



Second Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

31-32 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable D. James Walding
Speaker*



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 43A - 2:00 p.m., MONDAY, 11 APRIL, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	NDP
DOLIN, Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virden	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 11 April, 1983.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a Petition of the Victoria Curling Club Ltd. praying for passage of an Act to grant additional powers to the Victoria Curling Club Ltd.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition of the Steinbach Curling Club praying for the passing of an Act granting additional powers to the Steinbach Curling Club Ltd.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present this on behalf of the Member for Fort Garry. I beg to present the petition of Major Earl Robinson, an Act to incorporate the Salvation Army Catherine Booth Bible College.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to present this on behalf of the Member for Fort Garry. I beg to present the petition of the Portage Avenue Baptist Church, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Portage Avenue Baptist Church.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table a statement by Provincial Ministers of Finance and Treasurers and also make a statement.

As members know, on March 7th the Federal Government indicated its intention to retreat from the block funding principles of the established programs financing arrangements for health care and post-secondary education and to place artificial caps on, what it views as, its support for post-secondary education. The late presentation of the federal proposals has effectively precluded an opportunity for meaningful federal/provincial consultation on the matter and to a full realization on the part of both the Federal Government and the public of the impact of the

proposals on the financial underpinnings of these essential programs.

It is important to note, however, that it is not too late for the Federal Government to defer proceeding with its proposals and to provide an opportunity for reasonable federal/provincial consultations. Accordingly the provinces have jointly prepared a report on the federal proposal which I have just tabled.

As members are aware consultations on program objectives and conditions are under way among Health and Education Ministers respectively. In our view those consultations should be permitted to run their course and reach agreement on recommendations for improvement. Some of those recommendations will, no doubt, entail additional costs and the sharing of those costs between the Federal Government and the province is a matter which should be discussed among Finance Ministers prior to their implementation. Certainly that would be our preference.

Unfortunately, based on public statements to date it appears that the Federal Government is on the road to further cutbacks in its support for health and post-secondary education programming, at the same time as federal program Ministers are professing interest in program improvements. More importantly as the provincial statement points out, this kind of approach not only calls into question the financial viability of program improvements, but would further threaten program viability.

With regard to the current federal proposal, the Federal Government has attempted to convey the impression that its proposed cutbacks relate only to post-secondary education. In part the Federal Proposal is based on federal arguments that its support for post-secondary education is overly generous, above 50 percent, and too high. The Federal Government reaches such a conclusion regarding its share of post-secondary education costs by allocating about one-third of the EPF block fund to post-secondary education in contrast to the fact that some three-quarters of combined health and post-secondary education spending in the provinces occurs on the health side. Thus, the Federal Government is proposing to allocate an unrealistically high portion of the EPF block fund to post-secondary education and too little to health care. As a result, implementation of the federal proposal would mean that its support for health care as well as post-secondary education would be cut back.

From a broad program perspective, it is important to note that while such an arbitrary allocation can result in the calculation of a federal share of post-secondary education costs in the order of 51.3 percent for 1982-83, it also implies a federal share of health costs of under 40 percent for the same year. In fact, the federal share of combined health and post-secondary education spending in 1982-83 stood at only 42.4 percent; a major reduction from the 50 percent federal share in 1979-80. Provinces continue to believe comprehensive discussions on EPF are required, recognizing the integrated nature of the current financial arrangements and the significant decline in federal shares.

Members may also be interested to know that using the federal allocations of EPF suggests that federal shares in 1982-83 at 39.5 percent on health and 51.3 percent on post-secondary education have deteriorated significantly from the respective 47.8 and 55.8 percent federal shares recorded in 1979-80. This deterioration, partly as a result of last year's major cutbacks and partly because of the EPF escalator, is not keeping pace with program costs and is in itself a major cause for concern regarding ongoing program viability.

If the Federal Government views as an objective reductions in its support for post-secondary education to 50 percent, it should apply the same objective to its share of health costs and raise its contribution to health care closer to 50 percent. By focusing only on what it views as support for post-secondary education, the Federal Government is simply ignoring its less than adequate support for health care and less than 50 percent support for the programs intended to be financed through the block funding arrangement.

The provincial report notes that, based on 1982-83 information, federal contributions fell over \$2 billion short of the 50 percent share, both of health costs and of combined health and post-secondary education costs.

I should note that the above presentation of the federal shares include the value of the tax point transfer, 13.5 percentage points of personal income tax and 1 percentage point of corporation income tax, as part of the federal contribution. Inasmuch as these tax points are levied by the provinces and paid by individual taxpayers to the provincial treasuries, it is questionable whether they should legitimately be included as part of the federal contribution.

On the basis of established programs financing cash payments authorized by Parliament, the federal contribution to the overall costs of post-secondary education and health care in Canada represents just 21.3 percent. The provinces have experienced a degree of frustration as a result of the federal approach to discussions affecting these vital programs.

As noted earlier, segregated consultations are continuing among program Ministers on health and post-secondary programmatic concerns respectively. While those discussions are valuable and worthwhile to ensure a full understanding of desirable objectives for programs, they do not provide any forum for meaningful consideration as to how any increases in overall costs should be shared between the two levels of government.

They are also incompatible with the federal proposals to further reduce its support, particular in light of the substantial erosion of federal support for these vital programs over the last four years.

In summary, the provinces recognize the importance of maintaining high quality health and post-secondary education programming for all Canadians. They also recognize the important contribution the Federal Government has made to the success of these programs. Significant ongoing support from a strong central government is a prerequisite to ensuring that these programs remain available to all.

The provinces, therefore, ask the Federal Government to refrain from the new round of cutbacks in health and post-secondary support and to commit itself to negotiating in good faith with provincial Finance

Ministers, future financial arrangements for health and post-secondary education programming. The importance of the programs involved demands no less.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Honourable Minister of Finance for his statement; for making it available to us. I want to say, Sir, that the Progressive Conservative caucus will want to explore the implications of the subject matter that is addressed by the Minister's statement very, very carefully before making detailed and comprehensive comments on this situation. I would only take a moment if I may, Sir, to make one or two initial observations.

First, with respect to the Federal Government, if I may borrow a phrase from the Honourable Minister of Finance, they can't have it both ways. On the one hand, they appear to be deploring the fact that Alberta is talking about introducing deterrent fees in health care; deploring the fact that British Columbia is apparently talking about introducing user fees in health care; and on the other hand, they appear to be maneuvering with and manipulating the arrangements of the EPF legislation that was designed to reinforce and guarantee universal health care and support for post-secondary education.

Our system of universal health care which is cherished, I think by all Canadians, depends fundamentally on the kinds of principles and concepts embodied in the EPF legislation. If that is to be eroded and if provinces like Alberta and British Columbia have received a hint that it is to be eroded, then, Sir, I for one, can fully understand why they may be doing what they are currently doing. I don't subscribe to it, and I'm not suggesting that anyone in Manitoba should be thinking in those terms, but one can certainly understand what Alberta and British Columbia may be doing if the Federal Government is trying to opt out of and cut back on its commitments to support the principles of universal medicare and universal hospitalization in this country.

I don't know that the subject matter is being addressed as intensively and aggressively by the current Government of Manitoba and the current Finance Minister as it should be, but we will be looking at that and analyzing the Minister's statement and the subject matter in general on which the Minister's statement revolves, Mr. Speaker.

I would only say, on behalf of my party, that it is a disturbing development, both for my colleague, the chief opposition critic for Education and for me in my role as Health critic and for all of our respective colleagues in the caucus, as these two fields require sincerity and integrity on the part of the Federal Government where support funding is concerned. The current system is EPF. If Ottawa doesn't like it then the provinces and Ottawa should be sitting down around a table working out the problems, not making moves from withdrawn positions and from protected positions and from insulated positions that don't take into account the difficulties that the provinces face in meeting their obligations in these two fields.

We'll be looking very intensively at this subject and commenting further, Mr. Speaker.

RETURN TO ORDER NO. 14

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to file Return to Order of the House No. 14, which order was dated February 24, 1983 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. E. KOSTYRA introduced Bill No. 50, The Manitoba Intercultural Council Act; Loi sur le conseil interculturel du Manitoba.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we reach Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the Gallery where we have 32 students of Grade 5 standing from the Parc La Salle School under the direction of Miss Redman. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

On behalf of all the members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Fox Lake Mine

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy and Mines. Could the Minister of Energy and Mines confirm the unfortunate news that Sherritt Gordon's Fox Lake Mine is expected to shut down within the next three to four years with potentially catastrophic results for the people of Lynn Lake?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines.

HON. W. PARASIUK: Mr. Speaker, at a question and answer session with the Chamber of Commerce in Lynn Lake on Friday, the mines manager there did indicate that the ore at Fox Lake would indeed run out in three to four years and that there could be severe implications of this for the community of Lynn Lake if other ore wasn't found for development purposes.

MR. B. RANSOM: A supplementary question to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. When did the Minister first learn that this might be the situation?

HON. W. PARASIUK: The department has been aware for some time that the ore at Fox Lake did have a somewhat definite life to it. People weren't sure exactly when it would be running out. I had heard some indication that it could be running out in three to four years. I had been told that there would be development work being undertaken in and around the area, and

the announcement with specific dates attached to it did come as a surprise to me, Mr. Speaker.

MR. B. RANSOM: A further supplementary to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. Has his department been asked by Sherritt Gordon to participate in an exploration program in the vicinity of Lynn Lake?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Not quite, Mr. Speaker. We have asked Sherritt Gordon - we have indicated to them that we are prepared to enter into joint exploration ventures with them in and around the Lynn Lake area relating to copper, lead, zinc exploration. To date, Sherritt Gordon has not responded positively to our request to undertake joint venture explorations with them. They, in fact, have a lot of the mine leases in and around the Lynn Lake area, so, Mr. Speaker, if they're interested in the joint ventures, they in fact, will have to do it on land that in close proximity to Lynn Lake is held by them. We have not had any responses from them in that respect. They did make application to the Manitoba Mineral Resources Limited to consider a joint venture with respect to a gold mine. That was considered by Manitoba Mineral Resources on a commercial basis.

If the member can recall, the Manitoba Mineral Resources Corporation is operating now the way it was before, namely that it considers joint venture applications from private companies on a commercial basis without any type of outside involvement from the government. It was their judgment that given the particular proposal that they had received from Sherritt Gordon, they had some questions about the viability of that mine proposal, and that secondly, they had some questions about the joint venture proposal itself.

The door is certain still open for a modified joint venture proposal to come forward from Sherritt Gordon if they find that their cash flow situation is such, given the difficulties that they've been experiencing in the mining industry, and of more magnitude to them, the difficulty they've had in finishing up the fertilizer plant that they've undertaken in Alberta at a cost of \$400 million. It has, indeed, suffered some cost over-runs and is late coming into production. They are suffering some cash flow problems.

They, in fact, are invited to put forward joint venture proposals to Manitoba Mineral Resources Corporation which I'm sure that given the staff there, they will receive a good, solid consideration on a commercial basis by that entity.

MR. B. RANSOM: Another question to the Minister of Energy and Mines, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister of Energy and Mines aware that almost two months ago, Sherritt Gordon Mines made a submission under the new Employment Expansion and Development Program to the Provincial and Federal Governments, whereby an expenditure of roughly \$2 million would have provided a reasonable opportunity to prove up sufficient ores that could potentially lead to another decade of viability of Lynn Lake and the mine in that area?

HON. W. PARASIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was aware that Sherritt Gordon applied for a joint federal-provincial grant, instead of pursuing the opportunity that they

have had extended to them for some time of looking for joint equity participation. We have said, Mr. Speaker, that we are prepared to look at resource development jointly with private companies in Manitoba and to do so - and to take taxpayers' money and put this in on an equity basis - so that if there are any resources found, the taxpayers would get a return on that particular input that they would make.

It would appear from what the opposition is saying that they would like the Government of Manitoba to provide grants to the private companies and not take an equity participation. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we do have a fair system of joint venture possibilities, and that we are prepared to look at joint ventures where the private company would put up their fair share of money; the public through the Manitoba Mineral Resources Corporation would put up its fair share of money; and development would then be undertaken.

If the private sector refuses to look or make proposals of a reasonable nature with respect to joint ventures, and instead opts for the grant route then, Mr. Speaker, we will have a very different program in place for the development of our resources. I would expect that all members of the House would want us to get a fair return for our fair share investment that we make in resource development.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, almost two months ago, Sherritt Gordon advised both governments through their submission that Sherritt would have no reason to maintain a presence in Lynn Lake after 1985, and that there was no potential for additional reserves at Fox Lake and for exploration of additional sulphide ore reserves.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister has had that information in his hands now for almost a full two months and has rejected the possibility of providing \$750,000 of investment that might see the Town of Lynn Lake maintained for another decade. How long is this government prepared to stand by and see communities, and the business people in those communities, and the employees of that mine have no future?

HON. W. PARASIUKE: Mr. Speaker, as I said, this government is prepared to look at any proposal for investment. Mr. Speaker, we are quite prepared to make investments. The opposition is asking us to provide grant monies to private companies instead, and those are what people call giveaway, Mr. Speaker. When you have the option of pursuing a joint venture proposal on a joint investment basis and you say that you're prepared to negotiate with companies to pursue that, Mr. Speaker, I believe that is the proper approach to take. There can be applications from private companies that don't want to necessarily pursue a joint venture and joint investment program, but would rather want to get grants from Provincial or Federal Governments.

Mr. Speaker, we have said that we believe we can develop our resources jointly. There have been other instances where private companies and the Provincial Government through Manitoba Mineral Resources Corporation have undertaken joint ventures through joint investments. This will be the first time, apart from some of the grants that the Conservatives gave with respect to the whole CFI venture, where governments

have been giving grants to resource companies to develop resources, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the public would appreciate and would want a joint investment program, not a giveaway program with respect to resources.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Speaker, the proposal put forward by Sherritt Gordon Mines is under the new Employment Expansion and Development Program, the purpose of which was to create jobs.

My question then is to the First Minister, since his Minister of Energy and Mines has managed to blow every major development that's been under way in this province, such as the Western Power Grid and the Alcan development and the IMC development, and now refuses to proceed with a program which would have provided 2,500 man weeks of immediate employment and provide the potential for another decade of viability for Lynn Lake, will the First Minister agree to provide that funding out of the Jobs Fund?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to look at any application pertaining to the Jobs Fund, but we are not prepared, as the Minister of Energy and Mines has very clearly indicated to this House, we are not prepared to give funds away and to provide grants without return investment insofar as Manitobans are concerned. That may very well be the policy of the members across the way. It is not the policy of this New Democratic Party Government.

Keenberg Resignation - Racing Commission

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Economic Development and Tourism can inform the House if the news report that came over one of the radio stations this morning that Mr. Keenberg, the Racing Commissioner, has resigned, is factual or not?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Keenberg has resigned, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the commissioner, as this Minister states, has resigned. Does the Minister intend to accept Mr. Keenberg's resignation?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, Cabinet will be discussing the matter on Wednesday.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister can inform the House if the Cabinet will be discussing it on the basis of the bad handling the commission did with respect to hiring a new director who was not a Canadian citizen, or were they going to discuss it on the basis of the fact that the

commissioner said that racing would continue as usual early in 1982, and it didn't. Will they discuss it on the fact that the commission has been in a turmoil since the commissioner took office or will they discuss it on the fact that he demanded a private table and wanted to change the dress, wearing jeans, at the Assiniboia Downs?

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, the Cabinet will be discussing the issue on its merits. I'm sure one strong component of the discussion will be a recognition of the hours and hours of exemplary work given by this chairperson. I wonder if the member opposite - he has particular reason to recall, if he will, the condition of the track and the commission when we took over - and I could cite at length, Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments of the commission, very hard solid work, and I'm quite sure the Cabinet will be looking at the question with the substance of the issue and not all the peripheral items raised by the member opposite.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I would just like to ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, if she is saying that the previous commissioner, Mr. Sid Halter, had left things in a terrible condition.

HON. M. SMITH: Mr. Speaker, I have steered very clear in this House from blaming people for difficult conditions, but it should be said that we did inherit a very difficult problem with the track. We had incomplete financial reporting; we had just an arrangement out there that was not sound; and we had, in fact, to deal very delicately with a situation where we could not be seen to be commenting on the viability of the current operator for fear of throwing him into a premature bankruptcy.

On the other hand, we wanted to ensure an ongoing racing season for the hundreds and hundreds of people working at the track, the tourists who find it a central attraction, the people of Manitoba who value that track. I think, Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments during the year of weathering a very difficult bankruptcy, of having a very short hiatus in the racing season, of reestablishing the thoroughbred season and concluding it almost at a break-even space, conducting a highly successful harness racing season, we now have in place a horsemen's agreement with the new almost legally completed owner of the track; we have a horsemen agreement with them that I think is the best that has been agreed on; and I, for one, feel those are facts that should be known by the public of Manitoba.

Unemployment increase

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, the most recent unemployment statistics indicate that the unemployment rate for young people in the Province of Manitoba between the ages of 15 and 24 has risen by almost a full percentage point to 18.3 percent. My question to the Minister of Labour is this: Would she indicate to the House how many actual persons that 18.3 percent figure represents?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that the member opposite has given me the opportunity to talk about the unemployment rate and to answer that question for him.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, a point of order

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for St. Norbert on a point of order.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister of Labour a very precise figure as to the actual number that this represents. We have a lot of questions, Mr. Speaker, on this point of order, to ask the Minister of Labour. We would like to be doing it in Estimates where she refuses to answer questions. So far, our only resort is to ask them in the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader to the same point of order.

HON. R. PENNER: On the same non-point of order - it is precisely that, a non-point of order - to begin to try and dictate the answer to a question is the height of presumption. It's nothing to do with being a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour may answer the question.

HON. M. DOLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll try again to answer the member's question; he didn't give me a chance before. Obviously, at this time of year the unemployment rate among young people does increase as they come on to the labour force. We are doing something about that, of course, with our employment programs for young people and there are several of them in place and they are meeting with a great deal of success.

Those young people, many many of them, thousands of them, will have the opportunity to be at work within just a week or two. The increase in the unemployment rate for young men and women between the ages of 15 and 24 is greater for young men than it is for young women as they come into this group, but that simply outlines to us the need to reach that particular group, and that's exactly what we are doing.

I am particularly pleased that our unemployment rate overall has dropped to 9.7 percent; one of only two provinces in this country that is below 10 percent.

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

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the unemployment rate for young people in the Province of Manitoba last year under the NDP Government had risen astronomically then to 14 percent and has now risen even further to 18.3 percent, and we are presently in Labour Estimates, supposed to be discussing employment programs for young people, will she now answer questions with respect to employment programs for young people; particularly, when everything we have

heard to date so far indicates that there will be no expansion of employment programs for young people, that they will be at the same levels as last year, in spite of the fact that the level has risen from 14 percent last year to 18.3 percent now.

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think there was a question in that statement somewhere but I'm not exactly sure what it was. I would like to assure the member, as I did on Friday assure this House, that the calls coming in for the Careerstart Program are tremendous. We've had over 1,500 calls just to the central office in the past week and those calls are resulting in private businesses and non-profit groups applying for wage subsidies under the program.

I would also be happy to answer questions about our other employment programs which impact on youth unemployment, such as the STEP in government program, for which I have not received a single question in my Estimates.

Quality of drinking water City of Winnipeg

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Honourable Minister responsible for the Environment.

In view of the rather startling and sensational comments that were made last week at a conference that, I understand, the Minister attended, a conference on Workplace Health and Safety by the Manitoba Federation of Labour - the comments made by a Dr. Linda Murray, the Executive Director, of the organization said in part that the Provincial and City Government should not wait until more bodies pile up before getting rid of the water mains in the City of Winnipeg - I wonder if the Minister can give any assurance, whatsoever, to the people of Winnipeg that their drinking water supply is safe?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. J. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, what I can give to the people of Winnipeg and to the individuals in other communities in the province, as the member knows, who may be drinking waters that are being transmitted to them by cement asbestos pipes, the assurance that I can give to them is that the Provincial Government has entered into discussions with the City of Winnipeg on this matter. We expect to review it further. We have been involved in those discussions for some time now and we are awaiting a report right now from the National Academy of Sciences which is doing a study and a report on ingested asbestos and that's expected to be completed early in this year, in 1983.

We're also participating in a federal/provincial working group on drinking water quality and that group is expected to have its first meeting in June of this year. So, through those activities we are hoping to build up a body of documentation which will enable us to make the type of assurances which the member requests, or conversely so, will enable us to take the

type of action which is necessary so that those assurances can be made.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I guess we have to assume that the Minister cannot give us the assurance that the drinking water is safe and in view of that, does he have any idea what it would cost to replace the asbestos cement water mains throughout the Province of Manitoba in order to alleviate any concern for danger?

HON. J. COWAN: Well, it certainly would be a significant amount of money and I can't give the member any more of a clearer indication than that. But what I can give to the member and I think what he is asking is the assurance that the Provincial Government will, in its area of responsibility, continue to work with other authorities to ensure that we have documentation which is necessary to provide assurances on the quality of drinking water in this province and in instances where we believe action is necessary. We have the documentation and the strategy which is necessary to undertake that action. So, we will continue to work with the Federal Government by way of the Advisory Committee on Occupational Environmental Health and the federal/provincial working group. We will continue to work with the City of Winnipeg and other municipalities through discussions with them and hopefully, where necessary, we can come up with those cost figures which would be necessary to replace mains if that is determined to be an appropriate course of action.

At this point I can't indicate whether or not that would be an appropriate course of action, given the body of information which we have available to us. There is conflicting viewpoints on this particular subject, as the member is aware, and we certainly want to take all those viewpoints into consideration when trying to determine the appropriate action for the province to take in this regard.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, very simply, in view of some rather sensational comments being made by Dr. Murray, there are two things that the people of this province want. Either, (a) an assurance that their water supply is safe, or, (b) an assurance that this government will undertake the program necessary to replace them.

My final question, Mr. Speaker, is, will the province, therefore, be willing to make this a priority project under the Jobs Fund to replace all the water mains in the Province of Manitoba, if he cannot give us the assurance that the water supply is safe?

HON. J. COWAN: I think the point that the member is missing is that while one would not be able to give an absolute assurance that there is not a difficulty in regard to asbestos in drinking water as a result of these mains being used, one also cannot give an absolute assurance that there is a difficulty in this regard. Dr. Murray has made some comments and expressed an opinion, there are others including the City of Winnipeg, including the Federal Government, including others who have studied this area that give a different opinion.

What I think the responsibility of the Provincial Government in this regard has to be is to continue to

work with those groups to ensure that, in fact, the information that we have is up-to-date in a general way and is specific to what is happening in this province and that we indicate that we are prepared to take remedial actions or to participate with others to take remedial actions where it has been found that that action is necessary.

I think that is the assurance that the people of this province expect and I feel comfortable that, by giving that assurance, we have indicated our concern and, at the same time, have indicated a willingness to work with others to resolve this issue in whatever way is deemed appropriate, once that further information is available to us. It would be foolish at this stage to preempt the work which is ongoing by the federal/provincial working group on drinking water quality at this stage without having the opportunity to review their deliberations and their determinations.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister has given me a very lengthy response. Basically - given the best information available to his department can he say whether or not he believes, at the present time, based on the information available, the drinking water supply is safe or not? The people of Winnipeg have a right to know.

HON. J. COWAN: I can indicate that my department has reviewed the literature which is available on this particular subject and they indicate to me that they have not found significant studies to substantiate the comments which were made by Dr. Murray, but at the same time, as she indicated, one does not want to solely rely upon epidemiological studies in order to determine what is safe and what isn't safe. So they are taking an anticipatory stance and working with the Federal Government and reviewing the literature which is coming out of other jurisdictions in order to either substantiate that viewpoint which they are commonly holding now or, for the purpose of determining that action is necessary and, if so, what action would be necessary and how they would want to proceed.

I'm sorry that the member considers it to be a rather lengthy answer but I think it's important that one understand a very complex subject in the most accurate and complete way. I hope that these comments have been able, through him, and through an answer to him, to assure those residents of the City of Winnipeg that this matter is being reviewed and that, in fact, we are looking at it from an anticipatory stance.

I drink the water in the City of Winnipeg, as do most members in this particular Legislature, — (Interjection) — and in fact, I do so based on the evidence which has been presented to me with a sense that my health is not being unduly impaired. But, I've been wrong before and so have others so we do want to maintain that anticipatory stance and make certain that we are aware of the latest developments in this very complex matter.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Speaker, I'm well aware, as most members are, that studies have been ongoing on this problem and concern for many many years. The point is that a very grave concern has been raised in the minds of people by a very sensational statement made

by a person in a position of responsibility. I want this Minister to go so far as to tell us, whether or not the information that he has available says that people should immediately go out and buy distillation equipment and stop drinking the water from the City of Winnipeg's water supply; or whether or not they can continue to drink it with no further concern than they had the day before this report was issued?

HON. J. COWAN: Well, if the member had learned anything in his tenure as Minister of the Environment, he should have learned that we are often faced to make choices on the basis of incomplete information, and that there are differing perspectives to problems that we are forced to make decisions upon. I can tell the member that we are waiting the report on the National Academy of Sciences on ingested asbestos which is expected this year. I can tell the member that the first draft of a report being prepared by Health and Welfare Canada, on a review of literature regarding the ingestion of asbestos, should be available within a few weeks. We have contacted, in our anticipatory way, Health and Welfare Canada, and they have indicated that preliminary findings were that the risk associated with the ingestion of asbestos in drinking water is extremely small. Those are their words, or those are the words which are presented to me on their behalf. Even if they are extremely small, we want to take that into consideration in determining appropriate courses of action.

The Health and Welfare Canada has also indicated that work done by the World Health Organization confirmed their preliminary findings. As well, on October 13th and 14th of 1982, the United States Environmental Protection Agency conducted a workshop on ingested asbestos. That workshop, in its concluding remarks, confirmed the preliminary findings which I just indicated to the member in respect to the Health and Welfare Study and the World Health Organization Study.

Now, having all that evidence available to us, we still want to review the two new documents which we feel before coming in the near future. The one from the National Academy of Sciences and the other from the Federal Provincial Working Group. When I have that information I will be more than pleased to share it with the member opposite.

MR. H. ENNS: Then you will be able to tell the people where they can drink the water?

HON. J. COWAN: Well the people will have to choose as they do with so many things in this life, to the Member for Lakeside.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: We're asking you, you're the Minister. Can the people drink the water? What's happened to my nose?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

HON. J. COWAN: The people will have to choose on the basis of the information which is available to them, and I would hope that the responsibility of this government is to ensure that they have accurate information available to them that, in fact, acknowledges

that there are a number of opinions on this very important subject to public health.

Rail-line upgrading

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

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Highways and Transportation. Over the last few days there have been a number of press reports that have indicated that a C.N. official told the Standing Committee on Agriculture that rail upgrading, related to the recent change of the Crow rate, will be undertaken on mainlines and not on branchlines, such as, the line to Churchill. I was wondering whether the Minister could confirm that this statement was made and also indicate whether there has been any further feedback from C.N. or the Federal Government as to the status of upgrading for the rail lines to the Port of Churchill?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Highways.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, yes, I can confirm that the C.N. official that appeared at the Agricultural Committee hearing last week did indicate that their are no plans within the CNR Corporation at the moment for maintaining the necessary boxcar fleet in order to carry grain to the Port of Churchill for an indefinite period but, in fact, stated that by 1986-87 they will be down to a minimum level of boxcar supply and, beyond that, below minimum in order to meet present delivery targets or present delivery systems. So that, in essence, there is an absence of any commitment on the part of the CNR for continued delivery to that port.

He had also indicated that it was really up to the Government of Canada to determine whether or not there is a future with respect to that Port and that rail line. I believe that is where we are, Mr. Speaker. I believe the CNR will sit back and wait for federal initiative or some public subsidy in order to maintain that line into the future.

MR. S. ASHTON: Well, in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the upgrading is vital to the future of, not only the rail line but the Port of Churchill and the community of Churchill itself, I was wondering if the Minister would pass on the concern, I am sure is shared by all members of this House, about the lack of a commitment made by C.N. or the Federal Government to upgrading that port and the rail line itself?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before we continue, may I remind all members that questions should deal with matters that are within the administrative competence of this government. I notice that they've tended to wander a little bit of late.

Political signs or posters

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. L. HYDE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Government Services. Can the Minister tell

me what the policy of this government is with respect to the political signs or posters being displayed in provincial buildings?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the specifics of those that the member is referring to. Perhaps, he would be willing to share more information on what political posters he's talking about. There is a committee that is set up to deal with displays in this building from the Department of Cultural Affairs and Department of Government Services that reviews all requests for displays and then makes a decision on the basis and the merits of the request that is made to that committee.

MR. L. HYDE: To the same Minister. Is there a policy in place at this time?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I said very clearly that there is a mechanism in place and there is a committee set up that reviews all requests for displays in the building and then decides and makes recommendations on the basis of the requests that are made. So, the policy is that a committee is set up to review requests that are made.

MR. L. HYDE: For some time, Mr. Speaker, I've noticed an NDP election sign prominently displayed in a window of our provincial building at Portage la Prairie. Mr. Speaker, I have photographs here with me displaying the provincial building in Portage la Prairie and with a 'Elect Harper' sign, NDP sign, in the second window on the top storey of the building.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. L. HYDE: My question, Sir, is to the Minister, did he authorize this NDP sign to be put in this building?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, the answer I gave on the first occasion was for the Legislative building, that there is a committee set up to review; in terms of other government buildings, Mr. Speaker, there is no particular policy with regard to displays. I am not aware of that particular situation that the member is referring to. I can find out information on that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. HYDE: A further question to the same Minister. Will the Minister instruct the Minister of Natural Resources, from whose department window the sign is being displayed, to remove the same? In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is a sign encouraging the people, I believe, of my constituency to elect Mr. Harper. My question, is, Mr. Speaker, is it the intention of the Member for Rupertsland to run against me in the next election?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, there has been no authorization for such a sign to be placed in any

window by the Minister, and certainly that has to be the action of an individual member - I'm not sure, if it would be a member of the civil service who has placed it there, Mr. Speaker. But there's been no authorization, and certainly no one from the government is trying to encourage anyone to vote for the Member for Rupertsland in your constituency.

MR. L. HYDE: I'm asking him, is going to have that sign removed from that window?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, we'll certainly make sure that the sign is removed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be as kind to the Minister of Government Services as possible. Surely, Mr. Speaker, he can respond to the principle behind the questions being asked. Surely, there is a policy that this government has not changed because I can assure him that the policy was in place, that on Provincial Government buildings, election propagand signs are not displayed. Surely, he can confirm that policy is still in place.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen the sign, so I don't know if it's an election sign. Certainly, there's no election in place at this time, therefore, there is no campaign going on.

Mr. Speaker, I have indicted that we will make sure that the sign is removed if it is indeed in fact in place.

MR. H. ENNS: I then ask the Minister this simple, straightforward question, can we as Conservatives adorn provincial buildings with Progressive Conservative signs tomorrow, the next day, and leading up to the next election? Can we do that?

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, certainly not.

MR. H. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, "certainly not". So now we finally come to ask for it, but NDP signs can be put on provincial buildings. Is that what he's telling us? He has pictures of that being the case, and nobody questioning anybody whether it should be removed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Portage la Prairie is referring to pictures. We don't know the authenticity of those pictures. You're not allowed to bring displays into the House, and for him to stand up in this House and use pictures of any sort; displays of any sort; is clearly out of order and clearly not part of the rules of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Mr. Speaker, on that same point of order the Member for Inkster is refuting — (Interjection)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. There is no point of order before the House. Order please.

There is no point of order before the House.

Labour force statistics

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour. Can the Minister tell us which sector of the labour force in this month's labour statistics showed the greatest improvement?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. DOLIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to answer that question for the Member for Wolseley.

The greatest improvement in actual numbers is in women in full-time jobs. The participation rate in the province has remained the same. Our labour force is increasing all the time, but people are finding jobs and the actual numbers that are increasing the most are in the full-time area. I'm pleased that's happening.

It's unfortunate that women traditionally, of course, receive less money for the work they do, so I would suggest that the money coming into the economy is not increasing at the rate that it should, but at least the women are working.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time for Oral Questions has expired.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

COMMITTEE CHANGES

HON. R. PENNER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make an announcement with respect to committee meetings.

Because of the expected absence for health reasons of the Chairman of the Board of Flyer Industries, the meeting of the Standing Committee on Economic Development for April 21, 1983 will be held on May 26.

Mr. Speaker, there'll be a meeting of Law Amendments on Thursday, April 21, 1983 to complete the hearing of the briefs on surface rights and to the extent possible, consider the other bills referred.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, I beg leave to make a non-political statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Minister have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Minister.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to congratulate the Dauphin Kings who this past weekend added to their impressive Manitoba Junior Hockey League title the Manitoba Junior Hockey championship, by defeating the NorMan champions from The Pas; The Pas Huskies.

Before that, of course, Mr. Speaker, they were successful in the Manitoba Junior Hockey League championship by defeating the St. Boniface Saints.

The Dauphin Kings will go on now to meet the Saskatchewan champions for the Centennial Cup. Over the years, the Kings have certainly brought fame and respect to the community of Dauphin, Mr. Speaker, for their excellent sportsmanship and their fine skills in hockey.

As their MLA, I want to congratulate them on behalf of the members of the House and wish them every success in the future.

COMMITTEE CHANGES Cont'd

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, I know it's not question period, but I rise on a point of order. The Government House Leader has changed a committee hearing to the 21st of April when we are to be at Brandon at a Crow rate hearing. As well, I'm on the Law Amendments Committee, Mr. Speaker, where The Surface Rights Bill is being heard. I find it somewhat difficult to be in both places at the same time. It is of interest to me as a member representing the southwest, and as well on the Agriculture Committee.

I wonder if he's going to continue to place committee meetings on when we've already got them scheduled on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker. It's very difficult to plan one's work activity with that kind of leadership from the Government House Leader.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. R. PENNER: I will certainly take the concern of the Member for Arthur into account. It is difficult with so many committee meetings taking place to prevent overlap. Most of the delegations on surface rights have been heard. I'm sure other of his colleagues will be there to hear the other three. There may be an additional one or two.

For the rest of the time, we will move to consideration of some of the bills referred.

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

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Health and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Labour and Employment Services.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee please come to order. We are now on Item 3.(a)(1)(a).

The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, we are discussing the Employment Development and Youth Services

Branch and four employees who are supposedly monitoring job creation projects in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, the unemployment statistics for the month of March, 1983, which we received today, indicate that with respect to youth, between the ages of 15 and 24, the unemployment rate has gone up from February, 1983, at 17.5 percent to 18.3 percent in March, 1983, and that's compared to 14 percent in March of 1982. My question to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, is how many persons does that 18.3 percent represent; how many young people between 15 and 24 are in the official unemployment statistics?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. M. DOLIN: Those statistics just came out from Labour Canada this morning. We can have the translation into actual numbers of people for you later on, but it's not available yet.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, how many persons did the 17.5 percent figure represent then?

HON. M. DOLIN: It was just upwards of 17,000 people.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister explain why, on the Careerstart information and regulations, on the outside of the little brochure, there is the reference to the Minister, the Department of Labour and Employment Services, and the Youth Employment and Youth Services Branch; and inside, on Page 1, says that the Employment Development and Youth Services Branch of the Department of Labour and Employment Services is offering wage assistance, and the phone number on the back of the application form is the Employment Development and Youth Services Branch phone number; why those references?

HON. M. DOLIN: As I have explained at some length on previous occasions during the last week, the program is administered by that branch of my department, just as some public buildings that are being constructed are administered by Government Services Branch, and brush clearing and reforestation programs are administered by the Department of Natural Resources, and so on. This particular program is being administered by that branch of my department.

MR. G. MERCIER: By which employees?

HON. M. DOLIN: I think it's important to clarify just how these programs are monitored and how they are reassigned to departments from the Jobs Fund. Now, this program, which I can speak about, of course, with more information and intelligence, and so on, than some of the programs administered and monitored by other departments, is operated or run or administered, whichever word you want to use, by the staff of that branch. The staff people who are monitoring the Jobs Fund itself are looking at the totality of the Jobs Fund. The whole point in having a Jobs Fund was to be able to present to the people of Manitoba and, therefore, to you people as well, the entire picture of the attack on unemployment that is taking place this year.

The staff people that you are referring to that show an increase in this particular branch - two for an increase, two have been redeployed - will be looking at the entire Jobs Fund and the impact that it is having on unemployment, and they will be bringing to the Jobs Fund Committee information on that so we can make decisions based on that. It's important that we know if there are any places in this province that are hard hit by unemployment so that we can target them with new programs. We need to know what our existing programs are doing; we need to know whether the acceleration of capital projects is sufficient or whether we ought to take another look at it. We need to know all of these things and we cannot do it unless we have a group that is monitoring the entire attack on unemployment. That is the job of the people who have been given that particular assignment. The entire group of staff within this branch will take care of monitoring, administration, and so on, any program that is assigned to them.

Careerstart is one of the programs assigned to them. Also, they administrate programs such as the Manitoba Employment Action Program, the STEP Program for students in government, and so on. There are a number of things that they do administrate and monitor and this is just one of them.

MR. G. MERCIER: Just to be a little more specific then, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying that the four people employed in this Item (a)(1) are monitoring the overall effects of the Jobs Fund, and that in Item (a)(2), Administration, that is where the actual people are employed that administer, for example, Careerstart?

HON. M. DOLIN: Yes, that's correct.

MR. G. MERCIER: Fine, I'll defer my questions then, Mr. Chairman, on Careerstart until we get to Item (a)(2) because that's where it is administered.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister indicated that there is research going on here, an overall monitoring. Can the Minister give us any information with respect to the reports she has received from these four people in this area on the future of the Jobs Fund, and the rate at which we can expect jobs to be created in Manitoba?

HON. M. DOLIN: This particular unit, the Jobs Fund unit, of staff has just become operational in the last few weeks, so they are doing the research and getting the information together, and are just beginning at this point to report to the committee.

MR. G. MERCIER: When were the two new people appointed?

HON. M. DOLIN: There is one appointment effective April 1st and there is one vacancy at this point. The other two people that you mentioned were redeployed, in fact, the third person applied from within government too. One of the new people, new to our department, was also from within government. The other vacancy is in the process of being filled and will be filled from within as well.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is this the group of people that would be recommending criteria for programs under the Jobs Fund.

HON. M. DOLIN: This is just the group that monitors the programs and oversees the fiscal or financial arrangements for it; monitors that.

MR. G. MERCIER: Has there been any work done on the development of criteria for programs under the Jobs Fund?

HON. M. DOLIN: The development of criteria is something that is taking place right now. The part of the unit that is responsible for that is the planning and development part of the job creation unit and that group, the small group, works directly under the Assistant Deputy Minister.

MR. G. MERCIER: On February 25th, the First Minister made a statement to the House that a Jobs Fund Committee of Cabinet would begin immediately to prepare criteria that emphasize the number of jobs created. The Minister is a member of that committee, has there been no action taken on that?

HON. M. DOLIN: Yes, there is action being taken on that. Some of the criteria has been developed, more is being developed; it is being refined, there is still work to be done. The committee obviously had a number of items that it dealt with. Some of those have been announced and I have pointed them out to you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Possibly you can help me a bit. I am just wondering whether it would be proper to ask questions under the Careerstart Program, as to when and to whom did the application forms get sent out? Would that be under this category or under Item (a)(2)?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It would be the next one.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, I'll wait.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, I have some difficulty with the answers the Minister of Labour was giving, specifically saying that she didn't feel that it was her responsibility to answer when it was a branch of her department that were responsible for it. Who does she think pays the wages of those people who work for the different branches of her department?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that a rhetorical question or a question?

MR. J. DOWNEY: No, it's a question of who pays the wages of the people that work for the different branches of her department?

HON. M. DOLIN: I'm not sure what the question is. Who pays the wages.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Who pays the wages, Mr. Chairman, for the branches that she doesn't feel should answer to this committee? That's what I want to know.

HON. M. DOLIN: I would ask the member to indicate a little more clearly what statement he is referring to that he says that I made?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Chairman, earlier the questioning came from the Member for St. Norbert on specifics dealing with this department and I think the response was that, and I'm not precise maybe in this response, but she said that those people worked, they monitored, and they were at a specific branch of her department, leaving the impression to the committee that she shouldn't have to answer to the committee on the activities of that branch.

HON. M. DOLIN: Not at all, Mr. Chairman. In fact, I have read the job descriptions of those people into the record, and if the member would care to peruse Hansard from last week, he would find it there. I have very clearly defined and would be happy to redefine the jobs of those people. They are assigned to work within this branch of this Department of Employment Services, and we can talk and we can answer any questions you wish about the work of those people and what they are assigned to do. What I did delineate for the Member for St. Norbert was the difference in the job of the regular staff of the department - monitoring, administering, and so on - programs that are the responsibility of that branch, and the job of the people within the job creation unit - the Jobs Fund unit, if you will - whose job is quite different in that it is much larger than the responsibility of the regular staff within the department, because their task is to look at the entire effort of the Jobs Fund and the Jobs Fund Committee and report back to us on what they see what has been expended, what the results have been, and so on.

MR. J. DOWNEY: In other words, the Minister is not trying to say that she is not going to answer for her department then; that regardless of the branch that it falls within, she is prepared to answer to this committee the questions that the opposition are asking.

HON. M. DOLIN: I have always said that I am ready to answer any question that you have. If you ask a specific question about a budget line that is not in this appropriation, then I will have to simply defer that question till later, but I will certainly answer it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was just wondering if the appropriate item to ask questions about the STEP Program and the MEAP Program are the present appropriations.

HON. M. DOLIN: Those two programs are administered by this branch. A correction, if I could; under Employment Programs you would find the STEP Program, but the Manitoba Employment Action Program is a part of the Jobs Fund.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(1)(a)—pass; 3.(a)(1)(b)—pass; 3.(a)(2)(a) - the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: You're referring to 3.(a)(1)(a) and (b), and there really - I see what you're doing, Mr. Chairman - but there are no (a) and (b) there.

On (2) Administration, then, Mr. Chairman, where the Minister has said the employees administer the Careerstart Program, how many jobs will be created under the Careerstart Program?

HON. M. DOLIN: I think the member is aware that I have never gotten into the numbers game when we're talking about employment creation. No matter what the program, it's important to understand that if you're talking about construction, you're talking about people doing different kinds of jobs, and some may work for two weeks, some may work for two months, some may work for two years. Now, it is difficult to define how many jobs you've created. I'm sure the person that worked for two weeks would not say that he or she had the same job as the person who worked for two years.

When we're talking about youth unemployment and we're talking about wage subsidies, there is always a differential between the private sector and the public sector because of their difference in ability to pay and the way they're budgeted and so. So the member knows that if the private sector does take up the challenge to a greater degree than the public sector, then there are going to be more young people put to work. If the private sector does not take up this challenge, then the wage subsidy is greater to the public sector, since they are on budgets which cannot be changed, and the number of young people put to work is going to be less. So to predict the number of young people put to work would be an exercise, I think, in futility at this point.

We are going to put as many to work as possible. We are certainly encouraging in every way that we can the private sector, in particular, to take up the challenge and put these young people back to work. We will help them all that we can. We expect that we will be able to fund as many of these programs as qualify and, under those qualifications, we will make sure that young people are put back to work.

I have said repeatedly that the \$3 million allocated to this particular program from the Jobs Fund, which has been pointed out is virtually the same as last year, is a start. It's sort of a benchmark. We know that level of funding works for this particular kind of program. If the take-up is greater, we will certainly go back to the Jobs Fund requesting more money and I feel very certain that we will obtain it.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, what is the difference between this program and the program last year?

HON. M. DOLIN: Because in the press conference I outlined the differences between this year's program and those of previous years, I will give the members the information they ask; although I must point out again that the Careerstart Program is one of the Jobs Fund programs and will be discussed at great length if the members wish at the time that those Estimates are discussed.

However, as I outlined in the press release, the program has been changed to include all unemployed youth, not just students as it had before. There has been a special measures component added, which is an added incentive for the private sector to hire disabled

or Native young people, whether they are students or simply unemployed.

We have included a new ventures component which will allow young people, who have an idea that they feel would give them business experience or will add to, for the benefit of the community in which they live, that we will fund them and we will help them create the business that they're talking about. We are going to also go through some delegated referral agencies, as well as the usual way of channeling young people into these jobs and referring them to the jobs.

In some cases, where non-profit agencies have trouble coming up with the cash up front to pay the young people, we will discuss with them the possibility of some advanced funding. There's an employee benefit allowance of up to 10 percent of the wage assistance that will be provided to employers.

There's also no restriction on the size of the business that can be involved. This is something that you members of the Opposition have requested frequently. We determined that it would be a good idea to open this up as far as possible in every way so that there would be ample opportunity for any employer to participate in the program and put these unemployed youths back to work.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, is it fair to say then that the program is a lot more closer to the program that was in effect two years ago?

HON. M. DOLIN: No, Mr. Chairman, I wouldn't say that was correct. What I would say is that we took the best facets of the programs from previous years and put them together to make what we think is an outstanding program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There are a few questions that I would like to direct to the Minister under the Careerstart Program. I wonder if she could indicate, when and to whom were generally the application forms sent?

HON. M. DOLIN: I am not sure how far the members intend to go with this questioning. I would like to point out to them that if we get into actual specifics that I will have to refer them to Appropriation 29 as I have done before. But what I will say, is that the dissemination of information has been widespread, although a general mailing, such as took place last year, did not take place this year. All those who participated in the program before received information this year, and there was a mail drop or a mail walk, or whatever you call that, done throughout rural Manitoba to farms and businesses.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: The reason I raise this question is that it creates some difficulty for me in the rural area because, for example, certain individuals and certain businesses, certain organizations received the forms; other have not. I have a series of questions related to this, for example, which papers carried the advertisement? Was it only the city papers or was it covered in the rural papers?

HON. M. DOLIN: One of the reasons for distributing information very quickly to both Caucus offices, to all MLAs, was to get the information out to constituents all across Manitoba as fast as possible. I certainly know that a number of MLAs availed themselves of this opportunity and took it around or saw that it got out to people that they felt would be interested or, in fact, to every business and/or farm in their constituencies.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: The reason I raised this is that, specifically what the Minister is indicating, the difficulty I have with the large geographic rural area is that some of the businesses, some of the nonprofit organizations and some of the municipalities have received the forms and others have not. In fact, some of the forms have just arrived within the last four or five days that people received the application forms and with the deadline being April 14, and now the Minister indicated the other day that the deadline is April 22, these people again don't know that. They don't have that information and it is creating many problems. I think it is discriminating against many of the rural people who would like to take advantage of this program.

For example, municipalities, some of them meet only once a month. They have received the information; by the time they meet, the deadline is past. The Minister indicates, well, we shouldn't ask too many specifics on this item here, but by the time we have a chance to discuss the Careerstart Program in detail when the time comes, by that time the deadlines are past and we're talking about a vacuum; that's too late.

I have a grave concern that the people in rural Manitoba are being discriminated against. Firstly, because the advertising did not hit them properly; their getting the forms extremely late in many cases, and in many cases they haven't received the forms at all. The people that would like to take advantage of the program, who would be in a position to hire youth and there's much youth unemployed, the job opportunities in rural areas are much more limited than they are in the city. So, many of these kids that are coming out of the rural high schools are the ones that are going to be in great difficulty in terms of being able to get an employer to hire them.

I'd like to raise a question and delve into it a little further; whether it's possible to get an extension; whether this Minister can assure us that there's going to be a further extension so that the people in the rural area can also take advantage of this program, not just the city people.

HON. M. DOLIN: One of the things that the Member for St. Norbert pointed out at great length was all of the places where the name of the department, the phone number, and so on, appears. That's exactly why; so that number is widespread. It's been in all the advertisements. All anybody has to do is pick up the phone and call; all you have to tell anyone is that they can pick up the phone and call.

I would suggest that staff is here after we complete this session of the Estimates. If you want any further information, they'd be happy to give it to you, or you could give them the names of the interested parties that you're talking about. The unemployment situation, as you I'm sure are aware, has pockets of

unemployment to a greater degree. I don't believe that people in rural Manitoba have been overlooked in the advertisement for this particular program. The phone number, as I indicated, is everywhere. It's on every piece of information. The staff is here to answer any questions and every MLA was provided with complete information on the program some time ago.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: That still isn't quite adequate in my opinion as to how this program has been handled initially because of the short time frame involved. I represent 30-some small communities. Many of these people don't have access to this kind of information the way it related out here in the city. They don't have the . . . all of them. There's limitations; many of the farm people are busy all the time. They don't run down to the Ag. Rep. Office, or whatever the case may be, to see whether there's information available on this thing.

I feel that a different approach should have been made in terms of presenting this program, because I feel very strongly it's a discrimination against rural members or rural areas in terms of being able to take advantage of this program. I was one of the MLAs that went and asked for a bunch of these application forms; I've tried to distribute them. I've been phoning and telling people about it, but when you represent 17,000 people spread over a big geographic area, it's very difficult to get the information to all the people. I feel very strongly that a different attitude or a different method of distribution on this program should have taken place, that my people cannot take full of advantage of this program.

HON. M. DOLIN: I would like to point out to the member that 64,000 leaflets were dropped through a mail-drop to businesses and farms in Manitoba. That's very widespread distribution. The brochure that was dropped has the address and the phone number of all the various offices throughout Manitoba that the people can contact if they wish to participate in the program. There was very widespread distribution. We certainly learned from our experience and the staff has developed very effective ways of getting the message out.

If the calls coming in on this program are any indication, we have in fact let people know more about this program than almost any other program that we have instituted, so I would suggest that the information has been given widespread distribution.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: A question out to the Minister then. Because of the time frame involved, which is relatively limited, and the fact that many people do not know it has been extended by a week, is there any possibility that there could be a further extension of this program so people that are farther removed from the action will have an opportunity to get into the program?

HON. M. DOLIN: With any program, if we've got a good program going that people seem to respond well to, consideration is always given to reinstating that program or continuing the program.

To say now that we are going to extend the deadline again and again and again would be to defeat the intent

of the program, which is to put young people to work in May, not in July or August, but to put them to work for the summer months that they're off. Certainly, the take-up on this program is going to exceed our initial estimates and that take-up will be in place by the 22nd of April, I'm certain.

If the program appears to be so popular that the people of Manitoba are demanding that we continue it, if it reaches that height of popularity, then certainly the Jobs Fund Committee would look at what we are doing right and make sure that we continue it throughout our attack on unemployment.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: To the Minister, I hope the fact that there is relatively good response to it is not going to take and set a deadline or limit the opportunity for young people to get to work. Where the Minister indicates that she would like people to be employed in May already, I can indicate that there's many of our high school students in the rural area who do not get out of school till the latter part of June possibly. This is where the difficulty comes in by the employer. If he wants to hire some of the high school students that are in school and will be in school until graduation or after graduation, these are the kids that will not be able to pick up jobs because of the limitation that has taken place.

HON. M. DOLIN: This is taken into consideration when the program is administered. Employers can indicate that they wish to hire high school students, they wish to start them when school is over. High school students indicate that they want work for just those two months that they are off school. That is how in the past we've come up with an average of nine weeks employment. It's because we have both high school and university students, not to mention all of those young people this year that are not in fact in school, but are out of school and unemployed. So, certainly, our average job length will change this year, but in the past it has been approximately nine weeks. Those young people can apply and they simply wait until they have finished their year of high school and then their job starts.

That's why the difference in, I should say, minimum and maximum number of hours of work.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Maybe just so I'd interpret the remarks of the Minister correctly, was there some indication that if the program is successful, there is a possibility of the deadline being extended, or did I misinterpret those remarks?

HON. M. DOLIN: I have said that nothing is definite, all right. If the program, as I said, is so popular that there is a demand throughout Manitoba for its continuance, then we would, of course, look at that. But when you have a program that is taking place during a specific period of time; in other words, the student part of that population of young people, then you're dealing with a certain length of time and they wish to go back to school. The fact that we're dealing with young people who are unemployed and who are, in fact, not in school may cause us to look at this program, see what is very successful about it, and either institute another program, a similar one, or build in the design

to some of our other employment programs. I don't think it would be fair to say that anything is over with, finished, and we're all done; not when we still have people out of work, we would never say that, we will never say that.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I'm encouraged by the remarks from the Minister that nothing is definite because then I could possibly assume that, because nothing is definite, that the deadline may be not necessarily as definite, and that if people who have not been aware of this program and, even after the deadline, they would possibly have an opportunity to apply for the program and still be able to qualify.

HON. M. DOLIN: I would like to point out one incident that we ran into and I would certainly suggest that the member not take back to his constituency suggestions that people wait around until their next municipal meeting or whenever they feel like talking about this; this was under another employment program. The information was received in November but nobody felt like having a meeting until February because of the Christmas holidays and then because a lot of people were gone in January in this particular municipality, so they didn't get around to talking about the Manitoba Employment Action Program until February. It was a little late then to send in their application and the fact that they were annoyed that they didn't qualify under the program just was too bad because we simply had a deadline that was much much earlier than that, but they didn't choose to make a decision about whether they were going to participate until three months after the program deadline occurred.

I would certainly not want the member to go back to his constituency and say the Minister is very flexible on deadlines and perhaps you can wait around until May or June to get into this program; that's not going to happen.

MR. G. FILMON: I'm glad to have had the reassurance from the Minister that her department had direct mailed the applications and the information, the folders on this directly to 60,000 different businesses, I think she said, or organizations in the province. That allayed some of my concerns when she said that one of the prime reasons of her department sending a copy of the application form and the folder to each of us, as Members of the Legislature, was so that she would be assured that every employer, farm or business in the province would then be aware of it. It was going to remind her, as I'm sure she knows, that we're somewhat limited in our ability to contact all the people in our constituencies about things like that and, although Tuxedo doesn't have too many farms and perhaps there are few enough business enterprises that I could have, over the course of the last couple of weeks, taken one around to every door, it might have been difficult still. So, I'm glad that her department has direct mailed to these people as well as relying on us in our dissemination of information.

The program itself, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has spoken a number of times about the people of Manitoba responding to it in great numbers and I would hope that she is not assuming that this is a reflection on the

program or the fact that the program has been much better designed this year than in the past and, therefore, it has all these people responding. The fact of the matter is that programs in the past, ones that her predecessor and other members of her caucus criticized, achieved great numbers. Her colleagues seem to think that it didn't have anything to do with the program that it, perhaps, was a giveaway and things of this nature. I don't bring any of these criticisms, necessarily, to this program because I think she has capable people in her department who were able to design good programs in the past and I assume will continue to be able to design good programs at the present time, given the constraints that they have with respect to government policy.

The difficulty is, Mr. Chairman, that we have record high unemployment levels in youth under 25 at the present time and that, in itself, will demand that, regardless of what the program is, regardless of what its criteria, the applications are going to be very high and there will be many people interested in this sort of program and I'm sure, as well, that with difficult economic times that businesses will be looking for opportunities to get government assistance in order to get things done in their enterprises. This program, obviously, will appeal for both reasons because of the difficult economic times businesses are facing and the record numbers of people who are looking for summer employment. So, I would hope that the criteria, as they are laid out and as the Minister has indicated to us, are broader than they were in the past year and I'm glad to hear that they include small enterprises that weren't included in the past. I'm glad to hear that they've overcome some of the hangups they had about the design of previous programs that did attract substantial interest.

The other area that her predecessor seemed to dwell on last year in Estimates, in zeroing in on career employment opportunities for young people, was the need for a substantial career component, sort of contributing toward ones future career if one was a university student or a post-secondary student of any sort, that these programs would have a significant element of career orientation and not just a job, as he said. Is this part of the intention here since we're naming it Careerstart, firstly; and secondly, it's a carry-over of the same government so I assume that it's a similar policy orientation; is there a need to have an element of career orientation that would meet with the approval of the government as it relates to the training that these people are taking in post-secondary institutions?

HON. M. DOLIN: There certainly is an element of training involved in this program to give young people experience and job training in an area that they feel they would like to pursue. For university students we are trying to match them to jobs in the area in which they are studying so that there is a direct correlation. For unemployed youth we are attempting to match them with jobs they wish to become involved in and also are asking employers to involve skill training in that job.

MR. G. FILMON: How does the Minister feel that clearing up backlogged chores and paperwork is in accordance with people's career goals?

HON. M. DOLIN: That certainly depends on the paperwork involved. If it's record keeping that certainly is a skill in itself; if it is the setting up of an office, or the organization of an office, that is a skill that is needed on the job as well.

MR. G. FILMON: How about filing and general labouring chores; how does that fit in?

HON. M. DOLIN: One of the single largest groups of entry level jobs is in the area of office assistance and that, particularly, is in the area of filing. I don't know what the member did for the very first job he had. I filed, and it was in a hardware store.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I shovelled asphalt, as a matter of fact, on a patching crew for the city, not that that's relevant to the topic, but I just wanted to trade a little information with the Minister. — (Interjection) —

The Member for Thompson says I went from shovelling one thing to another, and I can't help that the members on the other side insist on providing me with this additional material that I have to shovel.

Mr. Chairman, the other area that I am concerned about is just the overall criteria specifications and how they compare to the programs that we have had in the past. Is the Minister flexible on the criteria as well as other aspects of the program that she has laid out?

HON. M. DOLIN: I would say, in response to that, that job training in a skilled work force are goals no matter what kinds of jobs we're assisting people in creating and assisting people in obtaining. A skilled work force is one of the most important things that Manitoba has to offer. We think it's especially important that young people have the opportunity to develop skills in a particular area. They may choose to develop them in an area and then discover that they don't care for that area as well. That is a decision then that is based on experience, not on imagination.

One of the important activities of the group that is monitoring all of the activities within the Jobs Fund is to look at programs and to see where they are particularly successful. Before we made any changes in the criteria, we would want to experience this program as it has been changed and determine whether it was effective, whether young people gained from it, whether employers were happy with it.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister concerned that the criteria as they now apply, especially to private business organizations, will simply result in the private business organization getting work done that they would probably ordinarily have done in any case and with the government subsidy now?

HON. M. DOLIN: What the member describes is the reason for the clause regarding additionality.

MR. G. FILMON: Did the previous program in the last year of our administration, I guess two years ago, have that same type of requirement or restriction?

HON. M. DOLIN: Yes, it did.

MR. G. FILMON: How will the Minister satisfy the concerns that the Minister of Finance keeps repeating that the auditor had, saying that there was no way of proving that aspect of it?

HON. M. DOLIN: There is a different kind of evaluation in place now. It's a direct contact with the employer. The contact with the employer is in person. The auditor was very satisfied last year with that change in the program.

MR. G. FILMON: What form does the contact take?

HON. M. DOLIN: There is a survey that is used by staff. They go out and contact employers personally with the survey in hand.

MR. G. FILMON: So they are now getting something verbally that they used to get in writing in the form of a signature on an application?

HON. M. DOLIN: Certainly, that verification is given in writing too; it's part of the application form. What the member is perhaps referring to is that there used to be a check at the end of the program. This monitoring is now done throughout the program.

MR. G. FILMON: How many times would this sort of monitoring take place during the course of a summer job?

HON. M. DOLIN: A minimum of once per employer plus the evaluation at the end.

MR. G. FILMON: This has now improved the assurance to the point that the auditor thinks it's fine?

HON. M. DOLIN: The auditor approved of the program in its changed form for a couple of reasons; partly because the evaluation was changed; but also because the stated goals of the program were changed. So employers knew right from the beginning what was expected of them and so did students know what would be expected of them. The young people knew what they were going to get in this program and, therefore, expected it.

I might also point out that where there is reason to have some concern about the program when it is being monitored, certainly more than one visit would be made during the course of that employer's involvement in the program. The one visit is automatic, one visit during the course of the program, staff would much more closely monitor any situation that they then felt there might be a problem with. The auditor, yes, is quite content with this set-up, but it's for the stated goals as well as the change in evaluation.

MR. G. FILMON: Did the program last year, which achieved the approval of the auditor, have as one of its goals and one of their criteria under which businesses could apply, clearing up backlog chores and paperwork?

HON. M. DOLIN: If that's additional work to be done that would not be done otherwise, then of course it would qualify under the program. The point is that you

match with that a young person whose intent or desire is to go into office work, if it's an office that you're talking about. If it's something related to some other occupation, then a young person that wishes some experience in business in that area would be targeted for employment to that particular job. That's one of the reasons why we do maintain some control through hiring agencies of how young people are matched with employers. Employers can't simply go out and hire whomever they wish without going through the employment agencies.

MR. G. FILMON: Just by implication, could the Minister assume that a backlog chore or paperwork is new work, is new initiative?

HON. M. DOLIN: If the work that the member is describing and without his being very specific about it, it's very difficult to determine exactly what he's talking about; if that work is not being done by existing employees and there is a need for the work to be done, then it makes sense to hire additional people to do it.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister confirm there was no deadline date under the program last year?

HON. M. DOLIN: There wasn't a deadline date last year, but staff found it very difficult to deal with the incoming applications and it was difficult for them to make a rational assessment of the quality of the projects being suggested when they didn't have them all in front of them.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, how many people administer this program compared to the program two years ago?

HON. M. DOLIN: How do I compare it?

MR. G. MERCIER: How many people are involved in administering this program compared with the program two years ago?

HON. M. DOLIN: The same number of people are in the department that work with this program, but we have decentralized a lot of the operation to our regional offices.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, how are they going to, with the same number of people, do all of this extra work by going out and speaking to the various employers, etc.?

HON. M. DOLIN: That's one of the reasons for having the regional people involved; not only does that give you another outlet or outreach, but you have those people right out there in the field and you have them much more able to reach the people that need to be talked to and who need to receive the information.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to talk about the adequacy of the program. We had a program two years ago, when the unemployment rate was much lower, and 5,000 jobs for young people were obtained

through that program. Last year, at this same time, the unemployment rate among young people was 14 percent and they had a program which provided, in the Minister's Annual Report, some 4,000 jobs. She has said that the same amount of money is being appropriated for the program this year so I would assume that it will create the same number of jobs, 4,000.

The latest unemployment statistics indicate that the unemployment rate among young people is 18.3 percent, compared to 14 percent at the same time last year. Students have indicated, and the president, for example, of the University of Manitoba Students Union, that the unemployment problem among students will be much more serious than it was last year because of the declining economy. Statistics Canada, at that time, a few weeks ago, indicated there were 20,000 young people among the 54,000 jobless in Manitoba. The STEP Program has not been expanded. Certainly under this government job creation in the private sector has reduced rather than expanded. The government has imposed a payroll tax which affects all employment, as well as unemployment among young people.

In view of all of these factors, Mr. Chairman, does the Minister not consider that this program, to be the same as last year, is inadequate?

HON. M. DOLIN: First of all, Mr. Chairman, the 5,000 jobs created number that the member is tossing out so lightly, was exactly the reason why the Auditor objected to the program in the form that it formerly had; that was an estimate, at best. Secondly, and most importantly, the whole idea behind the Jobs Fund is that we will be able to monitor and then create new programs that meet the needs of young people, of older people - certainly young people aren't the only group that is unemployed. Their unemployment rate is high, it's particularly high right now but this program, which the members insist on speaking about in isolation, is only one small part of the whole, one small part of the whole, and it must be seen as a part of that totality, because that entire Jobs Fund Program, the whole thing, will impact on unemployment to a very great degree, and this is just a component of that \$200 million.

The appropriate time, as I have said repeatedly, to discuss this in totality and to see whether the parts actually do make up the whole, to see whether there is an area that is left uncovered, to see whether there is a direction that the opposition members would like to suggest we take, the time to discuss that is when all of the programs can be spread out before you, when you can see whether there is enough of an impact on rural employment, on Northern employment, on urban unemployment which, of course, is the highest of all, and we can look at the whole picture. To discuss this program and its adequacy, or inadequacy, in isolation is simply not an accurate way to look at it.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, we are talking about Employment Development and Youth Services and the administration of that Branch; we're talking about young people. I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister appears to take some pride in, and I welcome the point for reduction in unemployment overall in Manitoba in March of 1983, compared to February of 1983, but the

actual - not seasonally adjusted - rate of overall unemployment in Manitoba for March of 1983 is 10.8 percent compared to 8.4 percent last year. So that overall situation doesn't help this youth component.

We're talking about the Careerstart Program, which the Minister said is spending the same amount of money and I assume, and I think quite properly, that it will not create any more jobs than was created last year, those being 4,000; and I'm pointing out to her that the unemployment rate among young people in Manitoba for March 1983 is 18.3 percent, compared to 14 percent last year. That's an increase of 5.3 percent in this category, and we have before us a program that will not expand in any way upon the program last year, and I'm referring to the comments that have been made by some student leaders about the crisis in unemployment among young people in Manitoba.

I'm suggesting to her really that this program is not adequate. Under this government jobs are not being created in the private sector with the tax regime that this government has imposed in their anti-private sector attitude, and we are facing a situation in which young people are losing hope in our society. I'm suggesting to her that with all of these facts before her, and this being the middle of the month of April, and students from university will all be on the job market in a few weeks, and many are probably on the job market right now, I'm saying to her that the program that she has introduced is not adequate to meet the need among young people this year in the Province of Manitoba. I'm suggesting to her that she should not be waiting to monitor the situation in May, June, July and August. I'm suggesting to her that she should be developing a program immediately to deal with this crisis in unemployment that she must know is going to occur this summer starting May 1st.

Will she immediately develop a program to expand upon the program that she has announced so far?

HON. M. DOLIN: Well, I find it interesting that the member - and I don't if his colleagues perhaps help me with this, but he doesn't seem to hear me when I say repeatedly, I've said all last week, and I will start again this week saying - that the amount allocated initially to this program by the Jobs Fund was based on past experience, and that should the need be there; should there be greater takeup on the part of the private sector as he wishes there to be, then certainly the Jobs Fund will look at allocating more. So, it is not the same as last year. It is the same base for starters as last year.

I certainly hope he's right and that the private sector picks up on this tremendously and creates all kinds of work for young people. I have to note that in other provinces where free enterprise is their foundation, the unemployment rates are higher than they are in Manitoba. I'll leave that with the member. But certainly, this is not a final figure. If that's all the takeup we get from the private sector, then we will create other programs that reach out in other ways. If they do wish to participate more and they qualify under the program, then we will look at allocating more monies to this program.

Also, the member consistently speaks as if this is the only program, the only opportunity for youth in this

entire province. I would certainly like him to check on programs such as the Manitoba Employment Action Program; the Water and Sewer Repair Programs; the construction programs; the health programs; the capital works programs; the building programs under Government Services; all kinds of other programs. He will find a lot of young people who are 24 years of age and younger. There's no restriction in those other programs that says if you're under 24, don't come. They certainly can work there too.

We have targeted some of our programs - not only this one, I might point out; the members haven't chosen to question us on the others — (Interjection) — - but, we have not targeted the wide group of unemployed with this particular program. We have other programs that target the entire spectrum of the unemployed, young and old, and you'll find a lot of young people working within them.

So, the attack on unemployment for youth should never be thought of that this is the only program that focuses on that as the target.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, earlier on in the Estimates, the Minister indicated her Research and Planning Department predicted unemployment to maintain at 10.3 percent through 1983. Can she indicate what she anticipates the unemployment rate to be among young people during the summer months? Surely, that would be part of that prediction.

HON. M. DOLIN: What I can say to the member is that we have been pleasantly surprised by the declining unemployment rate in general. There are some interesting trends taking place within our employment figures, within the labour force figures, notably those in the area of part time versus full time work, and in the men versus women in the work force; the increase in number of people within the work force and so on. All of these trends are being monitored.

This is a time in our history when things are changing very fast. We are right in the middle of a drastic change in our work force; in what we call work; in what that work force is involved in and so on; the skill needs; the training needs; the changing employment situation. We are monitoring it. We are pleased to see that there are people coming into the work force who are finding jobs. We intend to assist them in every possible way, but to make a prediction, that is really just another way of asking me how many people we think that this program is going to employ; is leading us, I think, down a different path. I would not care to get into that kind of hypothesizing.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has already indicated and predicted on the basis of the information from her staff that the Research and Planning Branch estimates unemployment to maintain at 10.3 percent throughout 1983. Surely, as part of those predictions in research, they would have estimated the unemployment rate among young people. Could we have that figure?

HON. M. DOLIN: The Conference Board of Canada figures are the ones that I quoted to the member, I think, on the first night of Estimates when he asked

that question. That is the prediction and it's a Canadian prediction and it's for Manitoba in particular, but they do this for the other provinces as well. So that's their prediction.

Translating that into what our research staff thinks might happen, and then within that figure, how many will be 16 to 24 or 15 to 24; how many will be students; how many will be young people unemployed, would certainly be a lengthy operation and I think, we would have difficulty finding a firm foundation for those figures.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is the Minister saying then she doesn't have that figure for young people; a separate estimate?

HON. M. DOLIN: If the member is asking me for a separate estimate of the potential number of young people unemployed, who knows when? Summer? Does that mean July; does that mean August; does that mean June; does that mean May when university students are out? I don't know. That's exactly what I'm trying to point out to the member. You'd have to be very specific, as statistics can be used, as the member well knows, to enhance any particular position, including opposite positions depending on how you use them.

So, if the member wishes to be extremely specific with his question, I will refer it to the Research Branch and see if they can come up with an extremely specific hypothetical prediction.

MR. G. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has already indicated a figure of 10.3 overall unemployment in Manitoba through 1983. If she has a figure for young people between the ages of 15 to 24 up to the middle of September, perhaps a figure from there on till the end of the year, I would like to know what it is.

HON. M. DOLIN: I can give the member the Conference Board of Canada predictions, if that's what he wishes? We're right on with those at 18 percent for this quarter. They certainly don't go by months.

MR. G. MERCIER: Do they make a prediction then also for the next two or three quarters?

HON. M. DOLIN: Yes, they indicate a 2 percent decline at least.

MR. G. MERCIER: To 16 percent?

HON. M. DOLIN: Approximately, yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: And then the following quarters?

HON. M. DOLIN: Both quarters. What they say is 16.5 for the third quarter and 16 percent for the final quarter. Remember those are our Conference Board of Canada predictions, and I am certainly not underestimating their importance, but they are predictions by a group that is looking at all of Canada.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister then feel that the Careerstart Program is an adequate program combined with all of the other programs if

you like, adequate programs to reduce that rate of unemployment among young people to a much more reasonable figure?

HON. M. DOLIN: Yes, I am very proud of this program, and I think it is a very good program.

MR. G. MERCIER: I am not sure what that answer was, Mr. Chairman. Is she satisfied then that there will be a very significant reduction in unemployment among young people as a result of the Careerstart Program and all of the other programs she's mentioned?

HON. M. DOLIN: As I said before, a Careerstart Program is a part of a much larger thrust and attack on unemployment. As a start, I think that it's a very good start.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, what is the objective then of the Minister? Is it to reduce unemployment among young people to 14 percent, 12 percent, 10 percent, 8 percent?

HON. M. DOLIN: My goal is I'm sure the goal of many people, that there be jobs for anyone who wishes to work. That, of course, is the ultimate goal and that is what we would work for. I would not be satisfied if there was an unemployment rate of 14 percent and some of those people wanted to work. I would seek to create or assist others in creating employment for them. I believe that is my role and that is something that I believe personally that as long as there are people who wish to work, we have a job to do to create employment for them. There may be a very different way of working in the very near future. I am not sure what that will be, but we are certainly watching it carefully and keeping in step with it. I believe that this particular program is a part of that entire thrust.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, we would all share in that objective. What is she going to accomplish this year though? What can the young people of Manitoba be assured of? What will be the rate of unemployment among young people in this province after all of the government programs?

HON. M. DOLIN: According to the Director of our Research Branch, we have frequently been under the predictions, the unemployment predictions. We would hope that not only would we continue to be under those predictions, but we would be well under them. One must consider, of course, that there are constantly more people coming into the workforce, so while we have an increasing workforce, if we have a declining unemployment rate, then certainly we are having an impact on this problem.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the Minister that she would be wise to heed the advice from members of the opposition. We have attempted, last year and this year, to assist the Ministers of Labour in the development of these programs. Last year, I think at our suggestion, the Minister of Labour expanded the criteria for the program and the definition of small business. I think by virtue of that, there was a much

greater number of job opportunities available to young people.

We are concerned about the deadline that she has imposed under the program this year when last year there was no program whatsoever or no deadline whatsoever. Sure, it may have caused a few problems among the administration, but at least the program was able to accommodate some 4,000 jobs for young people. This year she's imposed a deadline which I am frankly not sure is going to be that helpful. I think she's going to certainly find herself in a position of having to extend it further and it should be. We would say extended further to give employers an opportunity to develop these jobs for young people, and that doesn't mean that jobs for young people should stop in the meanwhile until the deadline is reached. That's a tact that she seems to be taking in a couple of answers here and in the Legislature. Just because the deadline is extended, doesn't mean that applications by employers and municipalities can't be approved as they come in and the job referrals may. But I want to say to the Minister that with the extremely large increase in unemployment that has taken place under this government that there is a crisis of unemployment among young people in Manitoba this summer; and that she better prepare now to deal with that because she is just a few weeks away from the date when these large numbers of students are going to be on the job market. If she waits a month or two months to assess, to monitor, etc., she's simply going to find out what we're telling her now that the program is going to have to be expanded if she really wants to assist all of the young people that are going to be looking for jobs. That's something that she better have her department consider right now.

Under the regulations, Mr. Chairman, I want to ask her a question. What if there is a situation where an employer, the regulations provide that an approved employer will interview only those candidates referred by the office and the job centres or delegated authorities? What if there are and I imagine there will be probably be quite a few of these where employers had approved projects last year, and maybe even the year before, and they had hired students. The students are still going through school and the employer has developed a good working relationship with the student. Rather than go through this step of having to interview candidates that are referred, if the student still doesn't have a job and the employer has another approved project, why couldn't the employer simply contact the student he's had in previous years? Maybe if it is in the regulations, I apologize.

HON. M. DOLIN: I see the member has his application form there or the information form. On Page 4 at the top, it says if one of the referred/approved candidates is hired. Now, "referred" is obvious, the meaning of that; "approved" is an indication of just what you were talking about. The employer would contact the office indicating who this student is that they wish to hire, and that contact would be made for them. The employer can do that, so that there can be continuity if they wish if they have a student who worked with them before.

MR. G. MERCIER: There is a mechanism there?

HON. M. DOLIN: Yes, there is and that's explained to employers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(2)(a) - the Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, there's been a fair amount of discussion in regard to the problem of unemployment amongst youth and certainly I don't think any Member of this Legislature questions the difficult situation that people are facing. Of course, it's a difficult situation for anybody who's unemployed. I think everybody accepts that. In terms of the situation amongst youth, however, I think every statistical analysis shows that that's the area where there is the largest amount of unemployment. However, statistics are pretty cold-blooded, Mr. Chairman, I think the most important aspect of it though is the human side. I know from personal experience in talking to many young people who are looking for summer employment how difficult a situation they are faced with.

If it's 4:30, I'll continue my remarks later.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30, we are interrupting the proceedings of this committee for Private Members' Hour.

We will resume at 8:00 o'clock.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Health, Item 4.(d)(1) Continuing Care Services: Salaries.

The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister can review for the committee the situation in respect to continuing care at the present time insofar as the home care directorate and home care policy and approach is concerned? Whether there have been any changes in the home care administration or home care office, leadership of the home care component or approach to home care, is the general overall question that I would like to address in discussing this particular appropriation with the Minister.

There have been some complaints that have reached me, reached colleagues of mine, and although I have no demonstrable proof of it, I venture to suggest that a great many members of this House have perhaps been approached in past months with individual queries or complaints from their constituents having to do with the maintenance of home care services at the quality level to which we have become accustomed and that which they had been long established.

There are indications, hence, suggestions of reductions in the home care field, of cutbacks in home care services, of reassessments, readjustments and reevaluations of the criteria for home care, and I would like to begin looking at this appropriation with a question in that vein to the Minister as to whether he and his staff, in sitting down and developing their Estimates and their Budget for 1983-84 and looking at home care generally, have made any fundamental or basic changes in administration policy, philosophy, approach, criteria for supply of home care, or any other aspect of the operation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I can say quite categorically that there has been no cutback in home care. In fact, that is the place in the item in my Estimates under the Department of Health that has increased the most. There will be at least \$2 million more that I'm asking for. There has been no change in policies. There is a study going on. There is a committee that was set up that is looking at the possibility of seeing how the existing alternative programs for the Home Care Programs are, to study the quality and so on. There has been a Manitoba-Canada Home Care Study and we're looking at that now, but I can say quite categorically that there is no cutback at all; it's quite the opposite.

I'm very proud of our Home Care Program. I still think that we have the best one in Canada, but the more you do the more the people out there feel that you should do. I think that has to be addressed very clearly and very honestly. I think there are some people out there - I don't think - I know - that are demanding a little more. There are people now who feel that home care should not only provide the service in the home but it should accompany these people anywhere they go, and there should be one-on-one and there should be things ready for emergency. That's not what home care is all about. The policies for home care are the same as when my honourable friend was the Minister. I think there's been very little change in that; that is, the maximum that you will allow, unless there is a special case, and I'll come back to that, is you will not spend more money on home care than it would cost to keep these people in an institution.

We're doing everything possible to keep people out of personal care homes, out of institutions, but there are certain areas where that is the only way to deal with it. There is no way that we intend to have the cost to be more costly than keeping people in a personal care. That is not what home care is all about. Now, that will happen in an emergency if somebody is pained and it's quite obvious that these people should be immediately in a hospital or in a personal care bed and that is not possible for a short time, then we're not going to worry about the expenses. It might even exceed the cost of keeping these people in a personal care home or an institution, but that is just a temporary thing and there has been no change on that since the time that I was Minister before my honourable friend was Minister.

I've received criticism too, and I think we always will, because you're dealing with people that to them their health is so important, they have a lot of problems and, as I say, the more we do the more they anticipate that we're supposed to do; the more there is a demand. Now if there's any specific thing, I'll be certainly glad to deal with them. I have examples of some of the people that complained. Unless this is brought up, I'm not going to initiate this; I'm not going to bring in this at this time because I'm a little fed up with some of the criticism that was levelled at this, and I'm not talking about the opposition; I'm talking about some people who, without cause, and I have the facts and figures that I can quote if I'm asked to.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest admiration for the Home Care Program that's been

developed in Manitoba and for the leadership and administration that's been given that program and the service that's been provided by our home care workers over the years.

Certainly, it's a model for much of North America, if not all of North America, and I know that our home care officials are in considerable demand in various jurisdictions around North America for providing leadership and guidance to those areas and jurisdictions which would like to launch Home Care Programs and need instruction on how to do so. So I want to assure the Minister and the officials of the office of Continuing Care and the Home Care directorate that it is an institution in terms of health care in Manitoba of which we're all proud and the opposition shares in that pride. We want to preserve it and maintain it, and our approach to the subject is intended to be positive and constructive and not either negative or destructive; but when there are disturbing reports, even if they're merely rumours, or complaints or questions that come in, it's the opposition's job of course to try to pursue them. This is an opportunity in the Estimates process to examine the integrity and the stability of that Home Care Program, so that's the reason for my wanting to address it pretty intensively with the Minister and I know that he understands that. I've had colleagues in my caucus suggest to me that in their particular areas, in their particular rural constituencies, it has become increasingly difficult to get home care service delivered into homes or maintained in homes; to obtain the necessary home care workers.

I've had questions asked of me, by telephone from residents in other parts of Manitoba, outside of Winnipeg, that there seems to be a goodly supply of supervisors in continuing care and in the home care field, but there's some doubt as to whether there is sufficient workers; whether the money that is being spent is being spent properly or not. I know, in looking at the appropriation that the Minister is asking the Committee's approval on, indications are good and gratifying. We're looking at a requested vote that represents an increase that certainly should compensate for inflationary cost increases; it certainly should compensate for normal cost price increases and then provide a little bit extra to reinforce home care assistance. I suppose the question is one as to where the money is being spent and whether it's being spent as wisely as possible. As I say, the question has been raised with me by Manitobans who have taken the trouble to telephone me about it that their concern, whether the money that's going into home care at the present time is going in sufficient amount to provide home care workers and to provide service, or whether it is going to provide more supervisors and more administration.

Just as a case in point, Mr. Chairman, I've had raised with me the question of so-called refresher courses for home care workers, and I've been asked by Manitobans - I must say that most of the queries have come from outside Winnipeg - as to what these refresher courses are for, and why, and what they are producing, and how much they are costing, and what their overall value is in terms of maintaining home care at the desirable level. Those persons who have asked me about them have suggested that, in their view, the money would be much better spent on services expansion, on

increased services to elderly persons, on more services delivered into the homes - which, of course, is what home care is all about - on more home care workers, rather than on refresher courses for those who are currently on staff. Not that refresher courses and continuing education is not a necessary and worthwhile thing, but if we're getting enormous pressures and demands for delivery of home care service then first things must come first, Mr. Chairman, and the priority would seem to be to place whatever available dollars are there for the Minister in this directorate, in this program area, this year on procurement of more home care workers, rather than perhaps on some other aspects of programming that could be pursued more comfortably in more affluent times. Right now the priority need seems to be for home care workers, is that correct or not? Are we looking at a loss of home care workers in terms of numbers; at a reduction; at a number of openings, vacancies, in the home care worker complement? Why would there be calls of this nature coming to the opposition at this time?

I must say, Mr. Chairman, that I wasn't receiving such calls a year ago but I am receiving them now so I have to call the Minister to account and to answer for the situation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. B. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I can perhaps give the Minister a special area that he might look at in responding to the general concern raised by my colleague, the Member for Fort Garry, and that is, in my home town, not just in my constituency but in the Boissevain area, I'm led to believe that in the year that we are in that there have, indeed, been reductions in the amount of home care being provided, and I gather in the amount of funding available to provide home care. Perhaps the Minister could just tell me whether it's possible that that would have come about as a result of some regional decision, local decision, or does it in fact reflect the year we're in, the tightening up in the amount of funds available?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to point out for the Committee. The Estimates that we have in front of us that we're asking for practically \$3 million more than we had last year. Last year we just about spent the amount that we had. I might say that last year we had - I'll give you a comparison - nursing services, R.N. and VON, 1980, there were 3,029; 1981 - 3,330; 1982 - 3,587 - that's the year that we just finished. Auxiliary services, LPN and home care attendants in 1980 there were 1,280; 1981 - 1,733; 1982 - 2,089. Community Therapy Services in 1980 - 272; in 1981 - 279; in 1982 - 309. Homemaking Services, Community and VON 1980 - 5,192; 1981 - 5,865; 1982 - 6,518. Now, as I demonstrate here with giving you this information, there has been an increase; I've also pointed out that I'm asking for \$3 million more than I had last year. Last year enabled us to give this increase.

Now, I also say very categorically, that the criteria hasn't changed at all. I cannot guarantee, unless I know what specific place, what specific criticism there is or complaints or question, I cannot give an answer. For instance, it is quite conceivable that in certain area -

I'm not saying this is the case, I'm not talking about Boissevain now, I'd want to check into that - but there is a possibility that, yes, of course, home care will be reduced in a certain year because of the criteria. These people are not always in the same demand, there are certain people that are not necessarily on home care for the rest of their lives. Home care serves many purposes. It's before people go in the hospital; after they go in the hospital; give services at times with this care; they get better for awhile. This is one of the situations.

Now, as far as the staff, it's possible that even with this money, we won't be able to do everything that the people want. I think that we have to be very, very careful on that. As I stated, there are some people that want more and more no matter what you do. There's one person who has made a lot of noise in this province, who's been requesting quite a bit of service. Well, without naming any names, I can tell you that we have spent on that person over \$3,000 a month for many years. In fact, just lately it was closer to \$5,000 a month. For obvious reasons, I don't want to start naming names, but some of these people have been less than fair - (Interjection) - that's home care. There're some people that have been less than fair. They expect that they're going to have people one-on-one; that's three-on-one if you're going to have it around the clock, and home care is not for that at all.

Now, there are people that have problems. As I say, we'll do everything possible to keep people out of personal care homes or institutions, but there is a limit. The people of Manitoba cannot afford that. If there's no limit at all, it's going to be quite costly.

Now, I would be only too pleased if you have any direct, specific concern, I certainly would - immediately - we'll have him checked and we'll find out what the situation is. You're dealing with people who, the families are very concerned. It is the health of their people, they're concerned, they should never be left alone and so on, but home care wasn't started for that; home care wasn't started to look after people in their home 24 hours a day and have the specialist that you need. There has to be a happy medium. There has to be somewhere, a line, where the best way to keep these people, unfortunately, is in some kind of an institution. Make these institutions as good as possible, it might be a personal care home, it might be hospital, it might be a rehab, it might be just for a short time.

Now, home care wasn't meant for that at all. We are looking at the situation of home care. We are looking at home care now to see if there's something that can be done for the handicapped people.

As you know, we have three of these facilities for handicapped, and there the average range, well it's about \$800 a month for every one of them. We're still ahead of the game and those people are gainfully employed, many of them. Some of these services, they pay for their rental. They're subsidized the same as any other low-cost housing, and there's all kinds of factors, but it is very dangerous to say here this is an indictment that there's something wrong with home care. There are demands that are not normal that will not be met. I'm ready to take a fair stand on that and to answer these people. Some of them, I think, are not reasonable.

Now, the more we do, there's every day - and the former Minister, I'm sure can tell us the same thing,

that nearly every day or every week, somebody wants something else covered by home care. We just can't do it. As I say, the criteria have not changed. I'm asking for \$3 million more. That's probably in a year of restraint and a year of deficit Budget. We said we certainly wouldn't cut. Not only are we not cutting, we're improving the service. There's not more people living in Manitoba. Mind you, there might be more people getting to a certain age that they might need more services, and this is one of the reasons that we want to spend some of the money also on prevention. We try to keep people healthy as long as possible. We will keep on with home care.

But I want to point out that it is not an unlimited amount of cash that could be spent for any whim or anything that people want. Unfortunately, we're still not in a position to do that. We're improving the situation in place now.

As far as education, I should like to say to my honourable friend, because of the volume; because of the extra need of extra people, we have to train some people. That's one of the criticisms that I'm getting, that we haven't got the right type of people there. Now, the department has been working hard in trying to upgrade the training. There has been many months of work with Red River Community College and there is now a training program for homemakers in attendance. With this program, the department has trained facilitators in each region so that training for the department service staff can be better scheduled and improved. This is mostly for people that will train others.

We certainly must remember that these people are going through difficult times, but at times they're not the easiest people to get along with and at times they want to change. It's not always their fault. At times, it's the staff also, and sometimes they want a change, so we must have at least a minimum of training. That's what we're doing. We're not going in a different direction that we're going to re-educate everybody that's in the service. It is that we need more people and we're training people that will be able to do that.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister assure me that this increase in the Budget which, as I say, is recognized and is gratifying, is going essentially to provide more delivery of more home care services into the homes of persons requiring home care and not going into staff programming; administration; staff expansion, or to any unreasonable degree, education, training and refresher courses? Again, I emphasize that education, training and refresher courses are not unimportant. I'm not suggesting that they are, but in the scale of priorities, I would hope that they're not being overemphasized at the expense of delivery of the service. I'd like to have that assurance from the Minister for those people who discuss this kind of subject with me and with him from time to time.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, I certainly can give this assurance that the amount that will be spent for increase for continuing care program related to increased case loads, heavier care needs of the aging population and home care support services of the severely disabled young adult enabling them to live in modified apartment settings; that there'll be over \$2 million spent on that.

Now, another thing for the Member for Turtle Mountain, I have a note here, and I hope that this message will carry, the people that will understand. It is an easy thing at this time because of the economy to say that we're discontinuing; we're cutting down, but as my honourable friend knows, there is reassessment on needs. I mean these people come in and after a certain time, you have a reassessment. Many of them feel that once they've established that, it should carry on, and it isn't. The criteria stays the same until the people improve, and then at times they will discontinue it, not because of the economic situation at all. It is because of reassessment made by staff. That's always questionable. People like to have, when they're used to it and sometimes it's good company also that they have people, maybe more so even in the rural area where it might be some of the same people forever, but then these cases have to be reassessed. If we didn't do that, this program would cost an awful lot more money. As I said, it's going out. I remember when we started, when we had reassessment because we thought it was spending too much money; it was \$5 million. Now, we're talking about \$20 million, plus all the other programs that we have besides that with the Provincial Gerontologist and the well-elderly and that kind of service.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Are there any tougher principles of reassessment being applied now than was the case a year or two years ago?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, none at all.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Before having to leave this committee and move into the other committee where he was required for some questions, Mr. Chairman, my colleague, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, asked me whether I would check with the Minister in respect to the particular local and regional question that he raised, whether there had been any change in criteria applied in his region, in his area. I asked the Minister a few moments ago whether, in general, there were any criteria changes in the program and he said no; but for the sake of the record and the sake of my colleague who was going to be asking specifically about the Turtle Mountain constituency and the Boissevain area, I put the question again to the Minister as to whether there have been any changes in that geographic region insofar as the criteria for home care is concerned.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That is the answer I was trying to give for that specific case which told there is certain - he asked me the reassessment of needs in the Boissevain area, and some were discontinued and many were continued. It seems quite obvious that the public associates these that are discontinued with the economy, but I am assured by staff that it is only because of results of reassessment and not because of the economic situation at all.

As I say, we are spending more money. It is a question of reassessment of needs. It might be that we lacked - and if there are certain specific cases, I would be only too glad to review them. I am not saying that we are infallible, that staff never make mistakes, but I think they are pretty decent people. It is tough, and if they

don't do that, you can just imagine how fast the cost will go up and eventually we won't be able to keep this service.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the rationale, of course, for home care is to provide an alternative to institutional care for people and to enable them to be maintained and to maintain themselves in their homes, despite their physical disabilities and difficulties. From time to time, additional programs have been added to the home care spectrum. It certainly is expanded in terms of its philosophical concept approach and umbrella over what it consisted of in its original form some years ago. We had, within the past two years, added the Home Oxygen Therapy Program, for example, and expanded in support to the Focus unit - Focus I and Focus II, the modified independent apartment living concept for physically disabled persons. There was, in fact, a third Focus facility that was brought on stream within the past year, I believe - 1982 Focus III - which became operational, I think, as a result of funding from home care or support services provided by home care.

I wonder if the Minister could review briefly those additional programs that were added to the home care spectrum in 1982 and advise the committee as to whether 1983, as covered in these '83-84 Estimates, includes any provision for establishment of new services under home care of the type that I have described.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, the home oxygen therapy for rural Manitoba, the provincial protocol has been established. There's a Doctor Anthonisen, the Respiratory Centre, who is acting as the department's medical consultant in this area. During 1982, hospitals where appropriate testing facilities were identified throughout the province, medical chiefs of staff in these hospitals identified physicians of their staff who were qualified to screen potential clientele. At present, there are 15 physicians, at least one physician in each region, who are available to screen potential home oxygen therapy clientele. Twenty-two home oxygenators are now in place for rural clientele in their homes. This represents 35 percent of the concentrators currently on loan in the province. Equipment and oxygen tanks costs are being covered for all persons eligible for home care.

Now, the Focus - my honourable friend is right. We now have Focus I, Focus II and Focus III. The Focus units are independent living settings for adults with severe physical disabilities. The units consist of apartments that have been modified to accommodate the physically handicapped. Continuing Care was instrumental in developing these units and continues to co-ordinate the provision of personal care and housekeeping support to the residents. It is intended that with some assistance, physically disabled adults will be able to live essentially independent lives as Focus residents. In many cases, residents have learned basic living skills during a period of residence in Ten Ten Sinclair and prior to coming to the Focus unit.

Focus units are defined as Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation housing developments. Rental payments are subsidized by Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation according to income, with some

clients paying the full rental costs. Residents may be fully or partially employed students who are participating in vocational training.

Basic information on each of the residences are as follows: Focus I located at 352 Assiniboine Avenue. There are nine residents and a large proportion of them are quadriplegic and Home Care costs residents an average of \$635.00.

Then there's Focus II located at 15 Kennedy Street; 16 residents; pretty well the same type. Home Care costs the residents per month the average of \$835.00.

Finally, Focus III located at Queen Street, a privately-owned apartment building, through use of a Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation grant. There are 12 residents, mostly young, 25 to 40 with chronic and degenerative diseases. Home Care costs per person there is approximately \$800 per month.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Are there any new programs contemplated for 1983-84, Mr. Chairman, or further expansion of these two programs to which the Minister has referred?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, there is a further Home Care Assistance amount of \$20,000 which will provide for the payments of salaries and travel costs for homemakers, nurses, attendants and for therapy services for care in the home. The continuation to all year costs of the new programs introduced last year, that is Focus III, and the Rural Oxygen Program we just covered. Then there are service costs for the Luther Project which will come on stream this year for 8 to 10 disabled persons. Growth in the overall numbers needing care in 1983-84 and for greater intensity of care needed by some.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, is the service delivered in the homes to recipients of home care basically by R.N.s and LPNs or is home care making extensive use of orderlies, male or female, and/or outside services such as Home Orderly Services Limited? In other words, what is the spectrum of workers, professionals, health care occupations, delivering service to home care recipients?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm going to make sure I understand the question, the honourable member is asking about the monthly number of different people required in the Home Care Program, or is it just on a specific . . . ?

MR. L. SHERMAN: Yes, please, Mr. Chairman, and the breakdown, if possible. Is it Registered Nurses, LPNs, homemakers?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'll give you the same comparison for the last three years. Homemakers in 1980 were 1,682; 1981, 1,852; 1982, 2,010. Registered Nurses - 103, 174 and 197; LPNs - 76, 75 and 95.

MR. L. SHERMAN: The last figure in each case is '82, eh?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, it's 1980, '81, and '82.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thanks.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Home care attendants, 136 in 1980; 171 in 1981; and finally, 209 in 1982. Therapists - 45, 56 and 48.

MR. L. SHERMAN: What was the last figure?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: 48, that's therapists; volunteers - 1,100, 1,281, and the same number in '82.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, do these increases in the total numbers of persons categorically employed by home care reflect increased caseloads in the home care system, increased pressure of demand, increased numbers admitted to the program, or do they reflect an enrichment of service and attention to those persons receiving the program and whose numbers have remained fairly constant? Are we looking here at an increase in caseload and therefore an increase in staff or employees of the program, or are we looking at enriched home care services being delivered to the same number of recipients but requiring a greater number of personnel to deliver them?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I believe that it's a mixture of pretty well all the reasons that were enumerated. I believe also that there are more people in home care because a larger number of them are waiting for placement in a personal care home or that normally would have to be in a personal care home. So I guess that means that there are richer services, more services. I can give this added information - the admissions to home care for the last three years - in 1980 there were 8,832; 1981, 9,212; 1982, 9,687. On discharge from home care: 1980, 7,763; 1981, 8,767; 1982, 8,697. Total numbers receiving home care services during the year which is an important figure: in 1980, 16,971; 1981, 18,386; 1982 - 19,343. Of the numbers admitted to the program and that might help with the question that was just asked, the alternative for them and home care not being available would have been personal care home placement, 16 percent; remain in hospital, 40 percent; and remain at home but without appropriate care would be 44 percent. Of the number discharged for the program the reason for discharge was, placed into personal care home or admitted to hospital, 23 percent; improved and no longer needing home care, 38 percent, and that's where the services have been discontinued; improved and able to manage own care is another 17 percent; deceased, 17 percent; and other, 5 percent.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Is there a waiting list for home care, Mr. Chairman?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, not really. Not for home care, there might be certain services that are not covered. At times we've had to inform people that some people by rights should have been in the hospital where you have the proper care of the trained personnel and so on. They've refused to go but there's no waiting list.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Would there be an average length of tenure of a home care recipient or is that possible? I know there are all kinds of categories of people

requiring different types of home care and obviously a physically disabled person with a disability with which they were born and from which they are never likely to recover in total would require home care on an ongoing basis. But is there an average figure that could be cited that would represent the average length of time that a home care recipient was on the program caseload, like one month, or three months, or is it possible to arrive at that kind of a figure?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I would think that it's impossible to really arrive at that. You have people that have been on home care ever since it was started. You have these people now, these new programs like FOCUS, they'll be there forever until they move or die; in fact, things could get worse. There are some people, of course, as I said, the figures that I gave in saying those that were discharged and were placed into personal care homes, that's another thing, the same people then would go into personal care homes if there are enough beds. We were trying to keep them at home as long as possible and I think we're doing that. We're keeping more people at home on home care that normally would have been in a personal care home.

Then there is improved and no longer needing home care, 38 percent. Then if we're going to add in, even giving home care, not necessarily just older people, although I guess the highest percentage would be older people, but people who are waiting to get in the hospital, for instance, there might need some home care, some limited service, of people who are discharged from the hospital. I was talking about the obstetric beds closed and I said that they would have more service in the home, more care in the home before and after. That's another possibility, but just to give an average, I think we'd be comparing apples and oranges.

I can give the average cost, the average monthly cost, and of course the dollars are not the same, but in 1980-81 the average cost was \$84.23; in 1981-82, \$98.15; 1982-83, \$106.42.

MR. L. SHERMAN: \$106.43?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: \$106.42 last year, and that does not take into consideration departmental staff salary costs which would increase it. The experience has shown that the third and fourth quarter costs are more representative of full costs, so that's taken at the end of December.

MR. L. SHERMAN: What is the cutoff point for providing home care? At what point do people who have requested home care for their elderly relatives find themselves told by home care, "No, we're not going to deliver home care because this case is beyond our capability and your elderly relatives should be in hospital."

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I raise this question due to a specific individual instance brought to my attention by a family and their doctor in the past few weeks. I don't particularly want to raise the name of the family, at this point, on the record but I can certainly discuss it privately, either with the Director of the Office of Continuing Care, Mrs. Enid Thompson, who is here,

or with the Minister, but I'm sure they know, in general, what sort of case I'm talking about anyway. It's a case of a family who would like their elderly relative to be at home, who say they don't want to take up a hospital bed, who say they don't want to put a load on the hospital services, these things can be done at home with family help and with home care, and home care apparently finds it impossible to deliver to that particular family. What's the cut-off point? Where's the criterion where home care draws the line and says, "No, we're not going to deliver service to you; you're going to have to go into hospital."

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I might say that the Home Care Program is not able to provide total care. I don't know of any Home Care Program anywhere that does so. The care, in an individual's home, is not appropriate for the person, for instance, who is at extreme risk or totally physically dependent through 24 hours a day and where the person is totally dependent on the Home Care Program.

This is one-on-one, all day, 24 hours and the home care cannot provide the service. In such a situation, for home care staff, there is no nurse or doctor; it's not only just one-on-one, it's different services. It might need a doctor and a nurse; there's no nurse or doctor or senior supervisory staff in the same building; there is no professional staff on duty every day to assure this continuity. The situation at this level requires professional staff around the clock and sometimes other specialists as well.

This is not only too expensive, to do it is not possible at this time because the staff isn't there, so that is a general n'a proseur? of what we look at now. As far as the cost, and there's always an exception for some reason or other, but the cost is that you could provide certain services and so on, but when the cost gets to the same level as a person would be if they were institutionalized - as I say there could be exceptions - well then it's time to look to see that person then needs the service of an institution.

Now there are times, for some reason or another, times that somebody is depending on some help. Maybe their partner, their spouse and their spouse might have to be away for a short while or might be sick and then that might cost a little more; well then we will go ahead. That's one of the times that even if it costs a little more. It might be that these people have been panelled to go in a personal care home and there's no home available, and it is an emergency, it's somebody who needs the care, where you can say there is a waiting list for personal care home and you might say, "You're on the waiting list," that's not good enough. These people have to be taken care of and there, until we find a place, and of course you can just imagine that these receive priority in the placement of waiting list, but it might be that these people will be kept in an acute hospital or somewhere else, or it could be that they will get home care at home and it could be that it's more costly than it normally would be in a personal care home, for instance. But that is not the rule, that is an exception.

MR. L. SHERMAN: But we can proceed on the firm, continuing assumption that all things being equal the

motivation and rationale for home care is to keep people in their homes and out of hospitals. Is that not correct? That has not changed. Home care is not now saying, "Well we just haven't got the muscle, the capacity, the resources anymore and we're going to ease as many of these people into hospital as we can." That is absolutely untrue?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, I'd like to have that assurance for the record, Mr. Chairman, because of conversations that come up with families from time to time. Thank you.

What about the home orderly service, Mr. Chairman? I want to ask a question or two about that service. At the time that our government was in office there were some criticisms raised about the home orderly service by some recipients of the service and by the Minister's colleague, now the Minister of Mines and Energy, the Honourable Member for Transcona. There were objections and criticisms raised at that time about the manner, the efficiency and the accountability of the home orderly service that was being contracted out and that was being provided to recipients.

There was some question at the time, some suggestion that the province should be looking at implementing, introducing a home orderly service of its own and when the current government, the New Democratic Government, was elected and assumed office, one of the first things they did in this area, I think, was conduct a review of the contracting out of home orderly services, of the company that works in that field, on contract, with the government and of the viability of the service, the satisfaction of the patients receiving the service and the financial accountability aspect.

I think there was a review completed and results published, but my memory is a little hazy on the precise results other than they seemed to reconfirm that the service was adequate and was as efficient as could be hoped for in the circumstances and that it certainly was less costly than having the government launch a home orderly service as a departmental program of its own. I'd like to have the Minister's response though to a general question as to my recollection of that subject and to the home orderly service review, was it reviewed with those conclusions? Is it the subject of an ongoing review? Where are the conclusions and results of any such review that was carried out? Is the government thinking of doing different things in the home orderly service field in '83-84?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is absolutely correct. There has been criticism in the past when he was the Minister and there is still criticism now. There was concern that their bookkeeping, their accounting - I'm talking about this private company now - wasn't adequate. That was the study that I think my honourable friend is talking about that I asked the staff to do. When this was done, it was found obvious that there was no intent in withholding money or overcharging to the government but that their accounting methods were very bad. That was improved, they were helped in setting up a system.

I think they found that they owed the government a couple of thousand dollars; that was repaid.

There has been criticism. Apart from that, the criticism often comes from younger disabled people, disabled people who are not satisfied. We still have to study, there is no doubt that it is an adequate service. It's probably not the best but then what do we face? If it's taken over by the province, by the department, there is no doubt that it'll be a lot costlier. Now, I'm not sure that we're not going to have complaints even at the time. There are improvements that have been made. They've revived and updated their training manual; they've formalized the training plan for orderlies and added services to provide backup at the most critical times.

They've improved the mechanism for the scheduling of calls to prevent lost or forgotten calls. That was in one of the criticisms - that they were late, or they didn't show up and so on. They are also planning to introduce a degree of uniform clothing to improve identification of the personnel. I might say that there's not a final decision. This is being considered by Cabinet and they've been presented the alternative also; and the cost, and we're still looking at it. But so far for this year we have no provision to change anything; we're still going on with the same firm. They have improved and they're doing their best.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Are there results of that review that the Minister carried out that are available, Mr. Chairman, or is it entirely an in-house confidential study?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the member would bear with me, as far as I'm concerned I have no objection to sharing this with my honourable friend. I'll find out if there's anything available and, if so, I'll provide the information.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. One of the key functions and responsibilities of course of this division and this service is the responsibility for placement of elderly Manitobans, and some other Manitobans who aren't necessarily elderly, in personal care home placement.

Before I explore for a minute with the Minister the arithmetic of personal care home placements, availability, demand and bed requirements at the present time, I'd like to ask about special needs personal care. There has been a continuing interest, I think, certainly there was one on the part of our government in my own case and I believe the current Minister is of the same opinion that as we have moved into the challenge of meeting the requirement of personal care in general, and that was a major challenge and it took many years to reach a point where we now are pretty well served by personal care beds throughout the province, we had to be looking beyond at some other things that we could do as soon as the general pattern and resource services permitted.

One of those was to get into the area of special needs personal care. Special needs being in some cases physical, and in some cases ethnic, and it certainly was an ambition of mine to try to get to the point where we could move into providing personal care homes for

younger people who were suffering physical disabilities and debilitating diseases, such as multiple sclerosis, whose life was not particularly enriched by having them admitted to conventional personal care homes where they were moving and mixing with a community of residents much older than they. So the thought was that they should be given an opportunity of being amongst their own peers in terms of age and in terms of disability. We were looking at special needs personal care homes to serve that type of young person suffering from debility or disability.

The other area, as I say, or one other area is the ethnic cultural one. It's extremely difficult, it goes without saying; I think all members of the committee recognize it. It's extremely difficult for some people who have not had the opportunity in their lifetime to achieve the cultural communication and fluency in either English or French that most Manitobans have. It's extremely difficult for them to then, in their declining years, move into an environment of English or French where they perhaps have lived their entire lives in other linguistic and cultural environments, whether it be Ukrainian, whether it be South Asian, whether it be African, whether it be Jewish, whether it be Slavic, whatever. It makes it very difficult for people of that lifetime exposure to enjoy their years of old age in an environment that culturally and linguistically is foreign to them. So that going into a personal care home that was not attuned to their ethnic background and their language was something that wasn't particularly attractive. We, I know, hoped to get into a situation where we could be looking at personal care homes that served and met the needs of specific ethnic and cultural groups. This isn't to say that there aren't some. Of course, there are Ukrainian personal care homes, French language personal care homes, Hebrew personal care homes, certainly there are specific ones that meet those specific needs in a limited way. They have been, to a substantial degree, the products of the efforts of persons in their own communities who have worked to establish that kind of cultural milieu and environment for their own old people. But there's a need for more of that and given the necessary financial resources, one would hope in the personal care field to move into that kind of availability.

I'd like to ask the Minister whether there are any plans in the current program area of the Office of Continuing Care, or the personal care field to get into special needs personal care either on both a physical needs basis and a cultural needs basis in a more intensive way in the current Budget, in the current year, or in the near future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to first of all start with the special needs, not for the physical needs. I have established an interdepartmental committee which presently is pulling together information, especially on the younger disabled in personal care homes and it will be broadening the terms of reference to the younger disabled in community care. This will provide a basis for which we can then proceed to look at the concern and for any possible answers to them, so we're looking at that. We have a special interdepartmental committee working on that.

I'm hesitant, Mr. Chairman, to try to answer all this too thoroughly, because that is mostly covered under the Manitoba Health Services Commission, the type of homes and all that. We're certainly in line here that these are the people that assess and I wonder if I could keep that for when we get under personal care homes but I'll give the information of the assessment and the waiting list and so on, if that is all right?

MR. L. SHERMAN: All right, Sir.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The number of persons on waiting lists for personal care home placement - that was at the end of December, 1982 - and I'll give the last three years. In the rural area in 1980 it was 1,079; in 1981 - 893; and in 1982 - 717. Now Winnipeg were 711 in '80; 519 in '81; 727 in '82. So it's been a low year in 1981 in Winnipeg. It has been declining more steadily in the rural areas.

Now the average monthly number of persons remaining in hospital in Winnipeg while awaiting placement - that is another reason why the change in the acute hospital - there has been 171 in 1980; 153 in '81; 148 in 1982. The non-acute hospitals with 214 in '80; 174 in '81; and 155 in '82.

You will have noticed, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, that there was quite a decline in the Winnipeg waiting list from '80 to '81, it went from 111 to 519; in '82 it went up to about the same, to 727. I wanted to know the reason for that and I was told that the statistics show that there are low and high years in the number of vacancies which occur even when the bed numbers remain the same; 1982 has been a low year by almost 300 fewer placements. Increasing number on home care whose care needs have been increasing, now require a placement.

Also there's a lot of other factors. For instance, the new programs that we have for instance - I'm talking palliative care and I don't mean new this year - but I mean those that are getting in the stream. There are more and more people that are working that so these people then can stay at home under home care. I think home care is doing more of - I shouldn't say a better job - but it's taking more of these people.

For instance, the people receiving home care pending placement this last year was 43 percent, where the year before there was only 29 percent. So, these people technically are still on the waiting list, but they're being provided fairly well in their home. It's just that some of them still need a bit more education. I think people are quite concerned and they feel well yes, but some day I'll need a personal care home, so they want to register immediately and have that bed reserved. But once they realize that there is a respite care program, there are programs of day care for the elderly and respite care and so on, I think then probably there'll be less people in personal care homes.

We still feel that we have one of the richer, when we're talking about the guidelines for beds per thousand, we still feel that we have one of the richer - we haven't changed that but we will be looking at that - as I hope we can improve all those other programs that make it possible to keep these people in the home as long as possible. We're working on this and other programs, of course, that we'll cover later on, what we

used to call the enriched senior citizen housing but we have a different name now. The staff didn't like that name at all. It reminded them as if we were focusing on the construction of a building and it was more of a building but it isn't that at all. It is a services and the services are not the same.

As far as the ethnic group and these things, I have some very strong views on that also. If the committee and the honourable member wouldn't mind, I'd sooner wait till we get to personal care homes to cover that.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the Minister whether those figures that he just provided with respect to the waiting list for personal care homes and the like, include figures for hostel care and extended care beds, or are we talking just specifically of levels 2, 3 and 4, personal care?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm surprised it covers 1, 2, 3 and 4. I didn't realize that it covered 1 because we are looking and we'll see that in our capital program. We are trying to phase out the hostel group as far as an insurance service as much as possible. We're not going to do it in one year, but eventually I think we will have to have other services for these people. It could be home care, or some of the services that are provided by the free enterprise system on - is it Nassau or something, I'm thinking of Herman Thorlakson's place; I think they're giving quite good service - and their licence is under the department of my colleague, Mr. Evans.

I have that broken down by region and levels if that's okay with you and the committee.

MR. L. SHERMAN: This includes Level 1 does it?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I have it broken down.

In the Hostel, Level I, in the Westman, those living in the community there is 105; and those presently in the hospital, 18. The personal care, Level II in the community 100 and the hospital, 71. Extended Care, Levels III and IV, in the community 17 and in the hospital 42, for a total of 353. I might say that I am less concerned and I am sure that my honourable friends realize that also and he's aware of these people waiting in the rural area where acute beds would not be filled anywhere, so what's the use of building. I don't think that's as serious as it might be in some of these hospitals in the city, teaching hospitals especially.

Eastman, the Hostel, Level I in the community 11; Personal Care Home, Level Two, in the community 39 and the hospital 8; Extended Care III and IV, in the community 17 and the hospital 14, for a total of 89.

Central region, Level I, nine in the community two in the hospital; Level II, 32 in the community, 17 in the hospital; Level Three and Four, 7 in the community, 19 in the hospital, for a total of 86.

Interlake, 18 in Level I, 28 in the community, 1 in the hospital. Level II, 26 and 25; Level III and IV, 12 and 9, for a total of 101.

Parklands, Level I, 5 and 0, the first is in the community, the second is in the hospital. Level II, 29 and 8. Level III and IV, 10 and 15, for a total of 67.

Norman, Level I, 3 and 1; Level II, 7 and 0; Level III and IV, 1 and 3 for a total of 15.

Thompson, none at Level I. Level II, 1 and 3 and Extended Care 3 and 4, 2 in the community, none in the hospital, for a total of 6.

Now, the total in the rural, there is Hostel Level I, there is 161 in the community and 21 in the hospitals. That would make 183 in Level I. Level II, there's 234 and 132, that would make 364. Finally, III and IV, there is 66 and 102, for a total of 168. A total of all levels in all regions is 717.

In the Winnipeg region, as I mentioned, there is a waiting list of 727. Without those in Level I, there's 92, 81 living in the community, 11 in the hospital. In Level II, there is a total of 443, 300 in the community and 143 in the hospital. Finally, III and IV, there is 192, 57 in the community and 135 in the hospital, for a total of 727. The total waiting list in the province is 1,444, but if we start with hostels there is 275, Level II, there is 809; finally, Level III and IV, there is 370.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you very much. So the Winnipeg total would be 727?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Right.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Minister for those statistics. The obvious and gratifying conclusion is that the waiting list for personal care home admission has been generally and steadily coming down in the province. I recognize that there was an aberration in 1981-82 when the figure declining in Winnipeg then went back up again. There seemed to be a very low dip in '81, but overall in general terms over the past three to four years it can be said with gratification that the waiting list for personal care homes in Manitoba generally has been coming down. The figure has been declining, both in the rural area and the urban area.

I might say, Sir, at this point in time, that I take particular satisfaction and pride in the fact that under our government, during the time when I had the honour to be Minister, we did build and add to the spectrum of personal care beds in Manitoba some 1,000 new personal care beds net, that is over and above the replacement beds. So the total was raised from something like 7,300 personal care beds in the province to something like 8,300 personal care beds in the province. In many regions, communities and areas, we have reached the 90-bed-per-thousand residents over age 70 guideline, although there are some underserved points.

I would ask the Minister whether the general network in supply of personal care beds at this point in time appears to him to be satisfactory? I know we're going to be dealing under the item on the Commission, Mr. Chairman, with Personal Care Program. At that point in time, we will be looking presumably at the Ministers Capital Program and what he is intending to do in the personal care field. But, we are at this point in the Estimates looking at the Office of Continuing Care and placement of persons in personal care homes. We are looking at statistics that indicate that where three or four years ago the waiting list for personal care homes ran roughly in the neighbourhood of 1,800 to 2,000, today, it is down around the 1,400 mark, 1,444, representing that steady decline I have talked about.

We also recognize, I think on both sides of this committee, that there will always be some kind of a waiting list and there will always be duplicative figures that swell the waiting list in an artificial way, that increase it artificially because of the fact that people are sometimes on more than one list.

So, the outlook at the moment appears favourable. I would like to ask the Minister what part this arithmetic plays in his planning and thinking about personal care beds personally and individually at the present time? Is he satisfied that we have now reached a point in Manitoba where we have got a handle on the overall need for general personal care facilities? Can he turn his attention to some other kinds of questions of need and services in the gerontological field and in the special needs personal care field?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I believe, yes, that we're getting fairly close. There is different factors, of course, that around the turn of the century you'll have to deal with more people in the age bracket that you are serving now. That is one of the factors. Now, of course if we're going to try and bring in new programs, and if we're going to expand home care and improve home care, there is no reason to do that if we're going to keep on providing as many personal care homes; I am talking about for the same population, the same age bracket.

I think that we, fairly soon, will want to look - in fact the Commission is starting - at the situation to see if we should not reduce our guidelines, taking into consideration all the programs that we have. Also, as I mentioned earlier, we are certainly intending under this program of personal care homes, under a university insured program, we are thinking very seriously, of course, of cutting down - well, it's more than thinking about it, we were gradually cut down the hostels under this program. I am not saying that these services should not be provided, but not under this program, unless we can offer it in a universal way to everyone in Manitoba, for the same service, it wouldn't be fair to keep them. That will take a little while to do. So, I think with all these services, improvement on that, I would hope that also with our services on prevention, our programs on prevention, will start to bear fruit, so these are all factors.

One concern though, and I think that because we are still going to build beds, one of the concerns is that we have to replace some of the beds that have been obsolete for a while. That was done under the former government. In other words, the beds that we'll build are not all new beds. I can tell you that we will build quite a few new beds; they are new beds, but not additional beds. As was done before under the former Minister and even in my days earlier, we have to try to get rid of some of these beds that are not proper standards. Right now it's very difficult. You have a choice that you have people without any facility at all or if you just have to be too tough on the standards, and sometimes the standards and the care and the staff make up for that.

I know that my mother-in-law is in a place that is not the best building in the world, it's something that will have to be replaced fairly soon, but I don't think I'd want her anywhere else because she's getting good

service. I'm referring to the St. Boniface, Foyer St. Boniface, St. Boniface Nursing Home on Archibald. It's a fairly small place; the building is not in very good shape but the service is very good. But eventually these places will have to be replaced. All in all, I think the member is absolutely right about the program and all that. I think that the personal care home will soon plateau; they'll have to be in good condition. We'll have to replace those that are practically obsolete but I think that we'll fairly soon reach the number of beds that we want. But we'll have to keep on, as was mentioned, keep our gerontologist working overtime and so on, to provide the necessary services to be able to keep these people out of these institutions.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I know the Minister did mention enriched elderly persons' housing a minute or two ago but that was a specific point I wanted to ask him about, and it seems a timely juncture at which to ask him because we've been discussing the degree to which we may now, in Manitoba, have met and captured and overcome the challenge of supply of conventional personal care beds. That of course was a primary challenge throughout the 1970s. But if we have indeed got to the point where we can see light at the end of the tunnel and where we really do have a handle on the requirement and need for conventional personal care beds and personal care facilities, can we not now, and should we not now, be looking to the missing link in the spectrum, and that is enriched elderly persons' housing.

I know the Minister referred to it a minute or two ago and he mentioned, I think, the fact it's being addressed by a different name or there's been a suggestion that the title or the name be changed because it doesn't necessarily reflect the service, but he knows what I mean by enriched elderly persons' housing. It seems to me, as you go around various communities in rural Manitoba, that, yes we have got the personal care beds that we need. I'm not saying this applies everywhere; I know there are still some communities anxious and deserving of personal care service.

But in general, as you go around, you find the communities have got personal care but they don't have anything between personal care and life in the home. They don't have anything between normal, home living and residential living in a personal care facility. That's where the missing link in enriched elderly persons' housing comes in. I would hope there would be a thrust on that programming area.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, there definitely will be. I know what my honourable friend is talking about because I kept calling it the enriched housing for elderly persons. Now an internal departmental committee was set up on supporting services for housing for the elderly and that was the representation from my department, the Department of Health, Community Services and Corrections and Housing.

The committee is working. There is a lot of expertise in these people that are working on this committee, in my department and other departments, and it has been identified. They felt that the name - and we've accepted

the recommendation - should be changed to support services, because it's not cut and dried; it's not every building that should have a cafeteria or whatever. The committee has made a submission identifying the nature and range of needed support services and they are unanimous in saying that the service needs vary considerably from one unit to the other. The intent is to co-ordinate and make accessible the services that already exist also and there are certain services such as meals, transportation, shopping, security, preventive health and health supervision.

The committee was instructed to make submissions to the Minister on the individual housing projects, some of the senior citizens' homes that we have already. There are certain people that want to discuss the possibility of personal care homes or housing as soon as they've had the approval from the housing authority to go ahead with their senior citizens' housing, and we encourage them to discuss with us these support services so we can provide them and there might be some adjustment in the construction of a building. But there certainly will be and there has been a thrust going in that direction.

The way it was identified, there was less involvement of the Minister of Housing except that he would have to approve the housing, but the services are mostly with my department and Community Services and Corrections.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The hour is 4:30, time for Private Members' Hour. The committee will reconvene at 8 o'clock tonight.

IN SESSION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: It's 4:30, Private Members' Hour. The first item on the Private Members' agenda for Monday is their proposed resolutions, Resolution No. 7.

RES. NO. 7 - TOWARDS DEMOCRACY IN THE WORKPLACE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move, seconded by the Member for Radisson, my resolution, but I understand that there are difficulties with the form in the last clause, so I request leave from the House to amend it accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER: Can the honourable member indicate what the correction is?

MS. M. PHILLIPS: In the first "RESOLVED", after the words, "the Government of Manitoba," add "be requested to" and in the "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED," after the "Department of Labour and Employment Services," add "consider the advisability of assisting."

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave to make that correction? (Agreed)

The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Shall I read the whole motion?

WHEREAS consultation with employees and their representatives by employers in the operation of business enterprises can engender a sense of commitment to and enhance the well-being and prosperity of the enterprise and of its employees; and

WHEREAS the broad skills and talents of employees frequently are employed only in narrow and specific job functions for the benefit of the enterprise; and

WHEREAS the special knowledge, skills, and insights of employees could both assist in the more efficient operation of the enterprise and to develop a sense and an effect of constructive co-operation; and

WHEREAS participants in the Economic Summit Conference organized by the Government of Manitoba at Portage la Prairie last November unanimously concurred on the value of improved consultation and communications, as a means of improving labour management relationships, and providing broader perspectives to the operation of business enterprise; and

WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba has proposed that a process of consultation and participation by employees in Crown enterprises would be beneficial to the employees, the enterprises, and the citizens of Manitoba;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba be requested to encourage employers, with employees and their representatives in the province, to undertake ongoing programs of participation and consultation in the operation of their enterprises; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba, through the Department of Labour and Employment Services, consider the advisability of assisting those enterprises wishing to establish consultative and participatory mechanisms with their employees and their representatives.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MS. PHILLIPS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The resolution that I've put forward this afternoon, in my opinion, extends what we in this country hold dear in terms of political democracy to democracy within the workplace.

Time was in our political evolution and our political history that it seemed ordinary for the country that we take our traditions from, namely, England to be ruled by the divine right of kings. This, in effect, was something that a few lords and nobles rebelled against and slowly over the years, we developed the political system that we hold dear and that we treasure today.

Through the changes in our economic system, however, and through the industrial revolution, the trade union movement developed giving some measure of democracy to workers in the workplace, but where in our political sphere, the system was extended to having every citizen participate and choose their representatives and have some measure of democracy over their lives. That doesn't extend into our everyday working lives and into the workplace, though the union movement workers have some say over their wages and working conditions but not over things that are reserved as management rights or corporate decision-

making. Workers have no say over job design, over investment decisions, over plant expansions and closure decisions, and the way that their everyday work is organized. Someone else makes those decisions in relative isolation from the experience and the expertise that the workers on the plant floor garner in their day-to-day operation.

The result of this present system, unfortunately, is a lot of time lost in the workplace and I know the members opposite have stated concern over time lost due to things like unemployment and strikes, but have not looked farther at what is the cause of that situation. They rail about low productivity and strikes, but I think this resolution addresses some of the methods that we can start to look at in this country to overcome a decline in our competitive system in the world marketplace.

For instance, unemployment in the last 30 years has never gone below 5 percent and it has been up as high as 12 percent in the official statistics, not mentioning the unofficial statistics. The number of working people that are then left out of the workplace and are not contributing to our country's gross national product by being unemployed over the years is quite phenomenal.

The other problem that we have to face is the problem of absenteeism. Absenteeism can be looked at in terms of people being legitimately ill or having legitimate reasons for being away from the workplace, but it also is well-known in studies of absenteeism as being really unreported revolt, and a direct result of alienation in an individual's job.

A recent study in Ontario of over 100 businesses estimated that absenteeism affects 8 percent at least of the work force. Another reason for lost productivity is injury and a federal study of disabling injuries, that is, those who are permanently injured, injuries that are compensated for and reported from the years '68-75 found that level was rising dramatically from 15 percent to well over 22 percent of all workers. Total disease and injury including uncompensated, unreported and long-term diseases, including cancer and heart attacks, have been estimated to reach about 60 percent of all workers and that's rising.

On the other hand, strikes that we hear so much about, as being the indicator for industrial disharmony have averaged, over all the years since stats were collected back to 1911 in Canada, .5 of 1 percent of all working time being lost due to strikes. So, strikes in effect are one of the smaller reasons that workers are either not participating in the labour force or are taking time off their jobs. Manitoba, in fact, for the last 10 years has been at least two-thirds lower than that national average.

So the collective bargaining system in terms of negotiating and coming to a collective agreement and having the grievance procedure to solve certain kinds of problems in the workplace is working but it's still not the part that's to blame for the kind of situation that we have.

In fact, one of the worst years recently, in 1975, 40 percent of all collective bargaining agreements were settled through the normal collective bargaining process and 47 percent were settled through conciliation, and so even in a really bad year, the collective bargaining system worked 87 percent of the time.

If you look at the days lost due to unemployment, that's 24 times the number lost by strikes. The

absenteeism ends up causing work days to be lost at the rate of 16 times the number lost due to strikes. The number of days lost to injury are 44 times the number lost to strikes and the number lost to long-term disease is 120 times the number lost to strikes.

So it indicates to me that we have to look a little bit deeper than our traditional collective bargaining system for some of the answers. I think the time has come wherein our economic decision-making can no longer be left only to the whim of a few, and oftentimes those decisions are very arbitrary decisions. They're decisions which deal with technological change, which mean layoff or plant closures, consolidation of production facilities, transfer to third world countries and I think we've come to the point where we can't leave those decisions to a few people who happen to have invested money in that operation, rather than their labour. Oftentimes those decisions are made not because they're losing money, but because they want to make more profit.

This leaves the Canadian workers who have invested their lives and that comes true for people that are working full time approximately 2,000 hours a year literally out in the cold. It leaves our cities and our towns abandoned. So just as a shareholder has a proprietary interest in his investment, the worker has a proprietary investment in their work and in their job. I think that we have to recognize that the job is a very important investment in our economy and the experience that they gained through that job should be taken into account when making overall decisions.

In industrial democracy, a worker participation is not something that is new in other parts of the world. In fact, we might be literal babies in the field, but in other parts of the world they've had many years of experience and experience that we should not necessarily transfer to Canada or to Manitoba, but we should certainly look at and see where their experience would apply.

I'd like to quote from a paper written by Joe Morris who is a member of the North-South Commission and former chairperson of the International Labour Organization of which Canada is a member, and of course the former president of the Canadian Labour Congress. He's commenting on the situation in West Germany and I quote, "I think their position stems from their belief that the economy is not solely the private preserve of the owners of capital or those people who exercise the power to make economic decisions without considering the effects or consequences on their employees, individually or collectively, or the surrounding community. They believe that industrial concerns are no longer private institutions but part of the social fabric of the nation and as such must be responsive to the needs of the community. They say it is no longer possible to regard factories and undertakings as merely aglomeration of material objects. Without its workers, without its relationship in the world in which it exists and without its place in the national economy, an industrial undertaking is inconceivable. If its existence affects groups other than its shareholders then the other groups must have a voice in the shaping of its policies and the conduct of its business.

"So what does workers' participation mean? Specific objectives of workers participation include the promotion of democracy in the workplace, increased economic efficiency of the enterprise and improvements

in the industrial relations climate. These subjectives have generally carried with them a commitment to enhancing job security through improved forward planning and the development of effective programs of training, redeployment and attrition adjustments of the workforce.

"Workers' participation can occur at different levels in an enterprise from the board of directors to the shop floor. These may vary from strategic planning, capital investment, production and market initiatives at the board level, through joint councils dealing with matters such as technological change and workplace, health and safety to departmental participation in such matters outside of collective bargaining as employee welfare and personal relations to the shop floor and work group involved in work schedules, quality control and job design decisions. Nevertheless, we can't translate the experience that we see in the Swedish model, the West German model or the Japanese model."

I'd like to spend some time going over a Canadian model that I think is one that we should hold up as an example to both Crown corporations and to private corporations.

In the late 60s and early 70s, the Kootenay Forest Products, then a branch of Eddy Match, a British Corporation, began deteriorating at an alarming rate. The company was rapped by numerous wildcat strikes, turnovers among managers were high, communication among levels of management deteriorated, proper planning ceased, capital was misappropriated, workers were laid off frequently and the company went into the red.

The workers felt that between the two absentee multinationals that at that time were - one, the Eddy Match Company already owned the company and another one named Crestbrook was trying to take it over. They felt that the social responsibility towards the community would be ignored and eventually the hundreds of workers that were employed by that company would be dumped on the scrap pile of unemployment.

On February 28, 1974, B.C. Cellulose, the government's forestry holding company, purchased 100 percent of the shares of Kootenay Forest Products. First and the most important, the workers wanted to help correct some of the mismanagement that they'd witnessed over those prior years and secondly, they desired an improvement in industrial relations.

Within months of the government takeover of that company the company asked the local of the International Woodworkers of America for a list of names who they might consider as representatives on the board of directors. The local union decided that these persons would be selected and elected from the crews and they forwarded a list of eight names to the plant directors, and two directors were appointed from that pool by the government. The board then consisted of three company officials including the president, two B.C. Cellulose representatives and the two union representatives, for a total of seven directors.

I'd like to quote a statement by the plant manager of that plant a few years later. The plant manager's name was Jack Sigalet, I can't pronounce it. To quote, "Kootenay Forest Products was the classic example of an absentee-owned corporation. Forward planning was perpetually discarded by the owners and day-to-

day decisions were continued on a hand-to-mouth basis until the company was sold. Our woodlands were virtually a tragedy; our plants were run down; our equipment was not maintained. Our cash reserves were negative and our inventories were gutted of all useable material. Since then, the sawmill has had \$1,500,000 worth of improvements. Woodlands have spent several million dollars on roads and we have a new \$300,000 logging camp at Duncan Lake and, most important, we have improved our productivity in 1976 over '75 by 100 percent in lumber and 20 percent in plywood. In short, from management's point of view, productivity has increased; morale has improved; operations are more efficient; wildcats are down and profits are up."

So if that's management's point of view, what is the view of the workers? One of the biggest concerns that workers have when they participate at least on the board of directors' level is that they will be co-opted and from some experiences in other countries, that's a fairly legitimate fear.

But one of the members of the board of directors reported to the Department of Labour in the Province of Alberta and said, "In our opinion, instituting a proper and successful form of industrial democracy presumes a strong union presence. A union's involvement with a co-operative and democratic organization, and the union's concern with the dignity of labour are vital to the success of industrial democracy. Industrial democracy implies, from our point of view, the full participation of the worker in shaping and creating a participatory structure in tune with the Canadian realities. Any attempt to implement industrial democracy based solely on the rationale of reducing strikes and increasing productivity will likely also fail, since workers will almost certainly consider such an approach as manipulation. Increased productivity, reduced absenteeism, fewer wildcat strikes and the like will be a spinoff benefit from industrial democracy only if an honest commitment is made to give workers enough authority for meaningful decision-making and in seriously modifying some of the destructive aspects of scientific and autocratic management."

So that's the union view and the management view from that particular company. I'd also like to point out that in a March 2nd, Globe and Mail article 1983, last month, a fellow by the name of Michael H. Wilson, MP for Etobicoke Centre, is quoted as saying, "Individual companies, particularly the multinationals, are now moving more and more to decentralization of decision-making. They are allowing their subsidiaries and divisions greater flexibility to develop their own destiny within certain broad guidelines without constraints of hand-on approvals from above. The individuals involved obviously have a better understanding of the conditions and opportunities of their job. Given a chance to prove it, they will be creative and self-motivated."

So I think that this issue is one of extreme importance not just here in the Province of Manitoba, but to our country as a whole. In fact, I would like to point out a full-page ad in the Globe and Mail of January 18, 1983, put in by Gulf Canada which talks about a consultation model. One small quote as I'm running out of time: "The problems of productivity, investment and other factors that can make us competitive can not be solved by one sector alone."

I think we have to take the principle of democracy that we all hold so near and dear and extend it to the

place where most of us spend most of our waking hours and not just for that individual self-satisfaction, and not just for the good of that particular company but for the good of the province and the country as a whole.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, first of all, want to say that I welcome the opportunity to speak on an area which I think many Canadians and many Manitobans are concerned about and that is the area of labour relations, the area of productivity and the area which will, in the future, I believe be one of the key components in whether or not Canada and the Western World remains competitive with many of the other Pacific rim countries and other countries that are showing that their productivity is really moving ahead and expanding.

The Member for Wolseley has, through the resolution, given us the opportunity to discuss some of the different areas as far as labour-management relationships are concerned. I hope today to just give the benefit of a few of the experiences that I've had in dealing with smaller enterprises and being involved in my own business, of some of the things that I've tried with regards to labour-management and some of the things that have worked and some of them that haven't.

We all realize in this particular age that the solutions to these problems, to productivity, to proper labour relations between management and employees is one which is critical and trying to move ahead with our productivity and receiving the best results possible for everybody concerned.

One of the areas that has been discussed and tried by many companies, of course, is profit sharing and is held up by many people over the years as being the solution for the particular problem. It does however, Mr. Speaker, have some down sides and I would say to members opposite that having tried it myself in one of my own businesses a number of years ago, I would like to relate to them what happened.

The problem that we have when we talk about profit sharing is, we forget about the other side of the equation and that is loss sharing. I guess it's like the old song goes - you can't have one without the other - because inevitably in our economic times right now there are companies that are sustaining losses; some are sustaining losses to the extent that they're going bankrupt. But we do lose sight very often of the fact that when we're talking about profit sharing there are times when companies lose money. This is where the problems occur.

It so happens that in one of my small enterprises a number of years ago, I introduced what I considered a fairly lucrative profit-sharing plan, included all the employees, including the mechanics and everybody involved in the small car dealership that I run. The first year of the program it went very well, Mr. Speaker. Everybody worked very well and we showed a profit at the end of the year and everybody received their share of that profit.

The difficulty that happened next year though is that a number of the employees, after receiving their share

of the profit, went ahead and established a lifestyle and made commitments with regard to the increased earnings they had received that year and took it for granted that next year was going to be the same thing; in other words, next year the profits were going to be the same. So they made purchases, encouraged certain debts based on the new income that they had received after the profit sharing.

What happened in the first four months of that year? There was a decline in the retail market and we then saw a decline in the profits, and by about midyear of the next year all the people realized that the bonuses or their share of the profit the following year just wouldn't be there, and yet, they had committed funds on the anticipation that they would be receiving the profits.

So, Mr. Speaker, what happened that first half year, after the half year was up, they all realized there wouldn't be any more money coming because we were having a tough year and there weren't going to be any profits, so there was more trouble in the camp than there ever had been before. Because they had made these commitments and they realized halfway through the year that there wouldn't be any money and a lot of them felt like just throwing up their hands and giving up. So instead of productivity being better, it got worse.

So what we did at that time in consultation with the employees is we reverted back to the old plan where we were paying on an hourly basis, plus commission on certain things that they were selling, and we then did away with the profit-sharing plan because it was not doing the thing which we thought it would do. I was convinced when I went into the plan that this was the real solution to the problem.

So I say to members opposite, on the one hand - and maybe in other industries it might work - in the manufacturing industry where the commodity produced is something that can be controlled as far as the sale of it is. In other words, the particular industry isn't maybe as reliant on the retail segment, such as the particular business that I am involved in, but I say to you that in my particular instance it did not work because it was not inherent in the profit sharing. The other side of the equation wasn't taken into consideration and that, namely, is that there could be losses. I say to members opposite that anybody that says that profit-sharing was the only way to go should have a look at it too, because there are down sides with that and I've experienced that myself.

The Member for Wolseley made several observations in the resolution, as well as in her speech, which I'd also like to deal with. One of the problems we have is that when we're dealing with very large companies, there is a tendency of becoming very impersonal when dealing with employees, and I would say that when we are dealing with very large unions the same thing happens. This is part of the problems that we face in modern society today.

A classic example of problems and people not realizing, for instance, in the Manitoba Federation of Labour, was the thing we went through with the Red River Co-ops. Here you had a co-operative which is not a multinational, which is a locally owned, locally run operation, retail store. They were in serious trouble. The Minister of Co-operative Development, no doubt, had some of his people in there. I think he said during

the Estimates that he had some of his people in there looking at it. They were forced to close several of their operations, lay off some of their employees. The existing employees at Red River Co-op decided, along with management, that here was a real problem, and in order to save their jobs they would all have to roll up their sleeves and in a time of difficulty for this company would have to accept a 10 percent wage cut.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that was a situation where the employees, along with the management, realized what was happening and for the good of the enterprise, which was a co-operative in this case, and for the good of the workers who are working there, in order to maintain their jobs and at least received some remuneration instead of going on unemployment, at least to keep their jobs took a 10 percent cut. But what did we have happen, Mr. Speaker? We had the Manitoba Federation of Labour decrying that particular thing and saying the workers weren't doing the right thing. They were not happy with that because they said this should never happen; it's a black day for labour because the employees, instead of making extra demands, are now going a step back and taking less. Well, it isn't that type of an attitude, Mr. Speaker, that is going to help enterprises that are in trouble or help productivity in Canada.

On the other side, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the tough dealings of other people in some of the larger corporations where you have a very impersonal tact taken with regard to dealing with their employees is helping that. Unfortunately, instead of going into a consultation approach, which many of the smaller enterprises have done in Canada, the large unions and large corporations have got into a confrontation approach of dealing with their labour management rather than the other way around. I say to members opposite that I don't think there's anybody in the Legislature here that would not want to see more co-operation and a healthier climate develop between the large unions and large corporations. To that, Mr. Speaker, I think we all would agree.

It was interesting today, when I was getting ready to speak on this particular resolution, in looking through the Globe and Mail of today, April 11th, I noticed an article in the Business Report, "Treating workers as family paying off for Penner Foods." Here is a small home-grown Steinbach firm, who now has several stores in Winnipeg, took over some of the closed Safeway stores over here in Winnipeg, I believe, in the Northend, and has also taken over one here on Broadway, is doing a tremendous job. And here's an example of Mr. Jim Penner, the owner of the store, who feels that the success of his particular enterprise is that he has treated his workers as part of the family. One of the reasons for his success, he claims, is that he is involving his people in decision-making processes, as well as allowing them to feel part of the organization by doing so. He notes in the article, one of the problems of maintaining or keeping employees when you are a smaller organization though is that there is only limited room for advancement. But he feels by maintaining a good relationship with employees and with his staff he can not only create a better climate in which for them to work, but it has also helped him expand his facilities in the province.

So here is an example from a businessman in my area, Mr. Speaker, who has employed, what I think,

some good labour relation techniques. I think he should be commended for that and hope that many of the other businesses and the smaller enterprises in Manitoba would take a look at that type of an approach in dealing with their particular staff and the people that they are employing.

The resolution also deals with several whereases, which I guess on the surface look like they are good ideas and would work, but I say to the Member for Wolseley, that some of the things that I read in the resolution cause me some difficulty because in the past they just haven't worked.

I note in one of the whereases she says that very often employees are relegated to only some specific narrow and certain job functions, but I would say to the Member for Wolseley that what happens very often is that people do that to themselves within their own working group. An example of that, which I found very interesting, was the Velvol Company in Sweden, who wanted to get away from the assembly line approach of assembling their cars, so what they did is they broke their whole plant down into groups of seven or eight people who would then assemble one car hoping that you would get away from the monotony of somebody just putting on a wheel as the car went by or a hub cap or whatever, or a starter, or a particular part of the car.

They thought by doing this, the people wouldn't become as bored with their job and they'd have a little more enthusiasm for their job. After about six months into the new job of doing this, they did a survey and they went in and had the people check to see exactly how the program was working and they found, interestingly enough, in these groups of seven or eight people - these people had sat down and found out what they were the best at - and you had these seven people, instead of doing different functions, one became an engine expert, one became a transmission expert, one became an upholstery person. So even though we'd like to think we could all do different jobs equally well, we can't and what I'm trying to say to the members opposite is, that whereas on the surface of it, it might look good, but practically some of these things just haven't worked out. Now that isn't to say that we shouldn't try to break the boredom in the workplace and that, but I think we have to, on many of these instances, be realistic to make sure that what looks good on paper will not necessarily work.

One of the problems and one of the great difficulties I guess in dealing with this particular resolution is, how do you get someone to accept the responsibility for the policy that will be implemented, and that's the problem. If a person has part of his or her life savings involved in something and then makes the decision they will go out and make sure, that to the best of their ability and to the best of their capability that particular decision will be carried out with dispatch and with the best results happening; but you cannot just give somebody the authority to make a decision when he or she does not have something to lose by it.

I say to you here today that while the idea of getting people involved in the policy decisions is a good one, you have to keep in mind that somewhere along the line somebody has to be accountable for that policy decision and the resolution mentions that in dealing with Crown corporations and that, that's something

that should happen. Fine, I think there should be input from the people that are involved but you've got another problem here.

Take, for instance, the government. You've got a situation where you're saying you want to include the average person in the department in part of the running of the government. Well, I say to the First Minister and the Member for Wolseley, I don't think you would like the staff people in respective departments coming up making policy decisions and helping with the policy decisions of this government. — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, my colleagues from Turtle Mountain and from Lakeside say they need the help - I would tend to agree with them - but I think the First Minister or anybody that is the head of a department wouldn't want the staff to impose the policies that they believe on the particular Minister. So all I'm trying to do is demonstrate how complicated the issue is because once you've made the decision, especially in government which is now a very large employer, you can't expect some junior in the department to come and say you're doing this wrong and tell you not to do it. There is a problem that is inherent in trying to get some person who, really in the final analysis, does not have his or her neck in the noose and that's the particular problem that we face.

Now, this does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that there shouldn't be suggestions received from different people. Every opportunity I believe, Mr. Speaker, should be taken to have management, owners and employers work together to try and see that we create more harmony in labour relations in this country. Heaven knows that we've had enough bitter strikes, enough bitter feelings between management and labour over the last number of years to last us as long as we would care to have.

I would say to members opposite that in attempting to deal with this subject matter which is complex and is difficult, I would say that I support any efforts between management and labour to try and minimize the type of animosities that have built up over the years and wish that many of the unions and the corporations would take example from a lot of the smaller businesses in Manitoba that have included their employees in the decision-making, that have developed relationships with their employees, such as the gentleman that was just reported in the Globe and Mail of this last week, a small entrepreneur in my area.

So I cannot take issue, Mr. Speaker, with the resolution as it is, I believe as I mentioned in the beginning, a motherhood apple pie type issue, when you want to get labour and management to work together in a cohesive manner to try and increase productivity and try and increase employment in Manitoba. So to that extent I do agree with the resolution, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, before I add my comments to the resolution, I just noticed - maybe it's because he was overshadowed by the frontbenches before, I don't know if he was in the House earlier - but I notice the Member for Niakwa is back and I'm pleased to see him back in the House. I hope he's got over his brief illness and I certainly look

forward to seeing him back in the House. — (Interjection) — Well, it's better than most members opposite.

I rise to support the resolution and I'd like to compliment the Member for Wolseley for introducing this resolution. I believe it's more than just what was referred to by the previous member speaking that it's just a "motherhood" resolution; it's like apple pie and that just dismisses it as something that everyone agrees to in principle, but it's something that just sits there. I think it's very important that we have the debate on this kind of resolution, that we give this kind of direction because I think it's more than just apple pie or motherhood. It's something that I think is seriously lacking in the Canadian industrial relations scene.

Both members spoke about some of the difficulties we have in the labour-relations climate in this country, and it's often been said - and I think the Member for Wolseley put it in somewhat of a perspective - that Canada has one of the worst labour-relations records, one of the worst records of strikes in the world, second to only Italy I believe. Given that as a statement that has some fact, one has to ask the question why is that, Mr. Speaker? Why does Canada have the kind of adversary system that continues to exist in the relationships between employees and employers? We have in public policy, both at the federal and provincial level, a policy that states that we should have harmonious relations between employers and employees.

In fact, I would just quote from the "WHEREAS" in the Preamble in The Labour Relations Act, Mr. Speaker, where it says, "wherein it is in the public interest of the Province of Manitoba to further harmonious relations between employers and employees by encouraging the practice and procedure of collective bargaining between employers and unions as freely designated representatives of its employees." So if we have the public policy of the Province of Manitoba encouraging harmonious relations between employees and employers - and indeed that's the case in most, if not all jurisdictions in Canada - then why do we have a situation in this country that differs from many other countries?

Well, I think this resolution goes to address one of those major differences. If you look at many European countries, the role of working people and their freely designated representatives through their trade unions have a much greater say in society in general in those countries and in particular with the various workplaces, and have an overall higher recognition and support by all in those countries. Many of those countries have fairly extensive processes in place with respect to ongoing consultation with trade unions at a national level and have ongoing forms of consultation and co-operation with working people in the various plants.

I say to the member opposite who said that this resolution has all kinds of great ideas in it, but in practice it has a lot of problems, that one only has to look at those countries to see how these kinds of consultation mechanisms can work and, indeed, do work in those countries. And those countries have in some cases, using the criteria set out by the member opposite, have a greater level of productivity, a greater level of co-operation between employers and employees.

The Member for La Verendrye talked about one particular problem that he had in his past experience

with respect to profit sharing and while profit sharing really isn't the be-all, and the end-all of consultation between employers and employees, it's one method of ensuring some greater equity in the workplace between the employer and the employees. It's not what is contemplated by this resolution but, nevertheless, you can't base a policy on a direction because one may have difficulties in implementing it. I can say to you that to implement an ongoing process of consultation between employers and employees in this country is going to be a difficult process because you're coming from a system that has forced people to take adversary positions.

In fact, one only has to look at the developments of the trade union movement in this province going back to the turn of the century. The trade union movement had to fight literally for recognition for its basic rights. So, a system that historically has been built on adversary, has been built on people struggling for certain rights is going to be difficult to change. But I concur with the member that spoke previously, that it is very important in our country that we're going to have to change and we're going to have to use a mechanism such as consultation between employers and employees to bring about greater equity, a greater quality within the workplaces, greater dignity for working people and greater overall productivity for us as a nation.

It is going to take changed attitudes. As the member that spoke previously indicated, it's going to take changed attitudes on behalf of unions and working people. But some of that reluctance on the part of unions comes from a tradition and a situation that has meant that they have had to fight and that there hasn't been co-operation, that the co-operation has always been in many cases a one-way co-operation, that of the unions and working people co-operating with management but that not going back. It is going to take a change of attitude of employers and companies in this country.

Right now, we see situations where working people and unions have to struggle, have to fight, have to go into the courts for some basic recognition, just the right to be organized which one would have thought was a right that was secured many decades ago in this country; one that's enshrined in legislation and public policy of this country. Yet you still find situations of working people and their unions that have to fight for that basic recognition.

Well it's going to take a change of attitude on employers to recognize that working people and unions have a rightful place in Canadian and Manitoban society. That's going to be difficult, but I think it's important that we have that change of attitude both on the part of employers and companies and with respect to working people and unions. And I know, as one who spent 15 years of my life working on behalf of working people that that will happen. I know from my own experiences that where there has been consultation - not in a formalized sense that's recommended in this resolution - such consultation with working people and their unions has indeed worked.

You know, there's an attitude that prevails, Mr. Speaker, and I won't suggest it was made by the member that spoke previously. But there was kind of a hint of it, if I could say that, where he said that you

know you have to recognize that the people who make the decisions with respect to companies, with respect to the governings of those companies, have something to lose because they've invested some money in those enterprises and that if the enterprises are not successful, then they obviously could lose some money. Kind of the suggestion was that working people have nothing to lose, while people that put, in some cases, a good part of their lives into companies, into enterprises, have a lot to lose with respect to what may happen to that company. We are seeing, unfortunately, a lot of that today where people that have worked for most of their lives for particular employers are seeing themselves out of work for the first time in their lives because of the current economic situation and because of what is happening with respect to many companies that make decisions in places that are far away from the actual workplaces by multinational or corporations that in the main have headquarters outside of the country.

So working people have a lot of stake in what happens to their workplaces; it's their jobs; it's, in many cases, many years of their life that they've put into ensuring that that company will be successful because it's by the toils of their labour that the companies are able to exist and are able to provide a profit to the owners or shareholders of that enterprise.

The resolution, Mr. Speaker, makes reference in one of its "WHEREASES" to the recent Economic Summit Conference that was organized by the Government of Manitoba. I had the privilege and the pleasure of participating in that conference and was involved in one of the workshops. I was pleasantly surprised at the co-operative attitude that prevailed in the workshop that I was involved in. We had a fairly diverse group. We had Mr. Kavanagh, who is the President of Great-West Life, and a production manager from a steel plant, and we had representatives of the United Steelworkers, of the clothing workings, and we had representatives of municipalities and farm organizations.

I was pleasantly surprised at the co-operative attitude that prevailed in that workshop to look at solving and look at addressing the major problems that are facing the Manitoba economy. I think that Economic Summit and the kind of attitudes that we are able to generate through that is a first step - in what's going to be a somewhat difficult road, I will admit - a first step down the road of improving co-operation and consultation between employers and employees in the Province of Manitoba. Because I sensed, and as I indicated

previously, I've spent 15 years of my life working on behalf of employees and dealing with employers throughout Manitoba. Indeed, I worked with employers in many of the towns and villages represented by members opposite in southeastern and southwestern Manitoba.

I noted at that Economic Conference, the first time that there was a greater feeling of co-operation coming, particularly from employers and also from the union representatives that were there, that they were recognizing that we are in difficult economic times in this province and that we may have to break down some of the barriers that have existed between employers and employees in the province and that we had to do that for the economic survival of the economic life of this province. So I was very much encouraged by the general attitudes that were developing at the Economic Summit and I think that this resolution, if adopted, will go a further way down that road to provide for greater consultation and co-operation between employees and employers in the Province of Manitoba.

You know the attitude that exists that employees really shouldn't have any say in the running of the company because they don't really know very much, you know there's this mass of working people that don't really have any knowledge in such things as capitalist decisions or overall management decisions and there's no sense listening to them because they know not of what is needed to run a company. It's been my experience that by involving people who are the ones that carry out the work methods, that work the machines, that use the equipment that runs those companies, that they do know of what they talk about.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The time of adjournment having arrived, when this resolution is next before the House the Honourable Minister will have 6 minutes remaining. The Chair will entertain a motion to adjourn.

The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, that subject to the committees meeting tonight at 8:00 o'clock, the House is now adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. tomorrow (Tuesday).