilding, and more than incipient but existent, for some considerable years and there is some considerable catching up to do.

Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable said about the pressures that are manifesting themselves and discontent and morale problems that are manifesting themselves in various areas of our health community in Manitoba and I want to just record for the information of all that once again we're not dealing with an exclusive Manitoba situation. Across this country, Mr. Speaker, we face enormous challenges in health care and health care delivery and health care funding and financing.

I just want to cite for the record the most recent issue — at least the most recent one that's come across my desk, May 6th, 1980. It's published bi-weekly, Mr. Speaker — of the Medical Post, the newspaper that represents the current and contemporary views and issues that prevail generally among the Canadian medical profession, and this is typical of issues of the Medical Post.

The headline story in the Medical Post of May 6th reads: French interns residents on strike, and it deals with Quebec residents and interns of French language teaching schools in the field of medicine in the province of Quebec. Above that is a streamer across the top of page 1: It's yes or no in Alberta, page 2; and there on page 2 is the story of the confrontation between the Alberta Medical Association and the Alberta government, the Minister of Health in Alberta, over the question of extra billing which the Minister in Alberta has threatened to legislate out of existence and the AMA is now running a plebiscite directed at the public on this issue.

Again on page 1 a major mid-page headline: Saskatchewan MDs threaten walkout over government legislation. This is the issue of direct billing and mode 3 billing in Saskatchewan. And, Mr. Speaker, inside on page 2: An eleventh hour meeting between Ontario's Health Ministry and the Civil Service Commission is described in a headline and a story and relates to a threatened boycott of new patients by psychiatrists at Toronto's Queen Street Mental Health Centre, who are asking for a 15.2 percent salary hike. And it goes on, Mr. Speaker. I don't wish to belabour members opposite with it but I sometimes think that a great many of us, in government, in opposition, in the public and in the media, seem to have the impression that the only jurisdiction on this continent that's having difficulties with the challenges that face us in the delivery of health care today within the realities of today's budgets and today's imperatives of fiscal responsibility is the province of Manitoba, and nothing, Sir, could be further from the truth. We're all in this thing together. There are as many areas and levels of discontent and challenge in other provinces and in other states, the United States, as there are in Manitoba. That's no particular consolation and it's not a justification either, but I do want to emphasize, Sir, that this is not unique to this province, it is not attributable to this government, it is not attributable to the previous government and it is not attributable to specific budgetary policies that may or may not have been reflected in each or any of the three budgets that have been introduced in this House by the Minister of Finance. It is a continent-wide, endemic condition that results from the enormous growth and desired growth of our capacity, technically speaking and professionally

speaking, to deliver health care services, of our capacity to produce the professionals to do that and of our necessity in this day and age of facing up to fiscal and budgetary realities which all of us, all of us as Canadians and North Americans, to a very large degree ignored for two or three decades.

So we're going to have this battle for some time, Mr. Speaker, and the members of CUPE are part and parcel of the requirement for responsibility in Manitoba housekeeping, fiscal and economic and social housekeeping, just as are the members of the government who are elected to be the trustees of the public's money and the members of the Opposition who are elected to watchdog the government, and just as are all other sectors of our society, just as is every other Manitoban, including the nurses, including the doctors, including the government and the opposition and every other individual in every other walk of life. We will have some difficult disputes and debates and contract talks to negotiate and negotiate before we get to where we want to be and before we have the economy of this province in sufficient strength to support greater wage settlements than are being generally arrived at and generally offered at the present time.

So I thank the Member for Transcona for his concern and for his counsel and I certainly appreciate the advice and counsel that has been forthcoming and will be forthcoming in these circumstances from members of the opposition, as well as from my own colleagues in government and from the general public, but it's not going to be easy, Mr. Speaker, and our purpose is not going to be served by either inflammatory comments from persons who have recognizably legitimate postures to take and positions to take, leading up to collective bargaining procedures, or from the opposition or from other commentators, in the media or elsewhere. We are not in a crisis situation at the moment. We are in a difficult situation of challenge. We are not in a crisis situation at the Health Sciences Centre. If we are, we will move to resolve that crisis very very quickly, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question. Question before the House . . . The Honourable Minister without Portfolio.

HON. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if by leave, inasmuch as the committee is prepared to sit and consider Supply, we might now adjourn the House and resume immediately in committee. Hearing no objection, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Health that the House do now adjourn and resume immediately in a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House accordingly adjourned until 2:00 o'clock tomorrow. (Wednesday).

SUPPLY — COMMUNITY SERVICES AND CORRECTIONS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 21 of the

Main Estimates, Department of Community Services and Corrections. Resolution No. 32, Item 6. Social Security Services, Item (c) Day Care Services: (1) Salaries.—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to take a few minutes on this debate on Day Care, because I'm very surprised. Yesterday I asked questions of the Minister. I've been following the policy or lack of policy of the government for the last three years and it's the lack of planning, the lack of knowing exactly what this government is doing is appalling. If we look back and I'd like to take the committee back from the start of this government when this government took office and my remarks are directed collectively at the government and the former Minister more than the present Minister who just started in this position. Mr. Chairman, on March of 1977, the then critic, the former Minister of Health and Social Development, the present Minister of Health, had this to say. Our problem, Sir, is that we don't believe that the government has gone much beyond lip service to interest in the day care problem itself. Our main concern is that this government has never done the proper studies required of an administration where day care is concerned. We believe that first and foremost before proper approach to the day care problems and solutions of the day care problems can be achieved, that we have to know specifically what those problems are. We don't feel, and I put it to the Minister, that any substantial examination of the market has taken place. I would say that we consider the top priority to be market research, if it can put it in these terms. The top priority of any government or any responsible administration or opposition in this province today is to research the day care market and find out where the needs are, the specific localized, individualized needs, and then try to formulate procedures for grappling with those needs.

We feel that this government has taken the universal blanket approach to day care and said to itself, and said to the population of Manitoba, that we need day care services, we're going to rush into the field and we're going — listen to this — and we're going to do what kind of funding and offer what kind of support we can, and it has been a universal kind of program that has not been measured in terms of responsiveness to individual problems in individual parts of the city of Winnipeg, or individual parts of the province.

I would begin by asking the Minister what studies have been done on the market itself, what kind of research has been done to determine the kinds of positions and the kinds of support and services that are most critically required would be most beneficial.

Then he says, I believe, Sir, that this government has talked a lot about day care and has paid, as I say, considerable lip service to the concept of day care but has wound up in the end by underfunding that concept and underfunding that program. The Minister no doubt will want to challenge me on this point.

Mr. Chairman, that was in 1977. Then the Member for Fort Garry became the Minister responsible — that was Bud Sherman, the Minister — then he became the Minister. And what did he do? The first thing, there was nothing that happened in that year,

nothing that happened in day care at all; there was the big freeze. So we criticized him for it.

Listen to chapter two now. This is what he said: He said, Let me say, now I'm quoting June 1, 1978, Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I stand by that remark . . . — I reminded him of this remark — . . . or those remarks from the point of view that I believe in the Day Care Program and, not knowing the degree of service that was desired and the extent to which the need and that legitimate desire was being met, not knowing very much about the budgetary position of the province until I got into government, I was pressing for expansion of the program and I would press for it again if I had the money to do it, but I am not going to belabor the point about the basic commitment that we have undertaken to the taxpayers for this year, but we obviously have demonstrated that we're not looking for ways to spend money this year. We are trying to hold it down. So I stand by my remarks but I don't have the money to engage in broad expansionary programs.

Secondly, I want to say that my acquaintanceship with the department and with the program over the last few months has now led me . . . — listen to this, Mr. Chairman — led me to the firm conclusion that the Day Care Program is effective, is efficient, is doing an excellent job and is meeting the majority of the needs, the overwhelming majority of the needs. I'm not as convinced as I stand here tonight as perhaps I was when I stood there a year ago that there is a true and justifiable need at this structure for wide-scale expansion of the program or an increase in the number of spaces. There will be, or that well may be developed, but at this juncture, Sir, my information is that the majority of the need is being met. We stand extremely favorably in relations in ratio to other provinces when it comes to day care spaces. Manitobans are extremely well served. It is my understanding that although there certainly will be some demand in Winnipeg, there is little demand, if any, outside of Winnipeg.

Then he says that, The Member for Seven Oaks and the Member for St. Boniface have referred to a freeze and to a reduction. There is no reduction of the Day Care Program, he says. The fact of the matter is that there are spaces coming onstream . . . — listen — . . . spaces that become available on a regular continuing basis simply because of the turnover that takes place among day care clientele.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, when he was sitting on this side of the House, well then it was a bad program and we hadn't done any studies at all. Then he came in and froze everything, there was pressure and there were demonstrations, and he came in and he made the last statement that everything was fine and it was a great program and they shouldn't throw money away.

Then the following year, last year, we saw that there had been a reduction and that is covered and answered, if you want to take the trouble of checking; there was a reduction of 15 spaces. What do we have now, Mr. Chairman, what do we have? They have a rate of daily fees that went from 5.00 to 8.50, —(Interjection)— Well, 5.00 from the original and then it went to 6.00. Yes, I don't say that it went all at one time, but from 6.00 under this government, right.

Now, for the first time, they can charge another dollar. The Minister made it quite clear on numerous occasions that if one day care decides to charge more there is nothing that can stop them, that is optional, but if they do they must charge everybody. The Minister said that is not subsidized and the press releases says that is not subsidized.

What is that going to mean? What is that going to mean, Mr. Chairman? The maintenance grant, and what maintenance? The Minister and the former Minister is very proud and so am I and so is my colleague who started it, they are proud to say that it is the best Day Care Program in Canada. You know what made it the best Day Care Program, it was the maintenance grant. It was the only way. They couldn't go any way and if you ask anybody in Day Care now they would tell you the same thing, that you have to increase the maintenance grant.

We thought of increasing the per diem, but what is that going to mean? The people with middle income or low income, not the people on welfare, they are the ones that are going to pay for it. Now, the rate has been increased, plus there is a possibility of 1.00. The Minister might say, well, it's not going to happen. If it's not going to happen, why was this allowed? Nobody can stop them. The Minister can't stop anybody now from saying, All right, we want to take advantage, we're going to charge 1.00. What's going to happen? You know, if these operators, if they are going to . . . Mind you, there is one good thing, we saw the inconsistency in the government. Already, you know, we had a big debate on personal care and that there should be the free enterprisers in that, the private enterprise, but the Minister did say that, in this, except those that were already there, that it's going to be only the non-profit organizations and at least I congratulate him on that.

But even these people, if they have trouble, what are they going to do? What will the temptation be? To charge, and if that means that the people who can't afford it have to go, well so be it. And this is government, this is the government that is standing up and saying, we want to help the people that need it the most, you know, Mr. Chairman.

The worst thing, Mr. Chairman, is I asked the Minister yesterday, Are you going to change the program? I had hoped that with this extra money, because there is no doubt in my mind or any Manitoban's mind that the government is responding to pressure. They flew kites ever since they took office and they have acted only when there was pressure. If that had been planned, Mr. Chairman, if this had been planned, it would have been announced in the Throne Speech. The Minister had no idea at all. There was a press statement that went out. He made a statement when he was asked the question, and that was it. We know that there is very little planning and —(Interjection)— It was carefully answered. Well, it wasn't carefully answered. I would say that the Minister was bluffing. You know, it is an advantage to having sat in that chair because you have the same temptations. I know the Minister is doing quite well for his first time and I have to chuckle to myself at times because sometimes he has no idea what the question is, but he'll bluff his way, and he's done a pretty good job and I congratulate him for that, but he hasn't taken me in, not all the time, Mr. Chairman.

Tuesday, 27 May, 1980

Now, there has been no planning in that department. We were told the people in the field are planning. We were told that, and the directors are planning. Well, we have an assistant, an acting director. It wasn't even full-time at one time. We had an acting director of Income Security, who has the responsibility, who is sitting here today, and God knows that she has enough of a load without that extra load. All of a sudden there was demonstrations, the Minister refused to meet with these people, but there was demonstrations ever since this government took office, there were at least three of them. All of sudden, Mr. Chairman, these great planners; these people that say you don't throw money at programs that won't go away; these people that say, well, the province can't afford it; these people that say we don't want universal day care and the former Minister said that many times. When all of sudden, Mr. Chairman, we are asked to believe that they can throw 4 million at this. You know, you look back, Mr. Chairman, last year was 4,695,000 and this year with this 4 million it is 9 million and something, it would be an increase of 100 percent. That would be, Mr. Chairman, if it was a full year, but it is only half a year, so it would be an increase of about 200 percent to spend that money this year. There is no way that they can spend that money if there is any kind of proper administration. They have no idea. Besides, Mr. Chairman, if there had been an improvement, ask the people at Day Care.

I understand what the Minister is saying, we have a choice, we want to be able to open more spaces or enrich the program. I sympathize with him on that. You can't give it all to a few, but you can improve a bit, but not necessarily, there is no doubt that any militant group, any pressure group who is doing their work, will always ask for more. There is no doubt about that, but the maintenance grant should have been increased, Mr. Chairman, should have been increased, especially if they have to raise the fees and if they have to allow another dollar optional for the Day Care Centres. Mr. Chairman, there had been no planning, there is no more staff. The Minister said, my staff will do that. They are run ragged now, Mr. Chairman. There is less staff in that department now, they have trouble doing their work, they have to work overtime, and now he is saying that from September they are going to spend 4 million. Do you know what kind of work that means? The program is the same; if the program is not enriched it is not going to cost more, it is all more spaces in half a year, and mind you, there is money for the Lunch and After School.

I ask the Minister, bring your guidelines. He said, well, I can't do that. Rightly so, he says, because so far there have only been grants. He has no idea what the program will be all about, because it is a new system now. He will have to start getting rates, guidelines like they do on Day Care, and we know by experience how long — you know, we announced Day Care in the Throne Speech, but it took a year, a year and a half before we could get going — and they are going to start going and they are going to spend 4 million. Sir, it is ridiculous. It is bad planning, and I am not saying it is not priorities, I do believe in this program. I asked the Minister and I thought, well, surely, they must be

doing something differently, and I said, well, where are you going to help the underprivileged? He said, oh, no, that is dangerous, they are going to get the same. Mr. Chairman, I have in front of me the policies of the Progressive Conservative objectives, the objectives, and this is their paper on Day Care in Manitoba. To provide subsidies to assure that the cost of Day Care for handicapped children is no greater to the parents than the cost of this care for children without handicaps. Why would you have to be ashamed to do that? He is talking about paying on the ability-to-pay basis, and that is not the case either.

If they are going to fly a kite, at least take advantage of it, and when they flew the kite earlier, this last year and this year, if they were going to do something, if they were going to bring a budget because of their panic, and they've got to do something for their image, and the Minister is saying, it is catching up, it is catching up, Mr. Chairman. We were told that there weren't enough spaces, that we were only paying lip service, and when this Minister took office or at the end of last year anyway, there were 15 spaces less than we had, than they had when they took over from us. All of a sudden they are going to spend 4 million more in six months. That is bad planning, it is not planning at all. It is poor administration and the people that said we couldn't run peanut stands, well, what the hell could they run, Mr. Chairman, with that kind of attitude, with their kind of attitude. —(Interjection)— Carter too, and that is about all he can do.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing for the handicapped; there is no increase in maintenance; there is no change, just more program; there is no staff. Mr. Chairman, anybody, especially a government that talks about cost first and need after, especially a government that said you can't throw money and think the problems will go away; especially a government that prides themselves or pretends and wants the people to think they are the greatest administrators and they are careful. How many times did we hear, we are moving but in a careful, responsible manner?

Mr. Chairman, if you are going to have a program you think about it before you announce it. They have no idea what the program is all about, but they have already advertised in the newspaper. They are so panicked. We heard this afternoon, all of a sudden the Minister of the Health, very conciliatory, and he says, why don't you work for us, it is a great problem for Manitoba? We told the Minister of Health what the newspapers are telling, we told him for three years in a row, we told him he was chasing the nurses away. We told him that when the time comes they were going to bargain hard, because he tried to scare the hell of them three years ago, and that was what was going to happen and it was going to catch with him, and it is. All of sudden he is going to investigate. We told him that three years ago and it was joke, we were trying to panic the people. Now somebody else tell him, he doesn't believe them, he is mad at the newspaper, and if anybody shouldn't be mad at the newspaper with the press that he has had over the last three years, should be the present Minister of Health.

Let's go back to Day Care before you bring me back, Mr. Chairman. I couldn't resist that because

Tuesday, 27 May, 1980

through the whole government it is a policy of catch up and why catch up at this time. I've defied, I've asked the people why, what is different? We owe, what is it? Eight hundred dollars more. Is it that high for each man, woman and child, 800 more, the debt, the gross debt in this province than three years ago. You remember the stories during the campaign and after that how much it costs and how bad it was. And just remember, everyone of you, everyone of your children, your wife, they owe so much money. Now we owe 800 more. There is more deficit than ever, the greatest budgeted deficit this year than ever, and they are the people that said, their Leader said not too long ago, Crosbie's Budget was great except it didn't go far enough. The Budget is worse, the people are leaving the province. There are less people in the province — I am not going to start a fight with all these different statistics — but there are less people in the province now than ever, even with the greatest breeders — we were told they were great breeders — (Interjection)— Well, I know it is not true, but you weren't here when your Leader said you were great breeders, so maybe you don't qualify, I don't know. Maybe you don't qualify for that, maybe you take the birth control pill and so on. I hope you don't charge Pharmacare for that anyway.

Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of government. All right, I defy you to tell me that things are better in Manitoba than they were three years ago. Do you owe less money? Do you personally owe less money on your share of the debt than you did three years ago? Is unemployment better or worse? — (Interjection)— I can handle you, but only one at a time. I don't care which one, you're both the same.

Mr. Chairman, this is the way things are going, they are trying to catch up. There is more unemployment than ever, money is harder to get, and we heard this afternoon that yes, people in the health field are underpaid. The Minister said that. He said, they're underpaid. But other people are. And you know where they started? First of all, by taking care of ourselves. We'll be voting on the . . . I know you won't, you might duck the vote; of course you've got a full time job, so you don't need it. But Mr. Chairman, we'll be voting on an increase for ourselves. The Ministers took care of themselves last year, yes, yes, the first step, 40 for the rural; not you, not the city slickers, but the rural members all got 40 a day more. Their pension counts now on the plan, all right, that's fine; I don't think that we're overly paid and I'm not going to criticize them too much if they increase their pay, but let's look at all Manitobans together. The Minister apologized last year and the year before for giving the doctors so little, and he was saying they had gone down. But let's remember, they say they hadn't had an increase for so many years, that the first year that Medicare came in, they had an average increase of 10,000 each, and 10,000 was a hell of a lot more than it is this year. And what did he say, but the people that . . . And you're talking about 20 percent. 20 percent of 100,000, and you guys are great in figures, you tell me what 20 percent of 100,000 is, and then you tell me what 20 percent of 10,000 is. The people at the bottom of the ladder are asked to wait; tighten your belt, while the other people just go ahead and enjoy life. It's different. And then they have the nerve to

pretend that they're interested to the people that need it the most.

Today, the Minister of Health said, all right, we had to do it, we achieved something, we gave it to the doctor. And I don't begrudge him that. But what about the rest of the people? What did they do? Where are they now? Compare them to the rate of other provinces, and where are they now? Another thing they're very proud of and they try to embarrass us with that, it's the question of succession duties. People weren't paying unless they made what, three-quarters of a million dollars, or something like that, they didn't pay one cent. But those poor people, that was the first priority. We raised taxes the first year to help these people to do that. We raised taxes. We didn't decrease; we were supposed to reduce taxes.

Now, you know the program is going — oh, two percent, that's a joke. There is the former critic who used to say, build personal care homes. Mr. Chairman, this is the gentleman who talked too much and he talked himself out of a Cabinet post because he wanted to build personal care homes. But he has been silent for the last three years. All of a sudden he's developed laryngitis. You remember when he was on this side of the House how much he wanted us to build these personal care homes.

We heard the First Minister today. The Minister said today, well the economy is sluggish because you build those, what was it, the hydro, you build them too fast. I couldn't believe my ears when the Premier of this province said you build too fast. You save millions of dollars. You build too fast. Why did you do it, we wanted to do it. That's the kind of a government we have. It's high time that they wake up and think the people of Manitoba are all completely crazy. They can fool some of them some time and not all of time.

All of a sudden they panic and they are giving us bad government. They are trying to catch up. They are wrong. I challenge the Minister to tell me that that's good government. They were asked to put money in the budget; you know, they asked for a deficit budget, and — I've got five minutes, okay. You threw me off, that's worth another minute. Mr. Chairman, they put the budget, the deficit budget, and they put 4 million for Day Care, and the Minister told us that he had no idea what it was all about, nobody worked on it. If you work on it, like the Minister of Health said, you identify where the problems are, where the need is. And you find out how much staff you need. Well, if we need staff we'll go and get it somewhere; they'll be seconded from Tourism or somewhere like that and come and help us in Day Care, you know. So Mr. Chairman, this is the proof there. There has been no thinking in this, everything that was done for instance when you first started this government the first interview of the Minister of Health and the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Finance said, in Health you've got to reduce by 10 million or 20 million. No idea what was needed. The Minister of Health says so right here that he had no idea what was needed, and that was it. That was it.

Then the first thing, the increase in the hospital, in the budget of the hospital, 2.9 percent. Why 2.9? Because we didn't want to give 10 or zero, so we chose 2.9. That's their rationale, that's the reason for it. And that is why they're in trouble in the health

field today and that is why the people don't believe what they're saying and that is why this pretense of wanting to help the people is not taken seriously, and that is why, more than ever, Sir, with all the mistakes they made, their lack of building and the cost, the freeze on personal care homes for instance, and it's costing so much money and their credibility has suffered. People no longer think that Conservatives who were supposed to be at least good managers are good managers. They feel that they are running panic, they are trying to catch up, they'll do anything. People that want a tighter budget that said to Crosbie just a few months ago, your budget doesn't go far enough, and the federal government should have a balanced budget that brings the highest, isn't it, the highest announced budgeted deficit in the history of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, is it any wonder that the people are anxious for another election to get rid of this government?

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

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to either question the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, if he said the 40 a day was to be, and I'm sure he didn't come really clear, but if it had any part of our pension, it is not right. It really should not be on the record if he did say it. I was listening and I would have to see it, but I think it should be straightened.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I like to field these questions to get me ready for when I sit on this side and have to answer questions.

Mr. Chairman, what can you say, you've said it all when you say there is no credibility in this government. Mr. Chairman, what I did say is that there was, first of all, the pay of a Minister can be calculated in the pension. That's one thing. And I said that the members had an increase of 40 per day during the session, and that full-time Ministers, who have a full-time job, who are from rural points but who live in the city because they work in the city, receive that 40 a day, which they never received before. That's what I stated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. GEORGE MINAKER (St. James): Mr. Chairman, just to reply briefly to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, the first thing I noticed and was happy for him to comment on with his opening remarks was the fact that he generally confirmed the statement that I made last night that we have the best Day Care Program in Canada and with the additional funding, would definitely. I think that the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks also confirmed that last night, then with the next breath, stated and very strongly tried to indicate that there was no planning, or lack of planning was appalling, I think were his exact words.

I would suggest to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, the reason we have the best program in all of Canada is because it is an ongoing planning. It has been going on while he was the administrator, and while we are the administration. This ongoing

planning has been taking place in the general development of the program and it is reasons that I can stand up and say that here's how we compare to components of group day care in the different provinces. This is why we can say what the fees are in the different provinces. There is an ongoing check and planning of this so that, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that his comments are not correct, that we are on an ongoing planning stage and all of a sudden, when there are 4.5 million injected into a program this year, that's a 95 to 97 percent increased funding, then obviously we are going to look at what is now the best program and try to improve it. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, now the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is complaining because I, as a Minister working with the government, have been able to convince my colleagues that we need 4 million more in our program.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to advise the honourable members opposite that it's the pressure that he talks about 10 days before the announcement of the tax reform. I can advise the honourable member opposite that the White Paper has been going on for the last two years. We're quite aware of what was being put into the White Paper, and to try and imply that 10 days prior to a major announcement, that because some 175 people came up the steps and said that we should have the maintenance grant increased and there should be another 15,000 spaces in the Day Care Program has influenced us into making the decision that we would start to spend the taxpayers' money where it is needed, is incorrect, and he knows it is incorrect, Mr. Chairman.

I can advise the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that it is our objective to spend the 4 million this year. Now, whether we will do it or not

MR. DESJARDINS: I didn't think so; it doesn't mean a damn thing.

MR. MINAKER: I agree with the honourable member that it is going to be very difficult, but I would suggest to him in the same breath that in the Day Care Program under his portfolio in 1974-75, there was 1,060,000 voted for and in actual fact, 604,000 was spent, 60 percent.

MR. DESJARDINS: Was it an ongoing program?

MR. MINAKER: 60 percent. Then in 1975-76, Mr. Chairman, they budgeted; in one year they increased the spending by roughly 2.7 million. They increased the spending to only 1.152 million.

MR. DESJARDINS: That was starting a program. You say this is an ongoing program.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, in 1976-77, they reduced the budgeting of the amount by 3.24 million and were only able to spend 2.86 million. So obviously the question is that we have an objective and whether we meet it or not is questionable, but we are going to try, in the same way that I would presume that the honourable minister, when he presented his estimates in those years, was trying to

reach that objective. That is why I am saying that we cannot say that 2 million is for Day Care or 2 million is for Noon and After School. We know in the Day Care Program basically the needs, because it is an ongoing program and planning.

We know where the needs are at the present time in terms of spaces. The one concern we have, Mr. Chairman, is that we don't collapse the existing system. Anybody that has been in the marketing business of developing something, knows that if all of a sudden you glut the market and that there are existing programs out there, or existing day care centres out there that are dependent on a good capacity in their program in order to survive, and we all of a sudden throw out 2,000 spaces, we'll say, all of a sudden the new people starting up will say: We can do it for 6 a day or we can do it for 7.00. In the meantime, they draw from the existing facilities that are out there and they start to collapse. This has to be programmed and that's why I'm saying that as we phase it in, it might well be that 1 million or 1.5 million will go into Day Care and the other will go into Noon and After School.

Mr. Chairman, to try and imply that when an announcement is made on a basic policy of funding different projects, you don't have the detailed program for those programs necessarily. The one thing I can advise the honourable members opposite, Mr. Chairman, is that one thing that the basic policy will be is the need. If the honourable member is saying that need is pressure, I agree with him, that the need for this program was recognized and for this reason we have decided to fund it in the manner that we have. But to get into the details of spaces required and the location and numbers at this point in time, I am not prepared to do that, because I don't think the honourable member was prepared to do that when he announced a 2.7 million increase in 1975-76. I don't believe he was prepared to announce where the spaces were going and how much he was going to charge and so on.

Mr. Chairman, as I indicated earlier, we have a good program, the best, I think, in Canada, and will be the best as we increase the numbers of spaces and enrich it in different methods, but at this point in time I am not prepared to make statements like that because we are still studying it on an ongoing basis, like we always have and what he did when he was the Minister.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable member indicated the concern about the option of the 1.00. I would just like to point out to the honourable member that there are five provinces right now that request, and it's an actual fact, that the user has to pay the first dollar, not the last dollar.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's their problem.

MR. MINAKER: That's right, but I'm just pointing out that we have now put in this option because it was requested, Mr. Chairman. It was requested by the Health Sciences Centre Day Care Centre, that the parents there that had the ability to pay for it, and they would make the decision if in fact they wanted to charge it. I would like to again advise the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that nobody is charging that 1 option at the present time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Why did you put it in, then?

MR. MINAKER: As an option, because it was requested and we felt that if it would assist the Health Sciences Centre, who had been running at a deficit, that if it helped them, then fine, and in that particular centre, Mr. Chairman, I think there are 12 spaces out of the 130 spaces that are subsidized. So that gives you an indication of the income of the parents that are utilizing that particular centre. In addition to that, it is indirectly funded by the Health Services Commission.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that that is why that is in there and to date, as I indicated last night and tonight, no one has charged that 1 to date.

Mr. Chairman, again dealing with the pressures that the honourable member tried to indicate was the reason why we got the 4 million, because a demonstration occurred out on the steps, I would just remind the honourable member that I believe under his administration there were three demonstrations with regard to day care. I am just saying that in the same way that the pressure didn't apply to him, it doesn't apply to our government and I think he recognizes that. I just wanted to . . . what his statements are, are not correct.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have replied to most of the comments made by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. If there are any other questions, I will try and answer them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I will adopt a somewhat different approach than has been adopted up until now with regard to the desire to see the government spend 4 million, whatever millions they are talking about. I am going to, Mr. Chairman, adopt a novel approach. I would like to see whether we can provide a better day care service and spend less public money on the provision of that service, and I would warn, Mr. Chairman, that in making this, what I consider to be a modest proposal, that I would urge upon the Minister that it be tried on an experimental basis, on a pilot basis, and not interfere with what is presently occurring, but to see whether we can get better value and more people served for what is a legitimate need.

Mr. Chairman, my problem, or the problem that I foresee in the provision of child care services, is that it will become a more and more institutionalized and professionalized service, that every institution that starts in this way, Mr. Chairman, becomes a more and more sophisticated profession. It will soon be, Mr. Chairman, necessary for not only the supervisor to have academic professional qualifications to be with two and three year old children during the day, but other staff will have to have professional qualifications to be with two and three year old children during the day. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I must say, and this may get me into great trouble with the professions, I think that this is carrying the idea of child care, for people who are working parents, to an extreme which has the potential, Mr. Chairman, of destroying the program altogether.

Because if it becomes the kind of thing that I perceive it becoming, it will be something which the

Tuesday, 27 May, 1980

government will legitimately come in and say that it's too rich for our blood and we can't do it. And therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would like to do, or like to experiment in this area, the kind of thing that the former Minister of Health, my friend the Member for St. Boniface, was trying, in the dental area, to down, not downgrade, but downprofessionalize and downinstitutionalize the provision of this service. We have handled this problem, Mr. Chairman, traditionally in the past, by saying that there is a need for a place where a working parent can leave a child during the day and pick him up in the evening, and immediately, because there was no public service available, the private sector moved in and built day care centres where this could be done, and then the community, looking around, said that this kind of service is only available to people who are well-to-do and can afford to pay that kind of institution for this work, and we would like to make it available to more people. And instead of devising a plan for making it available to more people, we said we'd copy what is being done. There would be more institutions, we will pay them a per diem — I understand that the per diem is now roughly 9 per day — per child to send to a day care centre, plus 600 a year, I think the Member for St. Boniface said, with regard to maintenance grants. And they are all, virtually all, in day care institutions, presided over by professionally qualified day care staff, and with people hired to do day care work.

Mr. Chairman, at the risk of being one who says that I do not want to create jobs, which I don't, I, Mr. Chairman, am of the other opinion, that I want to create a service which is more universally available, and available, Mr. Chairman, at social rather than individual expense to the extent that this is practical. And I see no reason why it could not be practical to the Nth degree. It is so recognized that when a child becomes six we are going to send him to an institution, very well built, very well heated, very well equipped, and we are all going to pay for it. When he is five we will do that at the kindergarten level. But when he is four or three, we say, we have to set up a different institution. We have to have that institution, built, equipped, heated, and staffed by people who, more and more, are saying that in order to be with children at the age of two years old during the day you have to have some type of special university qualification. I know that not to be true, Mr. Chairman, and I know it, not as a result of being a politician, but I know that as a result of my own experience in the area of child care, and I want the members to know that for years it was a field in which I was professionally hired and dealt with the upkeep of children. Not the tiny ones, I will admit it, but children from the ages of 9 to 13 at B'Nai B'Rith Camp, where we had them day and evening, and younger children in other areas, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, what is our need? Our need is that there be a place available where a parent who is working, and I don't care, as far as I am concerned, the parent who is working in a higher income group and the parent who is working in a lower income group, should have the same service available. I believe that Medicare should be available, and I repeat what I said in 1966 and which I still think should be the policy of the New Democratic Party, that it is in my interest that the public as a whole pay

for the medical costs of James Richardson's child, and the child who lives in South Indian Lake, both on the same basis. And I believe that it's in my interest, and in the interests of all of us, that if that is a kind of service that is needed, that it is in the interests of all of us that we pay for it, together, for the rich man and for the poor man, and that we do not have a complicated procedure to see how much each individual who sends the child to the institution will be required to pay on their own and how much we will pay collectively.

And I'm suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that is an ideal, but it's not an impractical ideal. As a matter of fact, it's far more practical than what we are doing. So I say, how do we achieve that? Mr. Chairman, we have public buildings located within close proximity of every working parent in the province of Manitoba, and I cannot say this with the same sort of degree of conviction in the rural areas as in the urban areas. But let's deal with the urban areas in any event, to start with, and I don't mean to leave the rural areas out. Some of my rural members will agree that there are less parents who are working parents who need the need in the rural areas, in terms of a day care institution, but I don't intend to leave them out. But in the urban areas, Mr. Chairman, we have public buildings that are heated, that are equipped, that are available for use. Because my understanding, Mr. Chairman, is that there are empty classrooms in every school, and that they are increasing, and the schools are located within walking distance of every working parent within the city of Winnipeg; that there is a classroom in those schools that could be easily converted for the purpose of having a parent bring the child down to that classroom and pick them up on the way home after work, the same way as they will do in the day care institution.

That is not an institution that we have to build, it's not an institution we have to heat, it's not an institution where we have to provide for a capital cost, and it's convenient, Mr. Chairman, and it's there. And there are other children in these institutions, which is also a good thing for children. The presence of other children is a wonderful thing for children.

But most important of all, Mr. Chairman, and this is the real part of this proposal which I ask the Minister to look to as an experiment, because he says we've got the best system in Canada. Mr. Chairman, the best system doesn't mean the one that you spend the most money on and the one that you have the most institutions for; the best system is the one that serves the need best. And I tell the Minister that there is a better way of serving the need, and if you go the route that we are now going, and add 4 million and add 8 million, and add 16 million, you are not going to have a better service. You're going to have a better paid service, you're going to have people with longer degrees and more of them looking after two and three year old children, but you're not going to have a better service.

And I say this, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the people who are now in the field. It is the purpose of everybody who is in a field to try to upgrade and professionalize their position and add a jargon to it and add degrees to it so that it appears that nobody else can do it. If you have ever seen a lawyer draw a will, he says, I give, devise and

bequeath. He doesn't say I give; doesn't say I devise; he says, I give, devise and bequeath, because a person comes in to sign a will and says, that's beautiful. It must be because he's a lawyer that he can write that. I give is just as good, I assure you. I devise is just as good.

But that's the kind of thing that professionals do. Teachers do it; doctors do it; dentists do it; lawyers do it; day care workers do it; social workers do it. I know, I was there, Mr. Chairman. I was there.

I am suggesting to you, Mr. Chairman, that such a day care facility in every school, which could handle, I would think, approximately 10 to 12 children, probably more in a classroom, I'm just thinking of the size of the classroom, certainly 10 to 12, don't forget we have to talk about cribs, we have to talk about play space, we have to talk about things which we'll make available for these children. But don't forget also, that we are dealing with much more institutions. We are dealing, Mr. Chairman, with much more institutions.

And Mr. Chairman, you do not need more than one supervisor for such an institution, because I am suggesting to the Minister that he get in touch with the Minister of Education and that he propose that in the curriculum of our junior high schools, that is children from the ages of 12 to 14, that we add a subject, and that subject be child care, and that it be a voluntary, and I suggest to you you will have absolutely no difficulty, —(Interjection)— The Member for River Heights says — Mr. Chairman, I assure you that this is coming off the top of my head, but it doesn't matter. The fact that somebody else has suggested this kind of thing merely makes me think that it is more logical, that you have a course in that school that is called child care. Don't forget, we are talking about one supervisor, and that the people who enroll for the course of child care, and I would suggest that in a junior high school you will have 30 people enroll for such a course, completely voluntary. I don't want to be accused of child labour, and it's not child labour because it is a legitimate responsibility which we want young people to have and which they will want to have, and which should be part of the curriculum, and I've seen it done, Mr. Chairman, in other countries and it works wonderfully.

And the best possible companion that you can have for an infant of one year old, two years old, three years old, the best possible companion, is a young person in the age of 13, 12, or 14 years of age. What you do, Mr. Chairman, is then say that the people who are enrolled, voluntarily, in the child care course, spend three hours a week in day care, which means, one morning or one afternoon. If you had 30 of them, Mr. Chairman, you would have 15 in the morning and 15 in the afternoon, which is three to a classroom, dealing with perhaps 15 children in the institution, and how many children would we be dealing with, Mr. Chairman? Just think of the number of schools and the number of children that we could deal with on a basis which would put the brakes on, Mr. Chairman, because frankly, I'm not impressed with the extra 4 million. I don't know what we're going to get for the extra 4 million. Will we pay higher wages? Will we have more institutions? Will we add rooms? I don't know. The Minister, at this point, doesn't know, the Member for St. Boniface

has indicated he doesn't know, but I know that money is going to go into institutionalizing yet another public service which need not be institutionalized, need not be professionalized, will be done better if it is not institutionalized, will be done better if it is not professionalized, and we will, Mr. Chairman, be building up, in our young people, a new sense of responsibility, and a new educational responsibility. Because Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind that given the interest span, given the desire, given the natural feelings of young teenage people for little children, that they will provide companionship in a day care situation which will outstrip, outdo, be far superior to a person with ten degrees after their name.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for River Heights says that it's already been done. —(Interjection)— He says, the high school kids go to the elementary school. I am now talking about a different program. I have seen it in the school, Mr. Chairman. In The Pas, they have a day care school at the Marigold. It is in the school, it is for children with special needs, but I don't know why, Mr. Chairman, we don't say that it will be for everybody's needs. And I don't want this, Mr. Chairman, as a specific targeted poor people's program. As far as I am concerned, at Tuxedo Heights school, if there are working parents, and I make that criteria, I do have that criteria, that I'm not willing to set up day care services merely because somebody wants to go shopping and bring their child in. No. It is because the parents are in the labour force. And then I don't care, Mr. Chairman, I don't care if they are millionaires. —(Interjection)— That's right. Or, as my friend says, going to school, going to university, and therefore that's a perfectly good excuse.

But Mr. Chairman, I don't care if they are millionaires, because I know that if you are giving a service and it's available to millionaires, it will be a good service, and the people who are not millionaires will therefore get a good service. There was never good Medicare service on a reasonable basis until the millionaire became a member of Medicare. There was never good tin cup educational programs until the upper class started to attend the public school system, and that's really been my greatest fear for our public school system, that the upper class will take their children out, because they'll send them to private schools. But as long as it's available to everybody and used by everybody it will be a good service, Mr. Chairman, because people who have more money are generally more particular about what's done, and they will make the demands and the demands will be available to everybody. And that's why I say you do not target in on the poor; you target in on society and the poor will benefit from that.

Mr. Chairman, I am making this suggestion. I make it to the Minister as a modest proposal. I say you can go two ways with the day care, and I don't care about the demonstrations, and I have to tell the Chairman that what I am now suggested I have suggested on numerous occasions within my own political party, and it became a question of how many union people are going to be displaced and what about the people who are now there in day care, and things of that nature. So I am looking for a new audience. I see the Minister sitting there. He

says he wants to have the best system in Canada. You be the audience.

You can go in two directions on day care. You can go the direction of making day care some type of a professional, institutionalized degree operation, or you can make child care, Mr. Chairman, part of the normal responsibility of our society, which becomes a feature of our society, starting from the youngest members of our society. And you do not have to build institutions; they are there. You do not have to heat them; they are there. They are within walking distance of the parents who have to use them. The spaces are available. There will be some money necessary; it won't come for nothing. There will be supervisors necessary. I'm not saying eliminate them all. But they should be manned, by and large, by the young people of our society as a contribution both to their own upbringing in terms of responsibility, and secondly, as a contribution that we co-operatively work together to improve living conditions in our society, the person who goes into the labor force doing his full work, and her child or his child is cared for by other members of society while he is doing that.

I would ask the Minister to consider that and instead of worrying as to how he is going to spend his 4 million, and he can't possibly spend it during the year, whatever it is, start thinking new ideas, Mr. Chairman, and start thinking them now before it's too late, because if we go the route, the traditional route of day care, we will ruin day care. We will make it completely unavailable to society because it will make it beyond the reach of people in our society and that, Mr. Chairman, will be its own undoing.

So I ask the Minister to consider that as a different direction to take on child care than has been taken to this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the Member for Inkster with interest because I have heard this proposal in the past and I share with him much of the enthusiasm he has for the suggestion.

I want to remind him, though, that it wasn't because of the concern that some union members may be displaced, I'm sorry, I disagree with him because when we first launched this program that proposal was made and at that time there was no question of unions or anybody else.

The program came into being in 1974, after a delay of about 18 months. The delay, I admit, was my fault. I refused to move until I knew where the federal government was going. That delay cost me quite a few moments of anguish everytime I met with another group, and there were many of them who pressed us very hard for day care and I had to tell them bluntly that I would not move until the federal government had made their move. I finally did move when the federal government made their announcement. We simply tied into their program. Their program was one which required groups to be incorporated — that was one of the criteria — that they be partially funded in the sense that a means test or a needs test be implemented.

As far as the proposal that we have just heard, yes, it is a good idea if it can be done. There is a concern amongst the many that if you bring it into the schools, that the school system will capture it. In other words, the school system which now goes from age five in kindergarten to age 18, that the Day Care Program will become a captive of the school system and the educational body, which includes the school boards, and the educational system will take over that day care system and will in fact extend the education program from instead of age five, down to age two, with all the accoutrements that the educational system then imposes on that kind of system. That is a danger and unless it is approached in the way that is proposed whereby it doesn't become captive of the school system, it's just that the facilities, the building, the physical facilities are used if they are available, and that the idea of using children voluntarily, because there are optional courses offered in junior high, would be as part of their educational program, would be active in working with these younger children. There is no question it would be a great educational experience. I think both the young children, that is the two, three, four, and five year olds, as well as the 13 and 14 year olds would benefit; they would both benefit.

With regard to the suggestion that there are classrooms available within walking distance, well, this is sometimes the case. The junior high may not be close at all to the primary or elementary school which is in the neighbourhood. The junior high may be quite a distance away because junior highs have been combined with high schools and sometimes are quite a distance from the neighbourhood. As well, in certain new areas, new subdivisions, the problem there is still a shortage of classrooms. There may be classroom space available in the older districts, but certainly where the bulk of the young families are congregated today, there is a shortage of classrooms and not a surplus of classrooms. I know in my own area there are some classrooms available in some schools in the older districts but the pressure is one for even more schools in the new subdivisions and, you know, it's a matter of bringing them together. It may be a transportation problem of bringing the high school or the junior high students to the elementary schools.

But it is something that merits attention and if it can be worked out so that the day care operation doesn't become captive to the school system, then it certainly merits some consideration, keeping in mind of course that it doesn't breach the federal guidelines, the federal participation, so that there will not be any loss of federal funds.

My concern, Mr. Chairman, is that with the present program as it now stands, the Minister gets up and tries to convince us that in fact this is a well thought-out program, that the department, who had a role to play, they knew all along it was coming and they were just going to leave it as a goodie in the Budget Speech. He says the justification is back in 1974 or 1975, when I first brought in the Day Care Program, I brought in a budget and didn't spend, I think, more than 600,000 on it, I think about half of what I anticipated. But that was a brand-new program; we were launching it. We had no idea of the difficulties of getting that program going. We had no idea, for example, the problems of launching family day care

and the hurdles that one would have to go through in the city of Winnipeg. They have now, in recent months, corrected it and hopefully that will make a difference, but certainly at that time we couldn't foresee it. But when we realized the next year that it wasn't going to move as rapidly because of the requirements to incorporate, because of other requirements, we reduced the amount that we asked for the next year.

Now what is happening is a different phenomena. The Minister of Finance comes in on May 13th, announces 4 million, and the next morning when asked where is that; is that in the estimates; is that next in the estimates; whereabouts is it in the Supplementary Supply, he says, I'm not sure. He looked upstairs and there was no answer from on high. He says, Well, I'll take it as notice. Then the Minister of Community Services did say, when we went into estimates that same day, that it's contained within that 28.6 million under Finance. How it is going to get from Finance to Community Services is something that the Finance Department and the auditors will have to work out because it's not even in the appropriations of Community Services. It will have to be lapsed in one department and a Special Warrant passed in another department to make that money available, because you can't just transfer funds at will.

Beit as it may, the Minister knows full well that if he hasn't got a very clear idea of what is going to happen, that nothing is really going to be spent by September 1st when this thing comes into being. The mere fact that every day care centre has to be incorporated, must be incorporated, that in itself takes time. The group has to get together; they have to determine that they want a day care centre; they have to determine where it's going to operate from. Then they have to incorporate it. You can't do that between August and September, or July and September, and he won't have many details. I believe yesterday he indicated that the program is being developed and new application forms should be available in July. Fine, but there's no way, between July and September, and that much is going to happen, simply because of the mechanics that are required to go through.

It is as simple as this. The government decided that they had to do something to improve their image. They felt they had an image problem, so they brought in these goodies, hopefully to change the image of their party. But to suggest that this is thought-out and it's planned and they know where they are going, it isn't so, and I know he is not going to spend that money.

The result is that next spring we are going to have the Minister of Finance announce that the deficit is not 139 million, we've reduced the deficit; as this year, because they reduced, they underspent 3.7 million on the social security programs. They were able to say: See, we underspent, we reduced the deficit. We're good managers. Next year, out of the 4 million, if they spend a million they will be doing remarkably well. They will say: See, we reduced the deficit by 3 million, just on this alone. We're geniuses.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that they could have announced this program, they could have done as they did on the Supplementary Supply under

Community Services, as they asked for 225,000 for Brandon, for the ARM Program in Brandon. They could have brought in an amount which they think they might be able to spend, but 4 million they couldn't possibly spend. It is window dressing. It is an attempt to capture people's imagination.

If by some fluke the thing moved so beautifully that people are sitting out there all organized and ready to go and, poof, it falls into place September 1 and it just runs after that right up until April 1, the end of the fiscal year. If they in fact needed more money, they could have Special Warranted it, as they do all through the year. Always Special Warrants are being passed and Special Warrants are covered off by lapsing in other departments. I suggest that the lapsing, there will be Special Warrants this year and this will be one of the items that is offsetting these Special Warrants, because this will lapse, most of it will lapse. They are going to need it for fire fighting. They asked for 2 million more. I hope they don't need 2 million more, but the way it's going, that 2 million isn't going to last long.

The drought condition — I'm not critical at all — the Minister didn't get up and say, We're going to need 5 million, 10 million for drought, to cope with this drought. I don't expect him to do that because you don't budget for a hypothetical or maybe thing. You budget for what is known or what you think will happen. It's like budgeting at the municipal level — looking at the Member for River Heights — for snow clearing. You have no idea whether you are going to have a blizzard in October and November, December, January or February. You have no idea; it's in somebody else's hands. But they don't budget for the worst year they ever had. They don't, and they hope that it works out, but if they need more, well, they spend it, so they've got it. It's an unknown factor.

Mr. Chairman, what bothers me, too, about what has occurred this year is that the increase which is taking place and actually from 1977-78 to now the increase has been in the chargeable fee, the amount that can be charged, the user charge has gone up 42 percent. It went from 6.00 to 6.80, from 6.80 it jumped to 8.50, and I am talking about Day Care Centres, plus an optional 1, that is in the Group Day Care Centres. Now the Minister says, well, nobody has really moved to 9.50 yet, nobody has taken advantage of that option, that is not going to happen. I say if it is there, inevitably they will move to it.

I recall the Minister indicated that those who are being subsidized the government will not pay that optional 1.00, but I gathered the other day, that is what I thought he said a few weeks ago, and now recently he did say the government would, however, pay that optional 1.00. —(Interjection)— No? Then I am still not clear.

What bothers me is this, Mr. Chairman. This program was designed to make it possible for people on modest incomes, who are working, who need day care services to participate. I am told, I understand that about 40 percent of the children in Day Care Centres are subsidized, about 60 percent are not subsidized. So you have a situation now where someone, parent or parents, on a moderate income are being asked to pay, what is it? 2,100, 2,200 a year, that is what it costs them at 8.50 per day. That

Tuesday, 27 May, 1980

is what it costs them. Someone who is working, they are fighting to keep their home, they are fighting to make ends meet, the wife is working, the husband is working, their joint incomes are not that high, they are just making it, and you are asking them to pay over 2,100 a year if they have one child in Day Care. I tell you this is a deterrent.

If you want to ruin the program, if you want to discourage the use, then keep raising that per diem charge, and that is what you are doing. We purposely kept it, we established it and we tried to keep it low, and we denied a request that Day Care Centres should be able to charge more if they wanted to. We did it very consciously because we didn't want Day Care Centres to be in the position where they said, well, look, it is true you can only pay 6.00, but we have got somebody who can pay 8.00 or 9.00 or 10.00, so sorry, we would like to take your child, but, you know, dollars count and we are going to take the 9.00 or 10.00 child. We said it is a uniform rate, that is the maximum that can be charged, but that is now being breached.

My concern is that what is happening is not the very low income, the person on welfare, the person who is just getting by or is just living above welfare, an incentive program of some kind, who needs day care, they are going to be subsidized. I am talking about the people, the tens of thousands who are working today, working mothers, to whom 8.50 a day, 2,100 a year is just too darn much money. If you are talking about discouraging people from working, then this is how to do it. It went from 6.00 to 6.80, and then 8.50, with a possible 9.50 is what it is coming to, because although nobody may be charging 9.50 today, and I will tell you why, because it is just too much money. I suspect within a year the Day Care Centres are going to say, well, look, we can go another dollar, we need the money, so let's go another dollar, because our maintenance grant is frozen, so let's go another dollar to 9.50. Then what happens to those people? Those people are going to have to take their children out and they are going to have to try to get some optional arrangement, of which there are many. Because as you know, Mr. Chairman, or Mr. Minister, that there are many many children who are not in Day Care Centres, either family or group care; they are in private homes, they are in arrangements with some babysitter, somebody down the street; they are unlicensed, in many cases there are too many children in those facilities, but that is what they will end up with, because you are going to be chasing them out and forcing them out. Every time you increase that per diem charge the person on the lowest level of income, that person will be subsidized; the one who is just slightly above or even considerably above is going to be socked, you are going to sock it to them, you are going to discourage the use of Day Care. Pumping more money into it isn't going to help you any, it isn't going to help you at all, you can go to 50 million. You impose a user fee of the kind you are doing and you are not going to get utilization, and then you are going to be able to stand up and say, well, you know, there isn't any demand, we've got empty spaces, and therefore, there is no demand for day care. That is going to be the position of this government. We have provided, the money is there, so on the one hand money is being put in; on the

other hand, the regulations are such that you are going to discourage use of the Day Care, except for those who either are very wealthy or who, because of very low incomes, do qualify for total subsidy.

Maybe that is where you are heading for. Maybe really what you are trying to do is get a program that only people on very very low incomes qualify, because certainly throughout the White Paper you talk about need, and your definition of need. Need is, as it was indicated the other night, the wretched poor, but if you are the affluent poor, you have had it. The wretched poor will qualify, they will be subsidized; those just above what you consider wretched poor, they will be pushed out, because you take 2,100 out of a family that is living on 15,000, 16,000 or 14,000, and that is too much money, that is too costly, and they are not going to be able to afford it. They will take that child out and that is for one child, that is for one child. Woebetide, if they had two they would really be in trouble.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is all I would have to say on Day Care. I am not impressed with what we have had to date from the Minister. Forgetting entirely, setting aside this whole new thrust of 4 million, the program, and I would have said exactly what I said if that announcement hadn't been made. The program, as it is developing in Manitoba, a program which the Minister conceded was the best in Canada, and it was indeed the best in Canada, without a doubt it was the best in Canada. You know, in 1977 we had something like 5,200 children in Day Care; in 1980, three years later, we finally got 5,288, 88 more children, so it has been in a freeze situation pretty well all the time.

We went from 1974 when it was first launched, it was sometime mid-term, from 375 places in 1975 to 2,300 places in 1976, 4,400 places in 1977, 5,200 places, and then it's frozen. Pumping more money in, if you retain this schedule of payment, is not going to increase it, because the cost is just too high for the average family to bear, and I am talking about average family. You are not going to encourage the use of Day Care, and so putting another 4 million into it, 6 million or 2 million, I predict is not going to make any difference.

What you have done this year, Mr. Minister, you designed a program which in a sense is self-destruct. You are creating a situation where a certain type of income will be able to avail themselves, the others are going to be frozen out and squeezed out over time. You are going to tell me that not everybody has gone to 8.50, that's right. Only 50 percent have gone up to 8.50. Since May 1st, they could have raised it, but not all of them have done it. I suspect that a lot of them are going through until maybe June, July, but by next fall they will be at 8.50, because their costs will have risen, and then they will all be at 8.50. If they are not at 8.50 today it is because they know that if they suddenly went from 6.80 to 8.50, they would lose children immediately, because that extra 1.70 a day would immediately force some people to take their children out, and so that is why they haven't moved to the 8.50. It isn't that they don't need the money, but they realize that the parents of the children can't afford it.

My criticism is that what we have seen developed in the Day Care Program, on the one hand, the actuality, the reality of what is going to happen to the

Tuesday, 27 May, 1980

Day Care Program versus the dazzle of the White Paper, the two are not compatible. Announcing huge increases on the one hand and a program with the kind of regulations that you have here create a situation where inevitably the Day Care Program is going to simply be impacted upon in such a way that it not only will not grow, it will stagnate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, first with regard to the Honourable Member for Inkster's statements. I wonder if the Honourable Member for Inkster might be available for my meeting with the Coalition for Day Care when I meet with them in their office, because I agree with many of his statements, not necessarily all of them, but some of the basic ideas that he is putting forward, but I can assure him that it is contradictory to the present Day Care groups.

I would just like to say, Mr. Chairman, that, first off, I have concerns about the Day Care Program becoming institutionalized and that is why it is community based. That is exactly why we are reinforcing that, Mr. Speaker, and that is why we changed the fact that the salaried employees can only form 20 percent of those Boards, and that the Board has to be a minimum of five people to get the input of the mothers and the families within the community that run and operate the facilities. That is why we said that we subsidize the parents, we don't run the Day Care Program. I want to assure the honourable members that is the policy that I follow and our government follows and which their government followed, that we are concerned that it might become institutionalized. My idea of Day Care is what do we want in the Day Care Program? What did my mother give me? What did my mother give the child she looked after, who was a neighbour's child when she became a grandma, because I left our place, and she had time on her hands? What did basically provide? She provided a healthy and safe living condition —(Interjection)— Yes, tender loving care primarily and nutrition, and that is what we look to in the Day Care Program that we presently have and want to reinforce. When we get into early child development or pre-school education, my belief is that should be in the Minister of Education's program, not in the Day Care Program, and I have reinforced that, so there is no argument there.

Mr. Chairman, the only comment I might indicate with regard to the fact that the Honourable Member for Inkster has indicated that we should utilize school classrooms, there are some Day Care Programs in classrooms at the present time. One of the problems we are running into, and this is why we will be meeting with the different school divisions or major ones, is that they are now charging, in my opinion, exorbitant rent. They are charging, I think, the Health Science Centre Day Care 15,000 a year. So we have to work with the Minister of Education and with the local school boards to try and encourage them that if there are classrooms available, let's utilize them. This is the way I have already talked to the Minister of Education with regard to the Noon and After School Program, because some of the programs that are in existence now, that were either federally financed or we are not involved in, are operating out of schools. I

know there is one in Assiniboine School in my constituency and there is one, I think, at Heritage School, I believe, in Westwood area.

I want to indicate that our thinking at the present time is that again it would be operated by parents, a community-based operation that either tied in with the existing day care centres or with new organizations but again family operated or community operated and not by the school itself.

My one concern would be that if we follow through on the proposal that the Honourable Member for Inkster has said about the fact that let's utilize the students in the classrooms to look after these children and put in programs, you're getting tied very closely to the education system and it could slip into an institutional-type program. This would be my only concern in that regard.

I might indicate to the Honourable Member for Inkster that there are, I understand, some high schools, several high schools who have providing a child services type of course, or child studies course and that there are some day care centres utilizing these students. But again it's contradictory to some of the people in day care program that they feel they are not qualified to look after younger people.

The other thing is that I want to advise the honourable member that we are reinforcing the family day care program like we did in our initial stages and, obviously, if we can find the private homes who want to provide this service in the community we'll encourage that. I have understood and my understanding now is that the city of Winnipeg has changed their bylaw regarding family day care and it's not considered as special type of application of a residential facility and now can simply get the licence or the right to operate such a facility in a residential area providing that it's a ground level entrance to the facility.

With regard to the question about the cost. I agree with the Honourable Member for Inkster that spending more money doesn't necessarily mean that you're going to have a better system. And why I said I thought we had a good system and the best system in Canada is if you relate back to other provinces, as a yardstick of what the subsidized fee rates are, I indicated last night that Newfoundland's maximum subsidized daily fee is 10.00. Obviously, it's more costly, they are looser, they are spending more money there. Again, the province of Quebec was 13.00, so obviously they are spending more money there. Ontario is 13.00 for the average and Ontario is 20.00 for the infant. Alberta is 11.50 and British Columbia is 9.00, so that —(Interjection)— But all I'm saying is that ties in to what the Honourable Member for Inkster is saying, keep the cost down, and also the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, says keep the cost down.

With regard to comments from the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, one of the things that he has indicated, that it is a self-destruct program. I completely disagree with the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks when he makes that statement, because it is geared, in our opinion, for the affordability to the taxpayer as well to the affordability of the user. At the present time we have waiting lists for people to get into Day Care Programs. They are willing to pay this amount, the user's fee. I would point out that with regard to what we have allowed for the

maximum user's fee, the daily fee, in Winnipeg 30 percent of them are still at 6.80 or less; 20 percent of them are still 7.00 to 8.00; and 50 percent are at 8.50; but in the rural areas, 85 percent are still at less than 6.80; and 15 percent are between 7.00 and 8.00, and none of them are at 8.50. When you compare the average, only 50 percent have changed above the 6.80 at the present time; 20 percent have gone between 7.00 and 8.00; and 30 percent have gone up to the 8.50, when you look at the overall Day Care Program.

Mr. Chairman, it is not a self-destruct program. We feel that they are fair rates and with the fact that it is the parents or the community base that are operating these facilities, they will decide what level their users can afford to pay.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, on one hand, indicates that we should increase the maintenance grant. Mr. Chairman, I have said it before and I will say it again, I am not prepared at the present time to ask a taxpayer who is earning 15,000 or 20,000 a year, whose wife is at home with their children looking after them, to contribute in taxes for more than 500 a child, of somebody who could be earning 50,000 or 70,000 a year, in say, the Health Sciences Day Care, a doctor, they get the use of that 500 maintenance grant, and I don't believe that is a sensible approach to it. Now I have asked my staff to look at enriching the subsidy of the daily rate based on the income, and in that regard I want to indicate to the Honourable Member for Inkster, when he talks about self-destruct and our rates are high and only the — which I don't count — which he has tagged the wretched poor, benefit. Just to give you a comparison of our subsidy or full subsidy available. If there are two parents with one child, in British Columbia they can earn up to 7,860, and they would get full subsidy; in Alberta, it is 10,860; we are only second to Alberta, the individuals here can earn up to 9,550, and that is net take-home pay. Again there will be partial subsidy in Manitoba up to 11,030, that is second in terms of being the best. It is second to Alberta only, who is at 11,784 before it is cut off. With regard to two parents with one child, which could be considered the middle income people of whatever, Manitoba is second only again to Alberta who allows full subsidy up to 14,220; we allow full subsidy up to 13,970 income, and again that is net, take home, but we are first when it comes to cut off. We allow up to 19,870, whereas Alberta allows up to 19,464, so I say to you honourable gentlemen opposite that we have a pretty fair program when it comes to subsidy based on income earning. I have asked our staff to look at and to bring back recommendations and costs to see if, in fact, we might look at changing that, but I feel that at the present time a maintenance grant of 500 is a fair amount to provide any family, regardless of income, who utilizes this particular program.

It is a costly program, as was mentioned by the Honourable Member for Inkster, it is more costly than educating a child in our schools. If we are subsidizing the full amount, the 2,700, when we count the 500 for the maintenance and the 2,200 users if they are at 8.50, it is more expensive. I think the average cost to the government for educating a student is somewhere in the order of 2,300.00. Now recognizing that we are responsible for the child 60

more days, and in the summertime as well, so that we can account for that cost; and also recognizing that there is a nutrition component in this program, so that I have asked the Day Care people how much of their money goes into nutrition and they say approximately 10 percent, but even if we apply that 10 percent, roughly it still costs more.

We are aware of this expense and that is why we have encouraged the community-based or reinforced what was already in existence with our Board changes and also with the increase in Family Day Care Centres, because we feel this is one way that we can provide this service.

I am a little concerned when the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks mentions licencing, because that can lead to institutionalizing too. If we start to go into every Family Day Care that maybe is privately being done by a little old lady, who is a grandmother on Linwood Street, who wants to provide the service to a neighbour. I don't think we should start to get inside the house and say, well, you know, you've got to get a licence and so on, if the arrangements have been made with the neighbours.

MR. DESJARDINS: That is not Family Day Care.

MR. MINAKER: That is private family day care. There are people out, Mr. Chairman, with the Coalition Centre that thinks that everybody should be licenced, even if they are just a neighbour looking after . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: We never said that.

MR. MINAKER: I am just saying that if we start to licence and really control everything down to the last item, then we will lead to institutionalizing.

Mr. Chairman, also just to advise that 45 to 50 percent in the Group Day Care Programs are subsidized, 45 to 50 percent of the spaces, and 60 percent in the Family Day Care portion will be subsidized proportionately, and the government input is 33 percent, so that is the other problem in trying to maximize the use of the federal government. If we increase that maintenance, right now the Feds are only providing 165 of the 500, so then that increases the cost again, so these are things that we try to look at.

I accept the honourable members' opposite comments with regard to ways that it can be changed. I will give them consideration and I will be looking at all of these items and trying to come forward with enrichments in the Day Care Program that we feel will be beneficial to as many people as we can, and that hopefully we will come forward with a Noon and After School Program that will be the best for the people in Manitoba and for the most number of people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister has indicated that he would have problems with the type of suggestion that is being made and he identified two problems; he said the Coalition for Day Care. Well, Mr. Chairman, I indicated to the Minister that there are people who are wedded to the existing

Tuesday, 27 May, 1980

system, in one way or another, who will cause problems, because I met those problems in discussing this type of program. I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, that because these problems will exist, and I clearly said that, don't change what you are doing, in principle, but start something new. And start something new on the basis that you are going to see whether you can provide an additional, and in my respectful view, a better service, which would be made available to more people, which would be made universally available, which will be paid for at social cost and at much less expense, and which will get us out of what the Member for Seven Oaks is talking about, because what he says is perfectly true. It doesn't matter if you are able to reduce it by 10 percent. If you are going to be at the area of 9.00 instead of 8.00 and it costs a family 160 a month instead of 200 a month, it is not going to change the essential availability and accessibility to the program.

So you have to make a radical departure, and that is nothing new that when you are making a radical departure you are going to run into vested interests. If you go to the Manitoba Medical Association and say, how should we handle the delivery of medical services? They will say, fee-for-service; they will say, fee-for-servie. They will say, Mr. Chairman, as they did say, not only should it be fee-for-service, but we want an undertaking that it won't be any other way than fee-for-service. I can tell you that is where the previous government drew the line. We said, fee-for-service medicare as far as we are concerned is here, but we are not going to guarantee that no other forms of service will be available, and I am saying to the Minister that I expect that he will have problems with the people who are presently providing this service, and I don't wish to criticize those people. — (Interjection)— Well, good, then don't ask me to come in and help you at your meeting. If you want me to do that, move over, Mr. Chairman, now you can use my remarks if you want. You can absolutely quote me that I said to these people, yes, but we are going to look for new ways.

When you tell me that the school is charging you a rent, the only reason that the school is charging you a rent is that they see the money. They say if a person is in a day care institution the government provides 8.00 a day on a subsidized basis, or the parent must pay that amount of money, and if they are going to have to pay it elsewhere, we are going to pay it here and we are going to have that money available. But I say, Mr. Chairman, that is false economy and that is false economics. The only amount that the school should get is the difference between what it now costs them to run the school and what it will cost to run the school if they have one of the classrooms available for day care.

Mr. Chairman, after all, we control both ends. If we are going to pay the school the amount that you normally paid the other institution and have that as available to the school so the government won't have to give the school 15,000 less on whatever program or they'll collect 15,000 less from their ratepayers, we haven't done anything. It should be, Mr. Chairman, on an experimental basis, and I'm asking the Minister to consider it on an experimental basis, that there is a school, that there is a classroom, that the classroom is not being used. There are such

schools. There are such classrooms. They are located in an area where there are parents who need day care. That a supervisor be put in; that there be an arrangement with the school that in the curriculum of the school there will be a subject called child care; that the supervisor will then teach child care to these youngsters who will come in on a voluntary elective basis to take that course, and be with children during the day.

Now, as I read the expense, whatever food is provided in a day care situation is a cost, so you have to take that cost. Whatever the supervisor costs is a cost; you have to take that cost. Whatever the radiator has to be turned up to have the heat go into that classroom is a cost. There are toys, and Mr. Chairman, I believe that toys will be easily collected in the community. If we decide that we're going to do things this way and we're not going to run around and say that everything has to be done in accordance with forms and bureaucrats, and a system designed to create something which makes what my friend, the Member for Seven Oaks describes as a self-destruct.

You start from the position that people are going to have this available at social cost, and I say, Mr. Chairman, on the figures that I have just given you, it would not cost the government more money than they are presenting spending, and you wouldn't have to charge the parents anything. I don't believe that parents should find it a financial advantage to put their child in a day care situation, so there are certain costs which I suppose could be there just to make sure that nobody is being taken advantage of. In other words, a parent would have a child at home, there would be food costs at home, and therefore those costs are merely transferred from the home to the place where the child is. But if my friend, the Minister, thinks that all I'm suggesting is that you take the physical institution, change it to the school, that's not what I'm suggesting. I'm saying that the school is there, that therefore the only cost that should be charged to the day care institution is the marginal cost above what the school would have to pay if the institution wasn't there, that the staff be entirely reduced to the point that we are dealing only with a supervisor and the people who are voluntarily involved in the child care program which is made available in the schools.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize professional jealousies. I recognize that the educationalists will say they want it, and the day careists will say they want it, I am quite satisfied that it still be done by those people who are in the professional area of day care, but Mr. Chairman, if they don't see it this way; in other words, if they say, we can only handle day care in accordance with certain professional standards which we have already set up, then I say, we have to say, well we're going to have to try something different. We're going to interrupt what you are doing, but we are going to have to try something different.

Mr. Chairman, if we moved in this direction and it was successful, which I believe it can be very successful, universal socially-financed day care could be made available to every working parent in greater Winnipeg, and it would not be at an expense to that parent of 200 a month, and it would not cost us 200 a month. It would not cost us, Mr. Chairman, more than what we are now subsidizing on the basis of an

Tuesday, 27 May, 1980

understandable, under the circumstances, needs test as to the day care institution. But the Member for Seven Oaks is right, that kind of thing in the long run winds up in wretched poor being able to get it at virtually no payment and people who are relatively well-to-do, relatively affluent, buying it, and the entire middle group saying, it's not for me. That's what will happen, Mr. Chairman.

I'm trying to urge upon the Minister that he find a way out of this direction where this program is going, because it's going there, Mr. Chairman. We are going to have sort of a day care professionalism built up. Pretty soon you will only be able to do it if you are licensed, like the member says. It used to be that children could play with children, or that a child could be called in to look after another child. But there will be licensing, there will be academic qualifications, there will be professional standards and I guess that I have to accept the fact that that is the case, and not downgrade it, and that's why I am willing, Mr. Chairman, not to put all the eggs in one basket, not to say, wipe out the old and bring in the new. Let the old continue, as we said, with the fee for service medicine, we said exactly the same thing. We said, fee for service medicine is what you are doing. We're not going to stop you, but we are going to try to have a different system available to those who wish to use it. I am not sure that we made as much strides as we could have but it was a difficult field, Mr. Chairman, and unfortunately at the present time in the province of Manitoba, it is still the case that fee for service medicine is the major, to a large degree more than major, way of obtaining medical services.

But with day care, you are not yet as solidly entrenched in the institution as you are with the Manitoba Medical Association. You can get more solidly entrenched if you wish, and your question to me shows that you have a problem. Will you be there with the coalition of day care people? Mr. Chairman, I'm not concerned that we do only what the coalition of day care people say. They have a role and they are to be paid attention to, and we are not to undermine their efforts. But we are to look for new directions, Mr. Chairman, because the direction we are going into has been described, correctly in my opinion, by the Member for Seven Oaks, as being the destruction of the program. Therefore, let's find a direction which will provide the service on a different basis, and if it doesn't work, at least we will say we have tried. If we don't do anything, I think that the road ahead is very clear and we will not be able to provide the kind of service that the very people who are asking for it would like to see available to the parents, male and female in the province of Manitoba, who want to be in the labour force and have children who need to be cared for while they are in the labour force.

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

MR. JAY COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. In my travels through the constituency of Churchill and particularly through the communities of Lynn Lake, Leaf Rapids, Gillam and Churchill, I have run across, in the past number of years, a growing desire and need for day care facilities in those particular

communities. I would ask the Minister now, if by way of background, he could indicate how many placements there are for day care in northern Manitoba, and by that I mean north of the 53rd, and if he could specifically indicate how many of those would fall into the constituency of Churchill's boundaries?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, it's my understanding that under NorMan, we have four family day care centres, and we have six group centres, for a total of 10. The actual numbers of spaces are 19 in the family and 194 in the group, for a total of 213. And in Thompson, there is six group day care centres, there is no family, and a total of 231 spaces. So there would be a total of approximately 424, I believe.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I ask the Minister if he could break that down further into how many spaces there would be in the communities of Lynn Lake, Leaf Rapids, Gillam and Churchill, in specific?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I will take that as notice and I'll get him the information, like I have on other occasions.

MR. COWAN: Certainly I can appreciate the fact that the Minister may not have that detailed a breakdown available to him immediately. While he is getting the information, or between now and the time that he does get that information, I'd just like to put a few comments on the record, because I do believe that they are worthy of the consideration of the Minister and his government.

When we speak of day care, far too often we are speaking about the city of Winnipeg and the surrounding area. The northern communities, in specific the smaller northern communities, are, for the most part, devoid of those types of programs, yet the needs of the individuals in those communities are perhaps, well they are in fact as important as the needs of Winnipeggers and, in many cases, they have special needs that come as a result of living in a remote community that would lead one to believe that day care could be as much benefit, if not more benefit, to them in that environment than it could to people in the city.

By that, I mean if you are a working single parent in a northern Manitoba remote community, there are not the types of support services available to you that there are in the city. If you have taken it upon yourself as part of a family unit to have both parents working, which is now becoming more and more a necessity as the cost of living increases in the rapid fashion that it has been over the past number of years, then you again lack many of the support services available to people who live in the city.

There will be those who will say, well, that's a part of northern living, and you have to take it as it comes in the north. Well, that is not the case, nor should it be the case. The fact is that northerners have every right to access to day care as do southerners. The fact is that northerners have the same needs for day care as do southerners. The fact is that for too many years now — and I'm not blaming this on any one particular government,

Tuesday, 27 May, 1980

because I think it's a historical problem — but for too many years now, there has not been that access available to them. I've talked to many women who are stuck in the homes in northern Manitoba because there is a lack of day care. Their husband may work in the mine, may work at another support service job in the community, is out of the house eight hours a day, they may have small children, and they, too, would like to participate in the economy by working at a productive job, and because of the lack of facilities, they find it impossible to do so.

There are not the types of nuclear family relationships in northern Manitoba that you find in the rural areas or that you find in the southern areas, because of the fact that many of the people who do migrate there are young and they are migrating on their own; they are, in fact, leaving their own family to start their own lives. So they don't have the types of familial support services such as grandmothers, such as aunts and uncles, that in many instances could provide some opportunity for persons or parents, who are locked in their homes, to get out for a while.

As you well know, or should know, in northern Manitoba we don't have the access to entertainment that they have in the south; we don't have the access to other activities that they have in the south. So for a person to be stuck in their home, it can be a far more traumatic experience and in many instances, it is traumatic — I don't use that word advisedly at all. I have seen the effects of what we commonly refer to as becoming bushed or cabin fever, especially in women who are in a community without family, without a large group of friends around them, and who have to spend long hours in the house because there is no day care facility available to them. There are jobs available to them, although there probably could be more, but the fact is that those whose families have grown, or that don't have families, are able to find the types of jobs, even if they are only part-time, that allow them to break away from the home for a while. There is also opportunity for them to participate in other sorts of organized activities if they were, in fact, provided with access to day care.

It is not a southern problem; it is not a problem that is confined only to those in the larger cities; it is a problem that permeates our entire society and, in fact, does play a profound role in shaping the lives and also in causing many of the problems that northern parents face.

So I can only encourage the Minister, while he is looking up the figures, to review the entire situation in northern Manitoba, in the smaller remote communities, to see if there are not ways and means of providing more day care spaces, because I can tell him right now, there are not enough. I can tell him right now that there is a need for many more, especially in communities such as Lynn Lake, Leaf Rapids, Gillam and Churchill. There is also a need for day care facilities in the Metis communities and in reserve communities, although in the reserve communities they may run into jurisdictional problems. I am certain that those problems can be worked out if the proper procedures are followed and if the determination to work them out is present.

So while I am speaking particularly to the industrial communities right now, I don't mean to confine my

remarks entirely to the industrial communities. I believe that the entire situation in northern Manitoba has to be closely examined and there has to be new options built into the system. There has to be an extension of a service, which is a relatively new service. If we listen to the figures given to us by the Member for Seven Oaks we realize just how new it is.

So perhaps we can forgive the fact, or at least we can understand the fact, that there are not those services available in northern Manitoba, as there should be, because of the fact that it is a new service and it has to grow in a systematic way. But I believe that we have reached a point, and I believe we reached it a number of years ago, I know that it is somewhat overdue now, where we can start to extend the service, where we can start to expand the service. The Minister is talking about a fairly substantial sum of money that they have provided for expansion of the service, yet we haven't heard anything specific about northern Manitoba, which leads me to believe, given the historical perspective, that money is not going to be directed towards that area. Now that may be an assumption that I should not make, that may be an assumption that is unfair, but until actually hearing that there are plans to extend the service and expand the service, it is an assumption that I have to make, based purely on history.

So the Minister will be looking at the figures and I think when he looks at him he will come to the conclusion and the determination that the need is there. I will hope that he will give it considerable thought. I am passing on the concerns of a great number of constituents who, on the doorstep, have expressed this situation to me time and time again, and it is not confined to any specific community in the north, it appears to be, at least in my constituency, constituency-wide. I am certain that the same situation exists in Cranberry Portage; I am certain that the same situation exists in Snow Lake. In most of the smaller industrial communities you will find those sorts of problems.

So I would ask the Minister if we can have a commitment from him to, firstly, investigate the situation; and, secondly, to find some money to provide more spaces in those communities that, to date, have not had the same access to day care facilities that other communities have had in this province.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I will definitely take the honourable member's comments under consideration and I can advise him that one of the primary criteria, No. 1, will be need in terms of location of day care centres, and it was indicated earlier in the debate; and also to reinforce the existing system, which I think I indicated when I announced the changes earlier in the year, that was what we are proposing to do.

So I guarantee that the north will be given fair consideration.

MR. COWAN: Just to that point, Mr. Chairperson, I would ask the Minister how his department is going about determining an actual need in a community. Is there a process by which they poll the communities, or a process by which they do surveys in the

community, or are they doing this from a centralized location and trying to determine from past records and determine from their own department's considerations where a need may exist?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, at the present time we have a day care worker, a co-ordinator that works out of Thompson, that visits the various different day care centres at least once a year and, again, twice a year, and in cases like in that area probably more often, to put in resource input as well as to investigate the needs of additional spaces. I believe, too, that with the announcement we made earlier in the year, that letters went out to the existing day cares offering them a 10 percent increase to their spaces, so that this was one of the ways we had followed up prior to the present large expansion that we are proposing. But we will be taking letters of enquiry, like we do at the present time, and we have a list of where there have been requests for day care centres that we will give consideration to.

MR. COWAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. I would just advise the Minister if they are going on the basis of that day care worker's activities, and if that day care worker is indeed only visiting those areas that have existing day care centres now, they will be, in fact, missing a large portion of northern Manitoba because the areas that don't have, the smaller communities that don't have day care facilities far outnumber those that do. So, again, I would hope that they would depend more on the letters of enquiry that have come into the office, because I know they have come in from almost every community, rather than try to expand the day care centres where they already exist. That is an important part of the Minister's activities, to expand existing centres, but I think equally as important, at this point, is to make a change and to try to provide day care centres where they don't already exist, to expand the system in that way also, not only internally, but externally.

I would also ask the Minister, when he does do further research as to where these day care facilities are existing, if he could perhaps report back as to what sort of enquiries have been coming into his office in regard to day care facilities, and by that I would hope that he would report back as to the general interest by community, so that we can have also access to some of the information that he has with regard to the existing need, and that will help us, I believe, in our role as Opposition, provide the sort of support that is necessary to the Minister and is also necessary to those persons that are making enquiries on behalf of their communities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I would have to indicate my agreement with the comments of my colleague in terms of day care in northern Manitoba, and my agreement with my colleagues for Seven Oaks and St. Boniface in terms of the overall nature of the program and what has happened to that program since the changeover in government.

Mr. Chairman, further to the questions from the Member for Churchill, I think the Minister has the information there in terms of The Pas itself. Is the one day care centre there classified as a Family Day Care Centre, or a Group Day Care Centre, and what are the number of spaces available at that centre?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, unfortunately we don't have The Pas broken out separately, I believe that falls under NorMan, and there are four Family and six Group Centres, but we don't have the breakdown on it. I can get that information for the honourable member when I gather the other information that the Honourable Member for Churchill has requested.

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I wonder if the Minister could now expand a little bit on the discussion we had earlier in terms of the Marigold Centre at The Pas and what he sees unfolding at this time now that they have announced that there are some more fundings for the program, finally, and that the freeze will therefore be lifted. One, has he heard from the people from the Marigold Centre within the last couple of weeks? Two, should they just sit back and wait and hope that something happens in September? I understand it will be September before there will be any real indication from the Minister as to what is going to happen. What steps can they be taking right now and what does the Minister see unfolding?

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is we have their application on file. We haven't heard from them in the past couple of weeks, but I gave the Honourable Member for The Pas my assurance that we were giving preference to those facilities that were existing that may not necessarily be funded under the present Day Care Program. I don't know what else I can give in terms of assurance to the honourable member, but we will be giving them preference.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairman, as I understood the Minister's previous comments, or his comments, at least, Budget night when he hollered across the floor that, in fact, the increased funding for day care would certainly mean that a place like the Marigold Centre would be on high priority. I wonder if the Minister could just comment on that.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, I thought I just did. I don't know what else the Honourable Member for Churchill wants from me. I can't give him the exact dollars that we are going to give to them; I just said that we would give them preference and I would presume that they will qualify. I can assure him that. Okay, that's all. What else can I say?

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, I can remind the Minister that I'm the Member for The Pas and not the Member for Churchill.

Mr. Chairperson, what action should the people that are fund raising now and trying to keep the Marigold Centre in operation, what action should they be taking immediately, or should they just be waiting until September?

Tuesday, 27 May, 1980

MR. MINAKER: I would suggest that they write to us again, Mr. Chairman.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Chairperson, there is one other area, and I wonder if the Minister, since he is fairly new at this position, has had a chance to give it consideration yet. It is one that affected us when we were in office, with the Day Care Program, and that is, Mr. Chairperson, there was a meeting held in Cross Lake, I think in 1976 or early 1977, and there was a resolution passed, this was mostly native people who were of Treaty status, requesting that the Provincial Day Care Program equally apply to Treaty people. I wonder if the Minister has had a chance to give that consideration. I would assume that he hasn't and that it's certainly not a high priority on the part of his government. One, is because the Day Care Program has been frozen anyway; two, because he's not sure yet what the nature of the expanded program will be when it comes into effect; and, three, Mr. Chairperson, the general attitude of the provincial government has been to, in fact, cut out provincial programs that previously applied to Treaty Indians, and this is one that didn't previously apply to Treaty Indians. For example, there have cut out the Critical Home Repair Program as it applies to reserves; they have cut out the Communities Economic Development Fund lending moneys to a reserve and have pretty well taken the position, I think, that the only consideration that Treaty Indians get is still through the unconditional grant and a grant to the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood, a core grant. I am assuming that the Minister is not intending to extend this program to Treaty people. At the same time, Mr. Chairperson, what has happened is that a committee that used to function to attempt to get the federal government to live up to its responsibilities for Treaty Indians, I don't think is operational anymore. Maybe he can inform me whether his department is involved, whether there is an ongoing committee of the Manitoba Indian Brotherhood in the province of Manitoba to negotiate with the federal government to insure that the federal government does, in fact, live up to its responsibilities for treaty Indians. This has always been a problem area, Mr. Chairperson, and under the previous government we were trying to negotiate and ensure that treaty Indians were not hurt because the federal government was withdrawing programs, and in fact, we estimated at that time, in early 1977, Mr. Chairperson, that about 30 million that the province was paying for programs that affect the treaty Indians should, in fact, be paid by the federal government, and the province could, perhaps in co-operation with the Indian brotherhood, recover 30 million which we could put into worthwhile economic development projects.

So I'm wondering if the Minister has had a chance to look at the provision of these services to treaty Indians and if he has any comment.

MR. MINAKER: No, I haven't, Mr. Chairman. I can say that with regards, I believe the honourable member is referring to the tripartite committee, that the subcommittee of the tripartite committee dealing with Indian child welfare, I understand will be meeting and presenting their report and then presenting it to the tripartite committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (3)—pass; (c)—pass; Resolution No. 32—pass. Resolved that there be Granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding 92,436,600 for Community Services and Corrections, Social Security Services 92,436,600—pass.

Resolution No. 33. Item 7. Corrections and Probation Services, (a)(1) Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that if the committee is agreeable, that we deal with Resolution No. 7 in its entirety rather than clause by clause, because what I would have to say applies to all of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would that be agreeable? The whole item? (Agreed). The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: In addressing a few remarks to this resolution, Mr. Chairman, I would like to put on the record that my faith in the correctional system has been reinforced because I didn't get one plain brown envelope with a bunch of questions in it pertaining to this particular function within the department.

But Mr. Chairman, the record here speaks for itself. If you will look at what is printed in the estimates, you will see that Resolution No. 7 calls for an overall increase of 3 percent. Now, we have just completed an analysis of day care and other programs, and everyone agrees that throwing money at problems doesn't solve them. But if you will just go through this resolution, Mr. Chairman, you will see where the government's priorities lie. A 3 percent total increase, print over print, an increase of 553,400, and that's a lot of money but nevertheless it's only a 3 percent increase. If you look at adult corrections, it's a 4.7 percent increase. But what is just absolutely ludicrous is that in the care and rehabilitation of juvenile offenders, they have not allocated even a one percent increase. It works out to .98 percent. Probations and parole, 3 percent.

Our criticisms of this particular function within the department are going to be brief, because it is but a repetition of other arguments that have been made in other areas. The government has postured for the last three years that they have been able to provide a loaf of bread by taking out slices in it, moving the heels closer together and thinking that they can delude the people. I empathize with the Minister, because this is one of the most difficult areas for governments to allocate money. Associated with the provision of these services are people that have no political clout, and it is traditional, especially with Conservative governments, to squeeze the last possible cent out of any budget that has a relationship to the rehabilitations of people.

But Mr. Chairman, if there is one thing that is evident in any program which anybody who knows anything about it would insist, is that the people who are in the provision of this type of service should not be made worse than they are.

If we look back, one of the first things that the government did when it took office in 1977 was to cancel the contract which had been let for the construction of The Pas correctional institution. The second thing that they did was to carry out

Tuesday, 27 May, 1980

modifications of the Brandon correctional institution to pack more people into it, and to scrap some of the programs, which hopefully would have dealt with the problem of people going into these institutions in the first place. It's a very complex problem, Mr. Chairman, and it can't be dealt with in isolation. The professionals that we heard much about here earlier used such things as causal relationship, between socio-economic deprivation and a whole bunch of other jargon, which means, as things get tough those people who have no property to respect usually don't respect property. The incidence of crime goes up, the sentences get longer, more people are packed into institutions, and the programs which were hopefully initiated to keep some of the people out go by the board, and you are forced, of necessity, to put into practice a more and more inhumane type of service.

Mr. Chairman, some of the things that this government would look at as frills, I believe, are programs which could, (1) keep people out of correctional institutions, and (2) better deal with those people that are in there so that the recidivism rate goes down. I am of the opinion that as time goes by and the statistics become available, that they will see that this period of government diversion of moneys, because this is what it is, this is not a restraint program that this government has been on for three years, it's a matter of diversions of money, a diversion of federal health dollars into other things, and here is another area, diversion of money which should, to keep the system the same.

And we must remember that it was that government over there that took the Department of Corrections out of the Attorney-General's office and put it over in Health in the hope that they could do something about rehabilitation of people. We have to remind ourselves that the government that we replaced was truly a progressive government. The Member for Lakeside drew a couple of things to our attention in his remarks the other day, that yes, they had done some good things in the provision of social services. This is one of the areas, that they had started to be more progressive in dealing with people who were in conflict with the law. They had, I will acknowledge for the record for the Member for Lakeside, that in the formation of the unified school districts, that was a terrific social effort. But in this particular area, Mr. Chairman, print over print speaks for itself.

It's not, to my judgement, Mr. Chairman, necessary for the staff to dig up staff man years and where you got this staff or where you got that staff, the dollars speak.

The government wants to put, I believe it is 5 million in a dam in Carman because the people over there are inconvenienced, and I empathize with the people over there who suffer damage once in awhile, but not to the extent that it will amortize that dam. They put 4 million over in day care, they expanded day care, they don't quite know what they can do with it yet, and day care is an important matter.

But Mr. Chairman, here is a very, very important function within this department, that gets an overall increase of 3 percent. No way can they think that the public is going to be that stupid, that a 3 percent increase, with inflation running double-digit, is even standing still.

When these estimates were first presented to us, I spent some time in building up arguments that perhaps we could take some time in dealing with. But the case has been made in other areas, Mr. Chairman, and this is but another manifestation of the same thing, that road building is more important, dams are more important, but dealing with people with problems, he goes by the board.

One of the other things, Mr. Chairman, I want to put on the record once more my respect and admiration for the people who work in this system, because they do an excellent job under very, very difficult circumstances. One of my concerns for these people was, has been, and will be, that there has to be built into the system some escape routes for them. There has to be staff development programs; there has to be alternate careers offered to these people, because the old way of dealing with people in correctional systems can no longer rely, as we give anybody a set of keys and he's a correctional officer and expect him to stay there and take the abuse that a goodly number of these people have to take.

People ignore this function of government; in fact most people wish it would go away. The government responded in the 1978 budget. Increase the number of policemen that we hire. That's their response to people in difficulty, but our citizenry, by and large, is not too concerned about it, and they're not concerned about it to the degree that they don't even know that everybody that goes into the system goes through the provincial system; everybody that is dealt with, everyone who is apprehended relative to the law, goes into the provincial system, and they stay in the provincial system until all appeals are exhausted, and then if their sentence is a federal sentence, they go to a federal institution.

So that I want to give the Minister my assurance. I said earlier that I empathized with him. I don't criticize him personally for this small increase; I criticize the whole government for their whole approach to financing health care services, all the social services where they are cutting back, moving more and more to fee for service. So that anything that I can do to be of assistance in this particular area, I would only be too glad to help. But nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, this is but another manifestation of the attitude of the government, to pretend that a 3 percent overall increase is even standing still in this particular area.

MR. MINAKER: Mr. Chairman, just to be brief, to answer possibly part of the question raised by the honourable member with regards to only a 3 percent increase. What I might advise the honourable member is that in last year's Budget they budgeted an amount of some 7,776,000 in Salaries, and in that was estimated a number of dollars for shift premiums and overtime, and through better management through the year we found out that in actual fact the expenditure had been reduced by approximately 600,000, which would represent approximately about 8 percent that had been over-budgeted for because they had presumed that this would occur. That is in that first item.

With regard to the adult system, we have for Rehabilitation and Care of Adult Offenders in our Budget this year, we have some new programs. We

Tuesday, 27 May, 1980

have an Inmate Incentive Pay Plan; at The Pas Institution there is three and one-half SMYs for 5 months; there is Spruce Woods Camp expansion of one SMY; there is an increased vocational training courses; there is an educational library and life skills program — I believe that one is at Headingly — and the Winnipeg Remand Centre has three new nursing staff and an inmate work transportation from Headingly, for a total of 270,000 to cover those projects.

With regard to juvenile probation, what has happened is the caseloads, because as we know the birth rates have gone down that the age group population has reduced, that the caseloads and juvenile probations are substantially done and the total cases in 1978 were 6,676 as compared in 1979 to 5,549, so this is why we have reduced our Budget. We didn't want to fudge the Budget and put moneys in where we didn't think they were required. Probation Service has been enabled to pursue diversionary and preventive programs for juveniles and they have been actively pursuing, in co-operation with the courts, the development of sentencing alternatives to reduce the jail admissions in adult corrections, as well.

These are some of the basic reasons. I think the key one is that if we look at that 8 percent on that first Salary item, the 600,000 that wasn't spent last year, that accounts for the major part of the reasons why there is only a 3 percent increase shown, as compared to the paper, the value last year.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, we can come up with rationalizations of figures. Print over print is last year's 18,443,900; this year it is 18,997,300.00. Print over print it is 3 percent. As I say, as time goes by we will see what happens in this.

Mr. Chairman, it looks like we are going to finish the Minister's Estimates tonight. Perhaps he and I can take a trip to Bannock Point to take a look at that facility, which I never had an opportunity to take a look at.

MR. MINAKER: We will go together, Mr. Chairman.

The only other comment I can make is also to draw to the attention of the honourable member that we do not have included in this figure any general salary increases that will occur after the MGEA Agreement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 33—pass.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding 18,997,300 for Community Services and Corrections, Corrections and Probation Services, 18,997,300—pass.

I would direct the honourable members to page 18 of the Main Estimates, Resolution No. 27. The item under discussion is Item 1. Executive Function (a)(1) Minister's Compensation—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to speak too long on this. I think that we have covered pretty well the department. It is a new Minister. I would like to congratulate him personally for the way he handled this and his co-operation. He has tried to answer all the questions. I think he has done very well. I don't want it misunderstood that I am

congratulating the government or the department or the programs that they have, but his own comportment during the Estimates, and as far as I am concerned we covered pretty well, had what we had to say, and it is late enough, we can go home.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass, Resolution 27—pass.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding 1,108,300 for Community Services and Corrections, Executive Function, 1,108,300—pass.

I would like to thank all the members of this committee. That completes the committee of Community Services and Corrections. Thank you very much.

Committee rise.