



Fourth Session — Thirty-First Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba
DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

29 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable Harry E. Graham
Speaker*



VOL. XXVIII No. 46A — 2:00 p.m., MONDAY, 28 APRIL, 1980

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
Monday, 28 April 1980

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER, Hon. Harry E. Graham (Birtle-Russell): The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. WARREN STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Petition of Investors Syndicate Limited and Others praying for the passing of The Investors Syndicate Limited Act, 1980.

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

MR. CLERK: Petition of the Winnipeg Foundation praying for the passing of an Act respecting Winnipeg Foundation.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports By Standing And Special Committees . . . Ministerial Statements And Tabling of Reports . . . Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne) presented Bill No. 36, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act and The Tortfeasors and Contributory Negligence Act, and No. 43, An Act to amend The Family Maintenance Act and The Queen's Bench Act.

HON. DON ORCHARD, Minister of Highways and Transportation (Pembina) introduced Bill No. 37, An Act to amend The Highways Department Act, and Bill No. 51, An Act to amend The Highways Protection Act.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Northern Affairs. Can the Minister of Northern Affairs indicate what action will be undertaken by his department through his Ministry in order to ensure the reopening of the nursing station at Thicket Portage?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. DOUG GOURLAY (Swan River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd be pleased to take that question as notice and bring back further information.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further, by way of supplementary to the Minister, can the Minister confirm that he, as Minister, and his department were fully aware of the conditions involving the unsanitary line which gave rise to the closure, as early as January 15th of this year?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the Minister would like to respond to my question.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to check into that further and bring back more details to the House on your question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education. Can the Minister of Education confirm that he did indeed receive a request from the Students Association of Manitoba to meet with them at their just completed conference this weekend?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. KEITH A. COSENS (Gimli): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can confirm that.

MR. PAWLEY: Can the Minister confirm that not only has he declined their invitation this past weekend but had declined earlier invitations to meet with them as an association?

MR. COSENS: Mr. Speaker, I did have a previous commitment that prevented me from being at their meeting this weekend. I have met with representatives of different student groups in the province in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. WILSON PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Health. Can the Minister confirm that at least 12 of 82 patients at the Golden Door Geriatrics Centre have had to be moved out of that facility and can he indicate if the government has any contingency plans for the remaining patients?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L.R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): I can't confirm that, Mr. Speaker. The only information of that nature that I could give the House is that three patients were transferred to the municipal hospitals, at their own or their relatives request.

With respect to the second part of the honourable member's question, yes, contingency plans are in effect and in fact the care and attention at the Golden Door, with respect to those who are resident there, is unimpeded and continuing at its normal level at the present time.

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, a supplementary to the same Minister and I hope he has his staff monitoring the situation and that my information, which I received about a half an hour ago, conflicts with the information he's just given us in the House.

A supplementary to the Minister, in view of the fact that negotiations between the owner and the unions with the conciliator present, broke off on Saturday almost before they began because the owner and his lawyer admitted that they hadn't really acquainted themselves with the union proposals that had been on the table apparently for some two months, can the Minister assure us that the owner is negotiating in good faith with the union in this industrial dispute?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the number of residents who have been moved from the home, let me just say that the information that I conveyed to the House is my information as of this morning; now if the honourable member has information as of half an hour ago I'll have to check that — it is being monitored on a continuing basis by the Health Services Commission.

Mr. Speaker, my primary concern was that there be negotiations; that there be a gesture of good intent with respect to the collective bargaining process. I'm satisfied that is assured through a meeting that will be held tomorrow afternoon.

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

MR. PARASIUK: Yes, to the same Minister. Can the Minister confirm that the owner of the Golden Door Geriatrics Centre who is brought to the bargaining table by threat of the government removing the licence to that particular institution, could he confirm that owner is also involved in four other private profit-making nursing homes and has pending an application for a fairly large expansion of the Golden Door facility, namely, about a 5 million facility? And in light of the actions of the owner of this particular facility, is the government going to reconsider its position of promoting private profit-making nursing homes at the expense of non-profit community religious groups that want to proceed with nursing homes on the basis of love of humanity and not on the basis of love of a dollar? Is the government going to reconsider its position towards these non-profit nursing homes?

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I can't confirm the contentions in the honourable member's preamble, Mr. Speaker. With respect to the second part of his question, the whole issue has been under intensive examination by government and has revolved essentially around those nursing homes operators who primarily were operating in the Fort Rouge area of Winnipeg until the winter of 1977-78, and certainly had demonstrated their commitment to the care and well-being of persons in their charge.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RONALD MCBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Northern Affairs. I wonder if the Minister could tell us why he and his

department have decided to reduce the authority and responsibility of community councils.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I'm very pleased to answer that question. A number of years ago when the previous administration were in power, there were two arenas built, one at Norway House and one at Wabowden, that should have cost in the neighbourhood of some 250,000 and 300,000.00. They ended up costing about 450,000.00. They were opened up without an occupancy permit and the last year it was noticed that one of the end walls in the Norway House Arena was waving in the wind when one of our staff members happened to be in the area. They called in the Department of Labour officials and noticed that or at least a full inspection was done and the arena was closed because no occupancy permit had ever been issued; the building was entirely unsafe. The situation at Norway House, the estimated cost to bring it up to safety standards was an additional 300,000 which brought the total cost to that area up to three-quarters-of-a-million dollars that was estimated to be put in place at about a third of that cost. Staff knowing that a similar situation had happened at Wabowden, a similar undertaking was done there with respect to inspections; it was closed. An additional 200,000 or so was required, or is in the process of being spent to bring that area up to safety standards. So you can see, Mr. Speaker, that we've spent close to a million dollars on two arenas in northern communities that shouldn't have been necessary. That money is not available to do new projects in the north and so some restraints had to be placed on — not all northern communities, most of them run their own show entirely and with very minimum of supervision from Northern Affairs' staff — but some of the other communities, we are working with them and some restrictions have been placed on them. It's not a general situation and it's one that's being improved upon but I thought it was necessary to bring out some of the reasons behind this action.

MR. MCBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I'm to understand then correctly from the Minister, because two communities ran into problems with the area projects in northern Manitoba and, Mr. Speaker, I might add that a number of communities had successfully completed arena projects that have met all the requirements there too, of course, at that time there was more funding available for recreation capital facilities in northern Manitoba than there is today, Mr. Speaker. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister could confirm that because two communities ran into trouble with their arena construction that he has put a restriction, new restrictions, on all the community councils so that community councils cannot any longer make decisions on expenditures for garbage sites, garbage pickups, road maintenance, all the things that a community normally does, unless the cost of that particular expenditure is under 200.00. I wonder if the Minister could confirm that's what he has done.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I brought out two examples, two of many that exist, similar situations that exist throughout northern Manitoba, I could bring in many more examples, I thought that two sort of exemplified very well the situation. As I mentioned earlier some restrictions have been placed on some of the communities, not all of them. And, certainly, we're working with those communities that they will become self-sufficient soon again.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate to us what restrictions he intends to impose on the officials of his own department, the accountants who sit in their offices and make the decisions on behalf of northern communities, in terms of the sewer and water system that they oversought at Cormorant and the fact that is not in operation because of construction problems administered by his department, whether or not he could tell us what restrictions he is going to put on his department in terms of the nursing station at Thicket Portage which has had to be closed down because it was built in the wrong place. I wonder if the Minister could indicate what restrictions he intends to apply to himself and his bungling since he's been Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The Honourable Member for The Pas fortunately brings up some good examples that he's very familiar with, after the mess that he left this government back some three years ago. And I might add that when we took over the government three years ago, there was some 18 new water systems installed by that former Minister of Northern Affairs, only three were working. We've spent some 2 million to fix up those water systems that were completely bollixed from Day One and so that is another good example that you throw back to me and I can only throw it out that that's some of the problems that we're trying to overcome.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister cites some figures there that I have seen no verification of. Mr. Speaker, he totally avoided the question I asked him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please, order please. I suggest that perhaps we're getting into a debate rather than the question period. I think the estimates is the proper place for the debate. Does the honourable member have another question?

MR. McBRYDE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could table a copy of the bureaucratic guidelines that have now been issued by his department and whether, Mr. Speaker, he could indicate what guidelines he intends to put upon his own department after the bungling of the nursing

station, the sewer and water system at Cormorant, the gravel supply at South Indian Lake, and many others I could list if we were in the estimates process, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. May I suggest that the wording of a question should not be ironical, should not in any way cast disparaging remarks. I would suggest to the honourable member he should rephrase his question.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister, who never casts disparaging remarks, could indicate to the House whether or not he will table for us the guidelines that have now been issued by his department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him whether or not he could indicate whether any grain is in store in the elevators at the Port of Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. JAMES E. DOWNEY (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, at this particular time I can't indicate any particular quantity that may be in the Port of Churchill but it had all assurances from the grain transportation co-ordinator that every effort would be made to make sufficient supplies available at the Port of Churchill for spring shipment. Providing that the labour dispute is settled by shipping season, I am sure that it will proceed as normal.

MR. EINARSON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister. I wonder if he could also indicate, by way of information to this House, what kinds of grains are planned to be shipped out to the Port of Churchill.

MR. DOWNEY: Mr. Speaker, before answering that question, I would like to say that I suggested that I would like to see Churchill operate as normal. I would like to see it operate a lot better than normal and target for some 50 million bushels, which would be somewhat above the average.

The question that the member referred to was the specific variety or type of grain that would be shipped through the Port of Churchill; I would suggest that last year it was mainly barley. I think there is intention to move other grains into that particular port this year but have to get further information from the Canadian Wheat Board or the grain transportation co-ordinator.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. HARVEY BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Northern Affairs and I ask him a specific question with respect to his government's handling of the stockpiling of crushed gravel material for the community of Bloodvein and Princess Harbour and as an example of the kind of

decision-making that's made by officials who are not on the spot, I ask the Minister if he can confirm that his department proceeded to have a gravel-crushing contractor crush material for the Department of Northern Affairs in that community for some 27 a cubic yard and it was the same contractor, Mr. Speaker, who crushed material just a few weeks before for the Department of Highways for 16 a yard and I wonder if the Minister could describe to us the means by which this kind of decision-making process is going to improve and reduce costs for northern Manitobans.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to take that question as notice and bring back further details.

MR. BOSTROM: I would simply follow up that question, Mr. Speaker, to ask the Minister who will protect the communities from the mistakes of public servants, mistakes of this nature, and I ask the Minister, in his own best judgement, if it would not be better to have the locally elected officials by the community policing the expenditures in their community. I'm sure they will not, in situations like that, make that kind of error because they know how much the community is paying on one hand for crushed material and they're not going to pay double to the same person to crush material for another project. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister, if decisions made in absentia from the situation such as the one I've just described, can be better than if the decisions are made by the locally elected officials in the community at the time the money needs to be spent?

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to look into the situation the honourable member brings forth.

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

MR. BOSTROM: Mr. Speaker, I would refer in fact to the examples that the Minister has given to us in making my point, and that point is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. I find the member is debating rather than asking a question. Would the honourable member care to ask a question?

MR. BOSTROM: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question is with respect to decision-making that affects northern communities and in the examples the Minister gave to us this afternoon, I would like to ask him if he would look into those specific examples and if he would check to see who was really at fault in the Norway House arena situation and in the Wabowden arena situation, because, Mr. Speaker, I would ask him to look at those situations carefully and see if it was not the civil servants in the department making decisions that were causing problems in these situations, rather than the locally elected mayors and councils in those communities. I ask him, Mr.

Speaker, if the mayors and councils at that time would have had more decision-making capacity at the local level if there would not have been a better handling of the funds involved.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. May I suggest to the honourable member he is debating rather than asking questions and I would suggest he bring those remarks forward during estimates.

The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. JUNE WESTBURY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs and follows my question of 28th March. Can the Minister now advise the House what decision, if any, has yet been made on the application of the Municipality of Rosser to join a Planning District?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. MERCIER: None, Mr. Speaker.

MRS. WESTBURY: Another question then, to the Honourable Minister of Government Services, Mr. Speaker. This refers to his statement of the 1st of April to the effect that the Order for Return on the contents of the former Rural Water Services Warehouse, he stated that Order is being prepared and I believe it will be available to the honourable member and the House within a matter of days. It now being four weeks later, can the Honourable Minister advise when we can expect to receive that order, please?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Government Services.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, it is available, I just do not have it with me. I'll have it in the House for the honourable member tomorrow.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder, before I ask a question I can make a statement. Mr. Speaker, I only said that because the Minister of Agriculture said, before I answer the question I want to make a statement, and did and I thought maybe it was working both ways.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Northern Affairs relating to the Local Government District of Alexander. In view of the fact that the Minister stated that he was investigating complaints or charges made against two elected officials whom he suspended, and had not suspended several civil servants in his department against whom charges were made, would he please — the Minister of Agriculture wants to hear the question, Mr. Speaker — would the Minister of Northern Affairs please clarify who is doing the investigation of the charges alleged against the two elected officials whom he suspended?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The officials are from the Department of Municipal Affairs.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister who is investigating the allegations and charges made against members of his own department?

MR. GOURLAY: They'll be handled in the same fashion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the Minister's difference in tense saying, they will be handled, and my assumption that it is not yet being investigated, may I then ask the Honourable Minister whether the people in his department, against whom allegations have been made and whom he has not suspended, will be involved in the investigation of the two people whom he has suspended, the elected officials, and involved in their own investigations such as he suggests has yet to take place?

MR. GOURLAY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns with a fourth question.

MR. CHERNIACK: My question is to the Honourable First Minister, who on April 24 took as notice a question I asked relating to the actions of the Minister of Northern Affairs dealing with the suspension in the LGD of Alexander and in contradistinction the failure to act on the part of the Minister of Urban Affairs relating to allegations against another elected official in the city of Winnipeg. The First Minister undertook to investigate and report back. No, I'm sorry, the First Minister accepted as notice the questions asked.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, my recollection is that I accepted as notice the questions asked on behalf of the relevant Ministers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Johns with a fifth question.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the First Minister accepted questions on behalf of the two relevant Ministers, I would ask the relevant Ministers whether they are now in a position to respond to the questions which their First Minister took as notice on their behalf; being, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Northern Affairs and the Attorney-General, Minister for Urban Affairs.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I can speak to that in that I have not had an opportunity to speak to either of the two Ministers and Hansard is not available, but having regard to the pressing urgency that the honourable member attaches to it we'll endeavour to get copies of his rather oriental type of questioning and pass them along to the Ministers concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs concerning the 2.8 million price rise due to the delay of the construction of the McGregor-Sherbrook Overpass, I'd like to ask him whether the Manitoba delegation made a specific request for additional funding because of the delay caused by the actions of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration? Was there a specific request made to share that inflationary rise?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there was a special request made to Mr. Ppin to consider some financial support to the city of Winnipeg in view of the fact that the delay in the construction of the Overpass has, according to the city of Winnipeg engineers, caused an increase in construction costs of 2.8 million. Mr. Ppin undertook to review that matter and advise the city in due course.

MR. DOERN: I would also ask the Minister whether he shares the continuing optimism of the Minister of Immigration that there may be additional moneys in the federal treasury for the purpose of rail relocation. By additional moneys I assume that means 1.00 and up.

MR. MERCIER: I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Ppin did not share his enthusiasm.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. LEONARD S. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Labour and ask the Honourable Minister whether he can advise whether the provincial forecast' just released by the Conference Board in Canada, indicates that job creation in Manitoba in 1980 is expected to be only one-half of the rate of job creation for Canada and the lowest in Canada after Ontario.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. KEN MacMASTER (Thompson): No, I can't confirm or deny it. I can't concur with the projections. I have not thoroughly read the report that the member is referring to but the last two years have been reasonably good with job creation in the province of Manitoba. The unemployment rate is still the third lowest in Canada and I'm somewhat pleased with that.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Considering that the rate of job creation in 1980 is expected to be considerably less than the rate in 1979 — I believe it's only 40 percent of the 1979 rate — is the Minister prepared with his colleagues, to look into the possibility of funding municipalities, school divisions and hospital boards with the objective in mind of assisting them in hiring additional people, additional staff for very worthwhile and required projects?

MR. MacMASTER: I'm not in the mood to recommend that we run around looking for make-work projects, Mr. Speaker, but I think that municipalities and school divisions do, in fact, place their priorities before the appropriate government departments and are given fair consideration. The construction projected hundreds of millions of projects are now out and available and I think it's going to provide reasonable employment in the province of Manitoba. If the manufacturing industry carries on increasing the activity in the province, coupled with our Industrial Training and Apprenticeship Program that we're going into, coupled with the approximate 1.5 million we've negotiated with the federal government to deal with critical trades that are required by industry in the province of Manitoba, I think we may have a reasonably good year in 1980 compared to other jurisdictions and even better, maybe, compared to other countries around the world, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon East with a final supplementary.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, it was rather difficult to hear all of the Minister's remarks because of certain noise in the Chamber, but I would recommend to him to look at the Conference Board figures which shows us in a very bad situation, not only for 1980 but also for 1979. The Conference Board, which is the same figures that the honourable members of the government like to use, as we have in the past. Since the Minister is not prepared to take this suggestion seriously and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it incorporates the same sort of principle that is used in the Student Employment Program, I wonder if we can assume that the government will just continue to lean really on its Conservative philosophy and do nothing about the sad situation where we'll have just about the lowest level, I repeat, the lowest level of job creation in Canada in 1980.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member a question? The Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did ask the question but perhaps members opposite and yourself, Sir, didn't hear it. I ask specifically, can we assume, can the people of Manitoba assume that this government will continue to lean on its Conservative philosophy and Lyon economics and virtually do nothing about the sad situation of job creation which will be about the lowest in Canada?

MR. MacMASTER: A couple of things of interest falling from the question. I think you'll question their statement, or few sentences, that formed an opinion. The manufacturing industry is in fact improving; the cash flow of capital projects in Manitoba, from what I understand from the Minister responsible and he made reference to it in his estimates, is in fact equal to what was there, if not greater in some cases, than previous years. We have in fact — and I think the Member for Brandon East had his question set, because he wasn't listening to the answers — we have in fact negotiated a new agreement with the federal government dealing with critical trades. Now,

what that means, Mr. Speaker, and I like to believe the Member for Brandon East would understand that, what it means is that there's a large demand from industry of all sizes and all types in the province of Manitoba for particular skills of people which we are lacking at the moment. And why would they want them, Mr. Speaker? They want them to expand their operations so they could create more employment. This is the first time we've had a Critical Trades Agreement with the federal government to try and train specific people in specific trades to help the expansion of business in the province of Manitoba and create employment, Mr. Speaker, it all falls together.

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

MR. D. JAMES WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I asked a question of the Minister of Municipal Affairs some 10 or 11 days ago. I wonder if he has the answer for me now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe there were a number of questions you asked that time with respect to the municipal tax printouts. Yes, I've checked that out and none of the municipalities had printed up their tax forms prior to the announcement of the provincial tax credits.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Question, maybe you'll give me an answer. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to get an answer to a question from the Minister of Northern Affairs through you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister could indicate why he's unwilling to make available to members of this side of the House the guidelines that have been issued to community councils in northern Manitoba.

MR. GOURLAY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I never indicated that I wouldn't make those guidelines available, however, if you insist on having them I'll make sure that they're available to you.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I do insist so maybe the Minister will now make those available to us. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Labour and I wonder if the Minister of Labour could indicate what length of notice is required by an industry that is going to lay off 190 people what length of time notice do they have to give to the Minister and to their employees? I wonder if the Minister can indicate whether or not he received notice from Manitoba Forestry Resources, Sawmill Division at The Pas in terms of their layoff of sawmill employees.

MR. MacMASTER: We received the appropriate notice in that particular layoff. It's an unfortunate situation but an appropriate notice was received by the employers and by ourselves, Mr. Speaker.

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could answer the first part of my question.

What length of time for this notice is required for industry with 190 employees doing that layoff? And, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could indicate whether or not a copy of the notice he received went to the union of the employees affected and, in fact, whether any communications went directly to the union for Manitoba Forestry Resources personnel, Lumber Division.

MR. MacMASTER: Two weeks' notice, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. McBRYDE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could then enlighten me in terms of the Act and where I misunderstand the Act. The Act seems to indicate to me, Mr. Speaker, that 12 weeks notice is required and I wonder if the Minister could explain where I misunderstand that particular Act. The other question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister, did the Minister give any special exemptions in the case of the layoffs at the Manitoba Forestry Resources?

MR. MacMASTER: I think what the section is that the member is referring to is in case of terminations, not layoffs, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. VIC SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the Minister in charge of housing. In light of the crisis that the housing industry is facing this year and, in fact, in view of the fact that the Critical Home Repair Program has been in existence now for seven years and the rules were changed by this government to eliminate those individuals who had once had housing repaired under that program, could the Minister advise as to whether the government is now considering changing the rules in order to allow individuals to apply for the Critical Home Repair assistance who had already once received assistance in the past seven years?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

HON. J. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): We are considering it, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to address the Honourable Minister of Labour in connection with the answer he gave to the Member for The Pas where he spoke about termination. May I refer him and ask for an explanation regarding regulations . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. It is highly improper for a member to ask a Minister for a legal opinion on the Statutes of this province. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I did not ask him for a legal opinion and I

might have difficulty if I did ask him about a legal opinion. I was asking him whether he could clarify whether there are any regulations which vary that part of Section 35(1) which refers to the fact that layoff — I'm just looking for it, I had it until you interrupted me, Mr. Speaker, so it'll take me a moment — that section which says that employers shall be deemed to have terminated the employment of an employee where he lays off that employee, and since it says, except otherwise provided by the regulations, could he clarify the way in which there is an exemption here where the lay-offs under the Act are considered terminations?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. MacMASTER: I may have a problem, Mr. Speaker, getting a legal opinion but I think the Member for St. Johns probably has as big a problem trying to make the same point. He should refer to the same section and look at section (c).

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona. Order, order please. I don't think the time of the question period is used wisely trying to argue about which part of the statutes we should be looking at. I don't think it serves the people of Manitoba, nor indeed does it serve this Chamber. The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. CHERNIACK: The Honourable Minister said, all he has to do is look at section (c). I think that once he gives the answer he should give us the section and the sub-section (c), and then I would be quite happy to look at it, Mr. Speaker. May I not ask the Minister to tell me what section and sub-section he is referring to when he says (c). That's all I asked, it's not an unreasonable request, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MacMASTER: The same section that the member was referring to initially when he was fumbling with his papers, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister responsible for the Critical Home Repair Program and it flows from the question of my colleague, the Member for Rossmere. In reviewing the criteria for Critical Home Repair Program funding, would the Minister please take into account the request by the Construction Association of Manitoba that individuals undertake home renovation programs in order to keep as many construction crews in Manitoba as possible, since these construction companies are faced with their crews leaving the province because of the tremendous downturn in construction activity and housing starts that has occurred over the last three years, would the Minister please take that into account when he reviews the criteria for funding for the Critical Home Repair Program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Economic Development.

MR. JOHNSTON: The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll take it into account but there is no way that the government is in a position to tell people that they have to renovate their house. We would hope that if they have any renovations that they would do it at this time. As a matter of fact if they have, I think they would find that the market is very good for them because I imagine they'd get very competitive prices.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, the time for question period having expired.
The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Government Services, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Radisson in the Chair for the Department of Health and the Honourable Member for Virden in the Chair for the Department of Urban Affairs.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY — URBAN AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Morris McGregor (Virden): I call the committee to order. We're on Urban Affairs, Resolution 119 — the Honourable Minister.

HON. GERALD W. J. MERCIER (Osborne): Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to introduce the 1980-81 estimates of expenditures for the Ministry of Urban Affairs. You will note there are only two resolutions, No. 119 providing 50,800 for the operation of the office of the Minister and No. 120 providing 33 million for payment of the block funding grant to the city of Winnipeg.

The members of the committee will recall that in October of 1977 I was appointed to serve as Minister of Municipal Affairs, as well as Minister of Urban Affairs. A year later the two departments were amalgamated and an integrated set of estimates was presented to you last spring. Then in November of 1979 the Honourable Doug Gourlay was appointed to serve as Minister of Municipal Affairs. I have retained the portfolio of Urban Affairs and am carrying on with my responsibilities with the close co-operation of Mr. Gourlay and the able assistance of his staff in the Department of Municipal Affairs.

I would like to take this opportunity of thanking Mr. Jack McNairnay for his service to me and to the people of Manitoba, as Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs, and to wish him well in his new responsibility as Deputy Minister of Natural Resources.

I should also like to express my appreciation to the new Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs, Gerry Forrest, and all of his staff for the excellent service they provided me in the past two years and are continuing to provide now in support of my role as Minister of Urban Affairs.

For the information of the members of the committee, as Minister of Urban Affairs I am responsible for the administration of The City of Winnipeg Act and for matters pertaining to the city

of Winnipeg only. I do not have responsibility for any other municipal entity besides the city of Winnipeg. I might add, of course, this has been the case since the first Ministry of Urban Affairs was established in 1971. As Minister of Urban Affairs, I continue to be responsible for co-ordinating provincial legislation, financial assistance, program and plans as they affect the city of Winnipeg, and to serve as Chairman of the Urban Affairs Committee of Cabinet, which meets with the City Council's official delegation as required.

Resolution No. 119 provides only for the operation of the office of the Minister. Appropriation 20(1)(a) provides 7,800 for the Minister's compensation with the remaining 7,800 appearing in appropriation 4(1)(a) of the Attorney-General. Appropriation 20(1)(b) provides 35,000 for the salaries of one executive assistant and one administrative secretary. Appropriation 20(1)(c) provides 7,200 for office expenses and travel related to Urban Affairs.

Resolution No. 120 covers appropriation 20(2) which provides 33 million for the block funding grant to the city of Winnipeg, up 3 million or 10 percent over the 30 million provided in the 1979-80 estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs. All other assistance is contained in the estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs or one of the other line departments.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the discussion that has surrounded the amount of the block grant and the determination of the level of property taxation this year, I would like to take this opportunity to put the province's position clearly on the record. The province must ensure that all municipalities, including the city of Winnipeg, had access to sufficient revenues to support the necessary level of expenditure on local government services and facilities. At the same time, this government believes very strongly that municipal councils should have maximum flexibility to determine expenditure levels according to local priorities for which they are accountable to their electors.

There will always be a place for conditional grant programs in the continuing evolution of provincial and municipal financial arrangements. Nevertheless, we believe the greatest emphasis should be placed on unconditional sources of funds, such as the provincial and municipal tax-sharing payments, the property tax credit program, and in the case of Winnipeg, the block funding grant. Wherever possible, we have taken a similar approach to the distribution of federal financial assistance, as in the case of the Community Services Contribution Program.

We firmly believe, Mr. Chairman, that the public funds available to municipalities will be allocated with greater sensitivity to local needs and administered more prudently in the long run if councils are permitted maximum flexibility in making their budgeting decisions.

Mr. Chairman, before I comment specifically on the block funding grant, I would like to point out that the city of Winnipeg is in a good financial position today despite the tremendous stresses of inflation, growth, and organizational change during the past decade. The Council has just approved 1980 current expenditure estimates of 289 million, almost triple the 1972 expenditures, and gross 1980 capital

estimates of 84 million. Approximately 55 percent of current expenditures are paid for by property taxes and grants in lieu of taxes raised by a municipal levy of 75.942 mills. This levy is a little less than double the 1972 mill rate and is 5.8 percent higher than 1979.

As of December 31, 1979, the city's net tax supported debt was 197 million and net self-supporting debt was 94 million. The corresponding per capita debt ratios were 325 for tax supported debt and 155 for self-supporting debt. Winnipeg's net tax supported per capita debt ratio compares favourably with the ratios of other major Canadian cities, and other common indicators of the city's financial health are also satisfactory.

I mention those few statistics only because in the day-to-day debate over specific issues, there is a tendency to lose sight of the fact that the city has been well served by its financial managers and advisors and is indeed in a sound financial position as recognized by its AA bond rating. The province, of course, has aided the city substantially through the past decade. In addition to the conditional grants now replaced by the block grant, the province provides a variety of other conditional grants which will total 8.3 million in 1980, plus grants in lieu of taxes of approximately 11.5 million. The city's tax-sharing payment will be 14.1 million. The Manitoba property tax credit is applied primarily to reduce school taxes but, since municipalities and schools share the same tax base, the result of the provincial program is to provide municipalities with additional tax room. In 1979-80 approximately 72 million in tax credits went to Winnipeg residents and this figure will be increased substantially in 1980-81 as a result of the Premier's recent announcement.

I would now like to focus, Mr. Chairman, on the block funding grant which is contained in my estimates. This grant was established in 1979, replacing nine former conditional grant programs, in accordance with this government's policy of providing maximum flexibility to the city in establishing its budget priorities. I'm afraid there has been some confusion about the year-to-year comparisons of financial support resulting from the transition from a capital commitment budgeting system, utilized by the city for some of the previous conditional grants, to what is now a simple cash grant. I would like to assure the members of the committee that the Block Funding Grant Program has provided the city with not only more flexibility but also more dollars than it might have expected to receive under the old programs. With one or two minor adjustments the actual cash flow from the province to the city for the nine programs was 4.9 million in 1972-73; 6.2 million in 1973-74; 11.3 million in 1974-75; 16.1 million in 1975-76; 21.6 million in 1976-77; 33.5 million in 1977-78 and 29.3 million in 1978-79. The second last year, 1977-78 was exceptional because 6 million was paid in that year for two years' worth of bus purchases and also because of the conclusion of outstanding land acquisitions for future rights-of-way in that year resulted in abnormally high claims for payment. In the last year, 1978-79, represented a return to the normal rate of growth and funding. The 29.3 million was paid out despite the province's general effort to restrain expenditures. In fact, while the province

committed itself to pay out 15 million for regional streets and land acquisition, the city was not able to complete all its projects on time and took up only 12.4 million of the 15 million allocated. In 1979-80, the first block funding grant was established in the amount of 30 million. This represented a modest increase over the payments of the previous year and, in fact, was substantially more than might have been allocated under the old programs. For the five prior years the average provincial cash flow for the nine programs was only 22.4 million. Concurrent with the introduction of block funding the province also waived its equity interest of approximately 8 million and passed contributions to the Assiniboine Park and Zoo, and Land Inventory for Regional Streets. Finally, once the city had reviewed the remaining capital project commitments outstanding after termination of the old Conditional Grant Programs, the province agreed to make a one-time conditional grant of 4 million in 1979-80 to assist the city in funding those remaining projects for which the province had made commitments but had not budgeted either current or capital funds. With the commitment account settled, the province then proceeded to honour its commitments to increase the 1980 block funding grant by approximately the rate of increase in provincial expenditures. The 1980 grant contained in the estimates before you is 33 million, up 10 percent over 1979.

I would advise members, in addition, that the payment dates for the payment of the 33 million to the city were recently changed so that the last payment moves up from approximately February 16th to December 31st of this year which results in a further savings of approximately 160,000 to the city. The city has chosen, in its wisdom, to apply 21.7 million to meet its current expenditures and 11.3 million for capital projects. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the 33 million is a generous and reasonable amount and I'm satisfied that it provides the city with more dollars, as well as flexibility, than it might have expected to receive under the old Conditional Grant Programs.

Now if we were to take all of the province's assistance into account and we go to the bottom line of the realty tax bill, we find that net taxes payable for the average home assessed at 7,000, after deduction of the property tax credit advance, have indeed increased since 1977, however, the three-year increase is only 114 in the case of a resident of Winnipeg School Division No. 1. Other school divisions are somewhat higher or lower. In addition, I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that as a result of the increase in the property tax credit by 100 on an average home assessed at 7,000, the Premier did point out that in all but two school divisions actual taxes in 1980 compared to 1979 will be reduced. For pensioner home owners with a 7,000 assessment net taxes will be lower in 1980 than they were in 1977 in all but two school divisions. Depending upon income, there will be additional benefits available to renters and home owners when they file their 1980 tax returns. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I did not point out that the city will face increasing financial pressures in the future. I'm looking forward to meeting with the city's official delegation when they are ready to review their new five-year capital program and in due course to consider the results of

the city's review of its development plan. I believe it is already apparent that while the city does not have to face the huge costs of growth on the scale now being experienced in some cities in Alberta, it will have to face up to substantial cost for the renewal of a great deal of infrastructure. Mr. Chairman, the province is prepared to give the city's future needs very careful consideration and to respond as required.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(b) — the Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the general statement made by the Minister and I would particularly like to address myself to the remarks made by him in his effort to found and legitimize the nature of fiscal relations between the provincial government and the city of Winnipeg in the years since the election of the honourable member's government.

Mr. Chairman, speaking very generally about the adequacy of provincial funding and the question of whether or not the provincial government has been sufficiently attentive to and responsible to the municipal ratepayers and citizens of this city.

I would like, first of all, to draw your attention to remarks made by the First Minister of this province who, as I'm sure all members present will appreciate, is very seldom involved or for that matter, in my opinion, very interested in the question of Urban Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, on January 5, the Winnipeg Free Press carried an interview or carried a report citing comments made by the First Minister during an interview and they were talking about the civic block grant that the government had announced in that week. The reporter noted that the city's councillors had been somewhat critical of the Premier's government's position vis-a-vis fiscal responsibility to the city; the Premier made certain replies and I would like to put them on the record.

First of all, in response to the question that the grant isn't big enough or the argument that the grant wasn't big enough, he said, Sure, they expected a bit more but they're happy with that. Then he indicated it was unlikely Winnipeg property taxes will have to be increased to provide the city with enough money for its projects, and later on, Mr. Chairman, we're going to discuss what projects have actually been undertaken. We'll have with us, in order to do that, we'll have the city's former Works and Operations Committee Chairperson to be able to provide us with information and, presumably, rebut the statements made by his colleagues on that committee during the past five months.

The Premier went on to say, Mr. Chairman, When the mill rates go up to that extent the ratepayers should look at their city councillors and ask them to do as good and prudent a job as their provincial councillors. Mr. Chairman, we're going to be examining the accuracy reflected in that sort of intemperate statement, whether or not the Premier's statement was indeed founded on fact or whether it was founded on fiction, if it was founded at all.

Mr. Lyon said that the city should be grateful for the new self-determination that it has under the block

grant scheme. He, too, Mr. Chairman, indicated that this allowed — and this has often been averred by honourable friends opposite — the city some degree of latitude in determining its own affairs. And he pointed out that previously, and I want to be sure I get this quote correct, the NDP administration had spent much of its time, in contrast to his government, playing around, and this is a quote, playing around in all sorts of civic issues. As if, Mr. Chairman, there was something wrong with that; as if there was something wrong, Mr. Chairman, with our having a Department of Urban Affairs that actually had staff, unlike the current state of affairs where only a couple of people, we are advised, are seconded to do that work, that very important work; that we actually gave assistance to the city in its planning processes; a staff that also was equipped to monitor the requests of the city in order that we could give consideration to the adequacy of our levels of funding. But, no, Mr. Chairman, indeed we didn't give them full autonomy; no, Mr. Chairman, we didn't give them full autonomy but we did give them the wherewithal so that they could enjoy a significantly higher standard of living than has been the case since this government has taken office.

Mr. Chairman, we used to have something called urban policy, little things that I'm sure the Minister, when he was in the same position as my honourable friend from River Heights, the Chairperson of the Civic Works and Operations Committee, would have appreciated. We had, for instance, a regional streets maintenance policy. We felt that city people should have the same essential rights, the same essential privileges as their rural counterparts. We felt that there should be some equity, as between the two classes — to use an inaccurate term — of citizens.

So, Mr. Chairperson, we did indeed used to assume 50 percent of those sort of expenses. It was an awful thing. It was so awful that in the year 1977, as my honourable friend has indicated, the city's grant from the province had risen on a comparable basis to the current block grant; that is the same nine items had risen to 33.5 million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when we put that into perspective, when we consider that this year we are only asked to approve roughly the same amount of funding for the city of Winnipeg government as the former government accorded the city in 1977, one does indeed have to wonder. Perhaps the Minister would have, in 1977 to himself because he didn't do it publicly and presumably neither did his colleague for River Heights, perhaps in their caucus, the ICEC caucus, they were remorseful about this and they felt that this was somehow not in accord with proper budgetary control and was a spendthrift attitude. Perhaps that was their personal inclination in 1977, but if it was, Mr. Chairman, we didn't hear about it in City Council nor did we hear about it in this forum in that year. That is an example, Mr. Chairman, of policy that the Premier of this province demonstrates that the former NDP government played around with civic issues.

We played around, Mr. Chairman, with the question of the transit deficit as well. We had an urban transportation policy. The former Premier of this province was very concerned with energy policy and he thought that it made darned good sense for the province to try and induce people to use mass public

transit. He pointed out that was a far more economy-minded approach to transportation in the urban context. He argued strenuously, not only in the Assembly but also to all and sundry who would listen, that mass public transit was a priority item.

Well, Mr. Chairman, to be honest and to be more than forthright and candid, we should indicate that honourable friends opposite were also concerned about mass public transit. Do you remember, Mr. Chairman, the howl that my honourable friends in their positions in the ICEC caucus, all three of them as a matter of fact opposite me, let out in 1975 and 1976 about the southwest transit corridor? Do you remember all we heard about that, Mr. Chairman? And do you remember all the trips back and forth as between Winnipeg and Ottawa and federal and provincial Ministers were meeting with my honourable friend, the current Minister of Urban Affairs, and all the words that were spoken, some in vain and some in agony, now somewhat futilely about the need for a transportation corridor to my honourable friend's then ward in Fort Richmond? And, Mr. Chairman, it made sense. I'm not suggesting that it was a bad idea; it made sense to have a transit corridor of that scale and of that sort; we still need it, Mr. Chairman, but we don't hear about it any more. It was very topical in '75, '76 and up to '77 but we don't debate it any more, Mr. Chairman. That was one of the things, I suppose, that was much deplored about that 50-50 sharing arrangement the NDP had with the civic government. I suppose the other thing was all the nasty buses we cost-shared — that must have been another thing the Minister when he was the Chairman of the Works and Operations Committee must have deplored in private.

This year his colleague, a former ICEC caucus member, Councillor Yanofsky, has publicly deplored the lack of funding, as has another colleague, the Deputy Mayor McGonigal. Both of those senior councillors have indicated that, in their opinion, the province reneged when they established the block grant formula, reneged on an agreement; and we all remember it because we remember the controversy when it was first established, on an agreement by the Minister and his government that the block funding would not be inclusive of transit bus purchases; that item would be dealt with over and above and would not be folded into the block grant.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this year there was an item on the city's Works and Operations Budget of some 4 million, which I presume my honourable friend from River Heights must have had a part in putting into place, dealing with the acquisition of a number of buses to repair and replace the older units still in service within the system. But much to, I am sure, the Honourable Member for River Heights' chagrin he found that his colleague, the Honourable Member for Osborne, was unwilling to allow the city to deal with that item over and beyond the block fund. So, Mr. Chairman, the new Chairman of Works and Operations is now telling us the city is probably not going to be able to purchase the new rolling stock they require and has indicated they will have to make do with older stock in service already on an antiquated basis.

Mr. Chairman, I ask you was that 50 percent sharing policy irresponsible? If it was I would ask my

honourable friends opposite to tell me what would be a more responsible position?

Dealing with Regional Streets Maintenance, Mr. Chairman, I should also have noted that Winnipeg had the unique, if not so distinguished, accolade of being cited as being the accident capital of Canada. That was in January of this year, Mr. Chairman, Statistics Canada's latest figures said — well I should say the figures were substantiated by Statistics Canada — and local experts at the University of Manitoba Accident Research Unit indicated the city's street system is to blame.

Premier Lyon says the former government played around with civic issues; he said the city could do all it had to do, all it really needed to do within the context of the block grant. Well, I ask you, Mr. Chairman, if that is the case, why did Dr. William Mulligan of the University of Manitoba have to indicate that Winnipeg had the highest per capita accident rate of 14 major cities in this country. I am not one to suggest this just occurred in 1979 or 1980, Mr. Chairman, that would be irresponsible, but I'm suggesting there is a job to be done and the city ratepayer needs assistance in order to do that.

The city road system is in a state of deterioration. We are, as several councillors, ICEC councillors, have suggested and I guess most notably, recently, would be a former employee of the Leader's office, Councillor Bill Neville. I wouldn't like to misquote Councillor Neville or attribute statements to him which he didn't make but Mr. Chairman, just on March 26th at the council meeting set to strike the civic mill rate, during the course of debate, Councillor Neville, a past senior advisor to the Leader of the Progressive Conservative Party of Manitoba, a distinguished member I presume of the honourable member's own party, indicated and I quote the responsibility lies fully with the province, said Councillor Bill Neville, ICEC Tuxedo Heights, it lies with their failure in understanding or indifference to the plight of the municipal taxpayer. And that, Mr. Chairman, in a nutshell is what it's all about.

Councillor Neville is not one I think given to hyperbole, dramatic overstatement. I think I can say he is a responsible councillor and a responsible citizen and he is quite correct, the burden, the onus of civic improvement and modernization has been put on the shoulders of the civic ratepayer.

A lot of people on the opposite side, I presume are taking some comfort in the fact that the mill rate this year only increased something like 6 percent. They say that reflects the adequacy of the block grant. Well, in that regard, Mr. Chairman, I would only ask the members opposite to remember all the other election years, the mill rates that were struck in all the other Unicity civic election years. If they take comfort in that I might say it must be very cold comfort because we all remember the history, I'm sure. And, Mr. Chairman, if you will allow me there are figures again which indicate the rather motley, if not somewhat absurd, history in this respect.

Mr. Chairman, at the last municipal election in 1977 mill rate growth was arrested dramatically; as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, in that year we had a decrease, in 1977, of 3.5 percent. It actually fell back some three and a half percent, and I remember because I was a member of that council, Mr. Chairman, that there was much chest beating and

there was much public posturing about the responsibility of that ICEC dominated civic government and that the taxpayers had much to be thankful for. Notwithstanding, Mr. Chairman, that the members opposite were complaining at the same time that the provincial government didn't provide them with enough money, they wanted new revenue sources, Mr. Chairman. Members around this table, the Member for Fort Rouge, will remember well and I'm sure in her turn she will provide us with some illumination on the contentious nature of debates about new revenue sources. It was a good idea, it was a good idea, it was too bad the main proponent of that sort of new initiative hasn't provided, again hasn't provided any reform or initiative.

The Minister of Urban Affairs, although he was an articulate spokesman on the council floor for this bold new area, encouragement of initiative, has done absolutely nothing in his three years as Minister. That's another thing that he and his friends, his former ICEC colleagues, have managed to sweep under the carpet for a goodly number of years. We just don't hear about revenue sharing very much any more.

But I was talking about mill rate growth, Mr. Chairman, we were talking about civic budgets and the effect of elections on the rate of growth in the mill rate. In 1977, Mr. Chairman, we had a dramatic decrease of 3.5 percent and we took heart. Well, Mr. Chairman, might I indicate that in 1978, those same councillors, or those, leastwise, who were not so audacious as the Member for Osborne and myself to repair to this Assembly, saw fit to raise the mill rate by 11 percent. Somehow, although they've managed to hold the line in 1977, things got out of control and there was actually an increase, I'd imagine, of 14-1/2 percent. There was a 14-1/2 percent increase in the mill rate to growth of the city of Winnipeg in 1978; cold comfort for the civic ratepayer, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, when we hear that the city is making do and when we hear that the city can look after its own house and all this talk about deficiencies and inadequacies in transfer payments is just so much political rhetoric, we should take into consideration a few cold realities and that is, foremost, that inflation affects the city's expenses in exactly the same way that it affects the province's expenses. When the province said that they would fund the city on the same basis, they would provide the same sort of increases as were accorded provincial government responsibilities and expenditures, they forgot to say one thing, and it was a very important omission, Mr. Chairman, they forgot to say that the block grant that they had created in 1979 was initially deficient. It didn't, Mr. Chairman, as I have suggested earlier, take into account that the city was saddled with many lost leaders.

Mr. Chairman, what has happened? How has the city managed to maintain that 6 percent increase this year? Well, it's quite simple, Mr. Chairman, and I've had arguments in committee with my friend opposite in the past two years over this very subject, one of the ways they do it is by increasing transit ridership fares and they do so, Mr. Chairman, at an unprecedented clip; one might say they do so with abandon. Mr. Chairman, in the past few years — and I don't want to be accused of making statements that are factually incorrect — the rates on the civic

transit system have risen substantially. First of all, in two years, we've had a 60 percent increase in fares; between 1977 and 1979, just a two-year period, riders fares in the city transit system rose a dramatic 60 percent.

Ed Schreyer wouldn't let that happen, Mr. Chairman. He used to always argue that if the province was to provide 50/50 sharing, the rates had to stay constant. Now, one might say, what for, does it really affect ridership; does it really affect any energy saving or was Schreyer just whistling in his hat or perhaps he was just looking after his friends, the lower income voters, the modest income voters? Well, Mr. Schreyer may well be accused of those things, Mr. Chairman — I think he was — of political grandstanding but there must have been something to what he said, too, because ridership on that system has diminished almost proportionately, a perfect direct proportionate decrease in the two years that the rates have been allowed to float and rise.

So in 1977, Mr. Chairman, we had 65-1/2 million riders on Winnipeg transit. In 1978, we had 62.9 million riders on the Winnipeg transit system; almost 62.9 million, to the Member for River Heights, Mr. Chairman, through you. In 1979, Mr. Chairman, astonishingly or perhaps not so astonishingly, 61.3 million riders. So we have a diminution proportionately as fares go up 60 percent over two years of ridership decreasing some 4.2 million rides over a two-year period. It's cyclical, Mr. Chairman; it was absolutely predictable. People faced with higher transit costs are using other means of transit. It is not quite as economical; it is not quite as attractive. So as Winnipeggers, Mr. Chairman, and I don't say this with any sense of irony or sarcasm, but as Winnipeggers spend 400 million a year on their automobiles — and that is some statistics I was able to derive indicating that Winnipeggers spent that astonishing sum of money on their cars, fuelling and maintaining and operating their cars — only some 10 percent of that is spent on public transit in the city of Winnipeg. Now that is an energy policy for the Eighties, Mr. Chairman; I ask you, is that an energy policy for the Eighties? We're spending some 40 million on mass public transportation and we're allowing people through private decisions to spend some 400 million and I tell you, Mr. Chairman, I didn't even lump into that all the costs associated with street maintenance, so, Mr. Chairman, it's absolutely astonishing.

A few years ago a local columnist and I think an articulate and sensitive advocate of the urban environment and its maintenance, personally who I think has always immediately addressed himself to the city's quality of life, suggested that the province should get a federal commitment which would provide a rebate on federal excise taxes of some two cents per gallon. He calculated that alone would suffice to provide at that time some 6 million of revenue which the province could then put towards public transportation and he noted, at that time, that would be sufficient to stop what was then a proposed 10 percent fare increase on the transit system in the city, and he thought it made good sense.

Mr. Chairman, I think anybody with a responsible overview of that situation would have agreed. I know

of no such initiatives that were attempted by the members opposite or the Ministry of the member opposite. For that matter, I have to hold my breath when I say Ministry because the Ministry is really nothing more than a fiction. As I suggested earlier, Mr. Chairman, it's nothing more than a very minor cadre of bureaucrats who are seconded, I suppose, to do some calculations annually so that they can establish a block grant. It doesn't reflect a real commitment to provincial affairs or to urban affairs in this province. So, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion one wonders what has changed in all the years, in the few years actually, since the members opposite were in the position of governing at Winnipeg City Hall.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable . . .

MR. CORRIN: I just have a few more remarks, Mr. Chairman. I spoke earlier of the southwest transit corridor as being a capital project that had been suspended, Mr. Chairman. I could also have mentioned certain revitalization programs that had been talked about for the downtown of Winnipeg. We spoke then of doing something and today it seems all too topical. We spoke then of doing something about north Portage and Main Street and we talked about infusions of funds so that we could dramatically turn about the deterioration that was affecting that area.

Mr. Chairman, the private sector has been more than responsible. You know, I'm heartened by the degree of participation and initiative taken by the private entrepreneurial sector in that area, but their level of commitment has not been matched by the province. Virtually nothing has been done to stabilize the situation north of Portage. The private sector has indeed beautified; they have taken steps to repair and renovate old structures; they are fighting to a large extent what must be described as a losing battle because they are competing with much larger private commercial entrepreneurs, people like the developers of the Eaton's Mall. But nothing is being done vis-a-vis that sector and later we're going to discuss Dash transit and the policy of this government towards Dash and, Mr. Chairman, that sort of negative approach I think clearly reflects the attitude of members opposite towards the redevelopment of the city.

The east yards, members opposite and the Honourable Minister pressed for the redevelopment and relocation of the east yards, the CN east yards. They spoke about converting those 60-odd acres into a beautiful commercial and residential complex. It was a good idea, Mr. Chairman, but nothing has happened. Those are the things we want to talk about in the moments and hours ahead, Mr. Chairman, as we review this Minister's estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a couple of comments. The Member for Wellington referred to the involvement of the Premier. Let me assure him, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier of this province is very concerned about the city of Winnipeg government and municipal government throughout the province. He is a part and a member of the Urban Affairs Committee of Cabinet and has

attended roughly every meeting that I can recollect we have had with the city's official delegation. The Member for Wellington referred to a comment the Premier apparently made about the NDP playing around and meddling in the affairs of the city of Winnipeg. I'm not going to dwell on that too long because it's a matter of record, Mr. Chairman, it's a matter of record how the previous administration did interfere with the priorities of the City of Winnipeg Council and I can refer to one major project; that being the Fort Garry-St. Vital Bridge, where there was direct interference in the priorities of the city and how that project was to be handled. We have eliminated that interference, Mr. Chairman. The member referred to a couple of people available to me in Urban Affairs. I want to assure him, Mr. Chairman, that the whole department, the amalgamated department of Municipal and Urban Affairs is fully and totally available to me as Minister and there's no diminution of any sort in the resources available to me in that department or in any other department of our government. When matters are raised by the city of Winnipeg that affect other departments, and I can refer him specifically to different initiatives that have taken place by our government in direct response to city of Winnipeg requests. Mr. Chairman, I can refer to the arena expansion program, where there's a very major commitment by the province in response to the city's request; purchase of library books, where there's been a direct response by the Department of Cultural Affairs in the sum of 250,000 to the city's request; the Community Workers' Project where the Minister of Labour and Manpower is paying to the city some 165,000 this year; the Community Improvement Program which our government has brought forward to recognize a contribution from the province to what was formerly called the Neighbourhood Improvement Program; a direct response from the Minister responsible for MHRC and the Winnipeg Rehabilitation Housing Corporation this year, Mr. Chairman; the list goes on and on. I can assure him that this government and the departments in this government are very responsive to the city's request.

The Member for Wellington amazingly referred to regional street maintenance policy as part of the Urban Affairs policy of the previous government. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is absolutely amazing. This is a policy whereby the provincial government made a contribution towards maintenance work in regional streets. That policy was such, Mr. Chairman, that it was increased once in seven years; that was the policy of the previous government. I dealt with the previous government and they said, that's our policy, we increase it once every seven years. Well, it's absolutely mind boggling, Mr. Chairman, for the Member for Wellington to cite that as an example of their Urban Affairs policy. We have, Mr. Chairman, rolled that grant into the block funding grant so that it now increases each year on an annual basis and I suggest that is a much more realistic way of dealing with a work that the city does where their costs go up every year. Under our policy, by rolling it into the block funding grant, the amount of the province's contribution will increase every year rather than once every seven years as it did under the previous government.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Wellington referred to accidents, statistics. Might I only remind him that a few days later, after that article appeared in one of the daily newspapers, it was strongly refuted by not only the city of Winnipeg but municipalities across Canada, because there was simply no uniform basis across Canada for developing those statistics, so that the figures have been strongly disputed, not only in the city but right across Canada. The Member for Wellington referred to the amount of provincial cash flow in 1977 and I, too, referred to that, Mr. Chairman; and I, too, referred to the fact that in 1977 there was extraordinary cash flow in that the total of some 150 buses I believe, were paid for. The province's share was paid for in that year as well as land acquisition settlements, a large number of them came forward that year and settled and that amounted to an extraordinary cash flow in 1977, and I said that in my opening remarks. In fact, Mr. Chairman, the amount of the block fund grant to the city in 1977 was more than the city was asking for under the previous cost-sharing formulas.

The Member for Wellington refers to the previous government's concern with respect to energy. Let me say to him that I think this government is far ahead of the previous government in its concern in that particular area. We have created a department to specifically deal with concerns in that area. The Minister responsible for that department has signed and is awaiting, as I understand it, federal approval of a federal-provincial agreement on energy programs and I expect that in studies that will be done under that agreement, when the federal government accepts it, will be a number of programs that deal with specific energy problems in the city of Winnipeg and I hope urban transportation.

The Member for Wellington referred to the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor. As one of the persons who brought that concept forward on city council, Mr. Chairman, I want to assure him that I still believe that is very worthwhile project and as we face increasingly greater energy problems I'm satisfied that program will, perhaps in the not very distant future, be a program that will be actually under construction.

The city is presently reviewing their five-year development program, as I indicated in my opening remarks. I believe that the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor is one of the higher priority items so far in that review. In the next few months our government will be, through federal-provincial agreement on river bank acquisition, which includes the east yards site and area, will be bringing forward a draft master plan for that. I want to assure the Member for Wellington that the east yards is, although the Southwest Rapid Transit Corridor is not directly a part of the River Bank Acquisition Program, it is very directly connected with development of the east yards site. So, Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate to committee members that I think that project is an important project, it certainly is in my eyes, I think it is in the city's eyes; I think it's something that must come forward and could very well come forward as a result of the planning that is presently being undertaken and expected to be released in the next few months.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Wellington referred to bus purchases and the deletion of the city's 2 million

from their budget this year. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the buses could not be delivered this year from Flyer Industries; that Flyer Industries are, in fact, booked sufficiently far in advance and I believe they're not in any position to deliver buses until at least March, at the earliest, March of 1981. In fact in referring to bus purchases, bus purchases were specifically included in the original block funding program but we're certainly prepared, as we've indicated to the city, to meet with them to discuss that subject matter further.

The Member for Wellington suggested, by citing a quotation from a councillor or some other party, that this government was indifferent to the taxpayer. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out and reiterate once again that under the increase in the Property Tax Credit Program the average homeowner assessed at 7,000 will have a reduction in taxes in all but two school divisions in this year; in the same way pensioners, as I understand it, will pay less taxes than they did in 1977. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that program was brought in because of a concern for the taxpayer; and for the Member for Wellington, or anybody else I don't care who he is, to suggest that this government is indifferent to the plight of the taxpayer is absolutely ludicrous.

The Member for Wellington referred to revenue sharing. I want to point out to him, Mr. Chairman, that under the Provincial Tax Sharing Plan the payment to the city of Winnipeg this year was increased by 2.2 million and a part of that was brought about because of the change in calculations that we had introduced in that plan to recognize, particularly, the special needs of larger urban municipalities in providing services to their residents. It's because of that, not only the growth in that fund but a change in calculations, that we are able to direct an increase of 2.2 million to the city in that particular program.

With respect to Transit, Mr. Chairman, I do want to point out once again — and it's a matter of record — that transit fares in the city of Winnipeg are the lowest in Canada; I believe there may be one other city that is equal to the city of Winnipeg but they are the lowest in Canada. I share with him, and I'm sure my colleague the Member for River Heights and the previous Works and Operations Chairman, the Member for St. James, all of us would share the concern probably with him over transit ridership. All of us see the tremendously increased costs in operating a motor vehicle and the cost of gasoline. Yet it's not, despite those increases, comparatively, certainly is not as large an increase in transit fares. In spite of all those things ridership has not increased significantly. So it would certainly appear to me that if the cost of the service is not a major factor, in my view — and I've said it all along — it's the kind of service that is provided. I know, in 1974 on Works and Operations, we introduced at that time a number of direct service express bus lines with limited stops to downtown. Those were successful in those years in increasing the ridership. Since then the ridership has stabilized. The strike that the transit went through certainly caused, as it was expected at the time, caused a lot of people to find other means of travelling. It would be interesting to know whether more people are, for example, car pooling rather than transit. That is another very acceptable way of

transporting people downtown, particularly to and from work when the major traffic snarls take place. But there again I haven't seen recent statistics but the number of passengers per car certainly was remaining fairly constant for a number of years.

But, Mr. Chairman, on the one point it must be emphasized that transit fares in the city of Winnipeg are still the lowest in Canada. That may be shared with another city. Those are all the comments I have to make at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I want to make some comments on rail relocation and in so doing perhaps cover some of the ground that my colleague commented on, and the Minister.

I want to begin by saying to the committee that this discussion, which is also directly related to the construction of the McGregor-Sherbrook Overpass, has been going on for at least 14 years to my experience, when I first got elected and probably a lot longer than that. I know that when we were in opposition in '66 to '69 that we made speeches in favour of a new overpass in the north end of Winnipeg because it was, at that point in time, long overdue. When we achieved the government in '69 there was also strong support for that proposition in Cabinet and we held, at that time, all the seats in the north end of Winnipeg, in Elmwood, East Kildonan and North Kildonan. So I think that it would not be an exaggeration to say that the New Democratic MLAs and Ministers reflected the thinking of people in the area. Then the project was approved, maybe around 1975 or so, and then in the last two or three years, there has been nothing but delay up to and including the meeting of last week.

I don't take any consolation in the position of the present Minister but I would let him speak for himself in the debate. It seems that the provincial government has been somewhat soft in terms of its position in support of the McGregor-Sherbrook Overpass and possibly to its position in regard to the possibility of rail relocation.

Now, rail relocation is a bit like motherhood, it's a very difficult thing to be against. But the fact of the matter is that the people of north Winnipeg really are suffering because of a lack of adequate bridges and overpasses and I don't think it would be uncommon to talk to people in the area who would be highly suspicious of the city and provincial governments in terms of building for them a facility with which they are agreed upon. And in addition to that, Mr. Chairman, not only is there a need for a major additional bridge over the rail yards to replace the old and obsolete Arlington Bridge and to compliment the heavily used Salter Bridge, but there's also need for another bridge somewhere along the Red River between Elmwood, East Kildonan and North Kildonan, or on the other side of the river, the north end and West Kildonan.

So the latest development which I want to deal with and hear more comment from the Attorney-General, is this recent meeting on rail relocation. Mr. Axworthy, I think, has to bear the responsibility of sticking his nose into that project and being responsible for a 2.8 million delay. I think that burden has to rest fairly on his shoulders because he

caused the delay. So if he has a nose worth 3 million — I don't know if he's a half of a six-million-dollar man or whether the rest of him is worth more than 3 million but I know he's got a 3 million nose. I say that when he stalled that bridge he blew 3 million in taxpayers' money; he caused the delay for electoral purposes and he blew it in Cabinet. I think he has demonstrated that he has no clout in Cabinet. He can say whatever he likes, but I don't think he has a position that is really very high up and I think he's demonstrated when the chips are down that he doesn't have any clout or persuasive ability in terms of getting his colleagues to agree. So now we're in the position, Mr. Chairman, of the Minister not only struck out but he continues to talk about the possibility of more money. I think that this is just absolutely a pie in the sky and I think that there's a lot of issues involved in talk of rail relocation, a lot. One that hasn't even been dealt with is the fact that if, in fact, we got approval and we got the federal funds, 100 million or whatever, and we came up with a sharing of the province, the city, the federal government, the CPR, and everybody else, we had everybody in total agreement, the Transport Commission, what would we do with that great big yards? Where would it go? No matter where you put it, well, if you put in Rossmere you'll permanently ensure the re-election of Vic Schroeder for the next 25 years because we will then say it is the provincial government that put the yards there, but no matter where you want to put it, no matter what end of the city, no matter how close to the Perimeter, no matter how far away from a settled area, the people won't want it. They'll say that it will deteriorate their property values. The other point is, we'll then have this massive empty space in the middle of Winnipeg. We'll have a bunch of old railway tracks, a lot of papers, mold buildings and so on. To redevelop that area would cost, I think it is safe to say, hundreds of millions of dollars at a time when we have high vacancy rates in homes; we have high vacancy rates in apartments; we have people in north Portage saying we need money for redevelopment; we have all sorts of demands on the taxpayers' dollars; and somebody's going to come along and say there's what, hundreds and hundreds of acres in the middle of Winnipeg standing ready for redevelopment. It also doesn't answer the question of are you going to then allow the two main lines to still go through, because that hasn't been tackled. Some would say, take them all out but just the two lines going into downtown Winnipeg; and others would say, no, you move it out to Rosser and then you have all these lines coming back like spaghetti. I think this has been thought through and if it was achieved I don't think that people have thought through the tremendous costs of relocation and redevelopment. They have not thought through the costs of redevelopment; they have not thought through the costs that will be alleged to be — well, one could say that because of moving into an area there will be negative costs and that, too, hasn't been considered.

So, Mr. Chairman, I look at what Mr. Pepin says and I would be interested to hear a greater comment from the Minister of Urban Affairs because I read in the paper that Mr. Pepin, who seemed to be quite candid, he certainly persuaded the Mayor that there is no funds for relocation and he certainly appeared

to persuade the Minister of Urban Affairs and the people in Winnipeg. The headlines are, No Money for Rail Shift, well, this headline says, or Overpass, meaning no additional funds. And Pepin apparently said that his predecessors made, A number of promises, commitments, half promises and half commitments. Now, Mr. Axworthy is making quarter promises and quarter commitments and he'll soon be making 16th and 32nd and 64ths, because we're not getting that 100 million bucks, we're not getting 100 million bucks; we're not even getting a million bucks; we're getting that original amount. You're getting zero for rail relocation and you're getting zero for the additional inflation, 2.8 million. Apparently, Mr. Pepin and Lloyd Axworthy both said that maybe there'll be some money in DREE. So now we have to wait till May 30 for some more wild-goose chasing; we're going to look around to see if there's any money in DREE. I mean what are we going to get? A million bucks, a couple of hundred thousand. What are we going to get out of DREE? We're not going to get money for rail relocation. I'd like to know about that; I'd like to know if the Minister can talk about what possible DREE moneys could be achieved by the city of Winnipeg and what possible dollar value. Because I, again, regard this as a complete waste of time.

Mr. Axworthy is quoted as saying that he's going to continue to fight for funding. Well, I don't know what he's going to do, if it's going to be a tag day or whether he's going to give part of his money from his trust fund that he's giving to the ballet, whether he's going to give a proportion of that. But it's chicken feed, whatever he's talking about is absolute chicken feed. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Axworthy also criticized the province and I think that the province has to answer clearly as to what their exact position is. He says that the province has been hanging back and that they should have committed, and I say that the Minister has to answer as to whether or not he would be prepared to commit funds either to rail relocation, which I assume he's written off, or whether he is strongly committed to not only providing funding from UTAP for the McGregor-Sherbrook Overpass, but also to push the issue, instead of sitting around and waiting again for another study.

You know, this is the thing that annoys me, Mr. Chairman, we've had study after study after study. The latest study, which was called for by Mr. Axworthy, he said was not adequate, that it was not a good enough study, it wasn't adequate, it wasn't satisfactory. It may not have been but who is to say, who is to say that the next study which would be fifth or sixth would be adequate. Somebody else will say that's no good either. The only kind of study that's any good is the one that backs you up or the one that you told the consultants. They go out for lunch with you, usually you don't influence them; you go out for lunch with them, they read your mind and they write a report that will suit the attitude of the people commissioning the study. That's how most consultants get by —(Interjection)— a vast study.

A MEMBER: A half vast study.

MR. DOERN: A half vast study. Well, I've never heard of that before. The other thing I say to the Minister is that the federal government as far as I

can see has just slammed the door in your face, it's slammed the door in your face. You went there with the Mayor and delegates and asked for money for the Convention Centre. They said, no. You went there and asked for money for a 50 million garbage burning steam heat plant and they said, well, we'll look at it, but you came back empty handed as far as I'm concerned. You had a number of projects; the city and the province went there and you came back with not one penny more, not a penny more. You have nothing for rail relocation; you have nothing for the McGregor-Sherbrook Overpass; you have nothing for the Convention Centre; and you'll probably wind up with nothing for that steam heating plant which I have fought for and supported for a long time. When you're talking energy conservation, when you're talking about alternate forms of energy, there's a natural for you that's in existence in other cities in Canada; that's in existence in other cities in the United States, that's built with a Canadian technology, by Dominion Bridge I think it is, they're behind that. As far as I am concerned in terms of positives that meeting was a complete and utter waste of time. So let's get on with the job here and write off, for the next 10 to 20 years, if not more, rail relocation. Let's just give it up and build the McGregor-Sherbrook Overpass and go on from here instead of more studies, more broken promises and more pie in the sky.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, having heard the official NDP party position now on the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass or perhaps the Member for Elmwood has joined the Member for Inkster's group or perhaps the Member for Wellington has joined the Member for Inkster's group, I'm not sure, but I expect that there may very well be, Mr. Chairman, a clear divergence of opinion within the NDP Party itself on this matter. Mr. Chairman, let me refer to the meeting with Mr. Pepin. Mr. Pepin referred to the fact that, in his view, having been involved with rail relocation projects across Canada in the last little while it was his view that the legislation itself had created great expectations among municipalities across Canada. He was taking the position, he said, as he had just on the previous day in Toronto advising municipalities, that the only moneys available for rail relocation were those moneys that were included in the Urban Transportation Assistance Program; that it's all the money his department had for rail relocation despite the legislation itself which refers to 50 percent financial assistance from the federal government in approved relocation projects.

MR. DOERN: Could I ask the Attorney-General a question? He has so much money, is that money renewable on an annual basis or can it be supplemented on an annual basis because Winnipeg will get so much in UTAP funds; is that for the next decade or is it for what period of time?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the UTAP Agreement, as it's referred to, is a five-year agreement. 10.2 million was allocated to the province of Manitoba and we allocated 7.6 of that to the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass and/or rail relocation. We wrote to Otto Lang when he was

Minister in February of 1979, on behalf of the city, forwarding the application for construction of the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass, advising the Minister that we were allocating the 7.6; as I understand it the Transport Commission approved the application, sent it to Mr. Lang at which point in time, in view of representations made to him by Mr. Axworthy and others, another study was undertaken. I have to say I wrote to Mr. Mazankowski when he was Federal Minister of Transport urging that this matter be dealt with. He felt, in view of what had happened, he had to wait for the study to be completed; the study was apparently completed during the federal election campaign. On the day after Mr. Pepin's appointment I wrote to him with respect to this matter and then, as we say, we met with him. He advised us that his officials had contacted the DREE Department and his information was that there was no money available in the DREE Department at all. Mr. Axworthy, as the Member for Elmwood has said, has taken the position there may be some money available. It was the understanding when we left the meeting that Mr. Pepin would respond to the city and to us as to whether or not there were any other moneys available.

We're talking about a pretty massive project and whether or not, even if moneys are available in DREE, whether or not under the terms of reference of DREE they can be allocated to rail relocation, would be a good question. But because of the massive amounts of money involved, because of legislation itself, it was my view as Minister that we had to determine whether the federal government would make a specific commitment to relocation, a specific financial commitment. And if they did we're prepared to go that far; we're certainly prepared to be reasonable but I think it was the prudent thing to do, to ask for that commitment. We now have our answer, certainly, from Mr. Pepin. We will have to wait for final confirmation from him. He's indicated that, eventually, if there is no money to be found in the city, as it probably will want to proceed with construction, he's prepared to sign the licence or the necessary authority to proceed with construction immediately. Mr. Chairman, that's where that matter stands. He said he would get back to us within a few days, so hopefully we will hear from him by the end of this week.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Crescentwood.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Wellington earlier mentioned or made a statement that the Premier shows very little interest in Urban and Municipal Affairs. I couldn't help but agree with the Minister more so that at any time our caucus group meets to discuss Urban Affairs particularly that the Premier is usually always there and takes a great interest.

If the Member for Wellington might check back in Hansard from 1976 and 1977 when his colleague, the Member for Seven Oaks, was Minister of Urban Affairs, he would see at that time, as a former city of Winnipeg councillor, I used to urge the then Minister of Urban Affairs, the Member for Seven Oaks, the current member, that we should adopt a system provincially of block funding or giving more autonomy to the city of Winnipeg and not having the

city of Winnipeg's official delegation come to the provincial government, almost on a weekly basis, bended on their knees and asking that every minor and major item get the provincial government's approval, and that the city of Winnipeg was a large urban and municipal government and that they were in a position with competent people that they could run their own show. It was that type of urging on our present Minister that convinced the present government that what we should do is let the city of Winnipeg run their own show and adopt a system, such as block funding, for financing the city of Winnipeg.

He made reference to the former system used by the former government of 50-50 revenue sharing on streets projects. Yes, that was a reasonably good system providing the city of Winnipeg came to the province and said that we want to give street 'A' first preference and, if the province agreed that street 'A' had the first priority with them, then such a system worked very well but if the city opted to renew certain streets and the province didn't see fit that those streets were at the top of the list of priority then that system failed at that point. So it depended where the political interest was. The former provincial government only had two members, and most of the time only one member, from South Winnipeg so, as the Member for Fort Rouge said, the Grant Avenue extension fell away down on the priority list, as did the Silver Avenue extension and many others. And yet he has the gall to be critical of the present Minister on funding of municipal projects particularly in the city of Winnipeg.

The Member for Elmwood makes reference to the MacGregor Overpass. I couldn't help but agree with him even more, but he made reference to the fact that it goes back some 14 years; I can tell him that it goes back to 1960 when the former metro government that we had here in the city of Winnipeg started to talk about either the relocation of the CPR yards or such a concept as the MacGregor-Sherbrook Overpass. In fact it was the former metro government who had commissioned to have the design of the MacGregor-Sherbrook Overpass done, prior to the unification of the city of Winnipeg in 1971.

I recall, Mr. Chairman, many many times talking to my late brother, the former Mayor of the city of Winnipeg, about the CPR yards and the relocation as opposed to a MacGregor-Sherbrook Overpass and, on a number of occasions, he mentioned that Mr. Axworthy, who then was a provincial member and heading up the Institute of Urban Studies at the University of Winnipeg, personally favoured and opted for relocation as opposed to the MacGregor-Sherbrook Overpass; and he, because of his strong personal conviction for relocation, he at that time would do everything in his power to convince his colleagues and friends in Ottawa, who at that time were in the federal government while he was here in the provincial government that, whatever you do, don't go to a new bridge approach because if we wait a little bit longer we can have the railroad relocated.

The Member for Elmwood has stated that relocating the railyards is just taking a problem from one area and locating it elsewhere and whether it was going to be removed well outside of the city of Winnipeg, it

could easily then be in the Member for Selkirk the Leader of the Opposition's constituency or someone else's where it would eventually cause a problem like it is now. Plus the fact, Mr. Chairman, that the railways would have to be compensated and the figure of about ten years ago was 10 cents per box car per mile, for each additional mile they had to travel around the city of Winnipeg because of the relocation. So it only makes sense that the bridge be forged ahead with and, even though it has been discussed for some 20 years, hopefully we can see some positive signs and some constructive signs in the near future that maybe the bridge is the only possible alternative.

The Honourable Minister who is now in the federal cabinet, Mr. Axworthy, last spring about this time was discussing rather openly at public meetings in the Winnipeg North Centre area the possibility of rail relocation and I think he mislead a lot of the citizens in that area, but then of course at that time he wasn't sure whether Mr. Richardson was running federally in Winnipeg-Fort Garry or not and he was looking at the seat of Winnipeg North Centre.

At the same time, and that's where he had great support through his Urban Studies Department at the University of Winnipeg and where I think for years he played politics with such a department at the University of Winnipeg for his own personal gain and his own personal gain has come to a head now where the Minister of Urban Affairs, Mr. Mercier, has just stated, in a meeting last week with Mr. Pepin, that it appears that Mr. Axworthy's personal dream of rail relocation has just gone down the tube and some 20 years later it looks like the bridge is the only possible answer to that problem.

The Member for Wellington also mentioned, when he made reference to 50-50 funding, how his party when they were government worked with the city of Winnipeg. I must say the former government, what they often did was they used to throw a carrot at the city of Winnipeg and say: Yes, you need more funding, we'll give you areas of taxation, like hotel room taxes or amusement taxes; offer them revenue-sharing means of raising money, usually unpopular means. Like a hotel room tax would be a very unpopular means of raising money as far as the hotel owners and the tourist industry, but of course the provincial government of that day didn't have the intestinal fortitude to go ahead and throw the hotel room tax on. They said to the urban government, here's an idea for you, here's a way you can raise some money, knowing full well it would never meet with the people at large. The amusement tax they threw at the city of Winnipeg: Here's a former revenue you can have; if it's not enough just increase the amusement tax. Well, it wasn't long before the Winnipeg Jets Hockey Club were into difficulty with the amusement tax and the provincial government of the day, the former NDP government, said, well, we'll help you with that problem of the amusement tax; we'll buy X number of season tickets and we'll send notably very worthy persons to the hockey games but you still, in the meantime, must collect the amusement tax.

Mr. Chairman, I think the present government system of block funding, where the city comes and negotiates once a year with the provincial government Department of Urban Affairs and the

Minister and the Committee and arrives at what hopefully on both sides is a suitable figure, is the only way to deal with the city of Winnipeg and that the city of Winnipeg have capable, competent councillors, some of whom, former ones are sitting around the table. They were all, in my opinion, excellent councillors and worked very hard at their job. They have excellent personnel, and I think the city of Winnipeg can run it's own show. They don't have to have Big Brother down here on Broadway, constantly telling them how to run the city of Winnipeg. This is the approach the Premier of this province and the Minister of Urban Affairs has taken; it's one I took while I was in opposition for two years and it's one I hope, through you, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, is continued to be adopted in the years ahead.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of comments. One thing that is not being referred to is that The Relocation Act requires a development plan and transportation plan and economic plan. The development plan and transportation plan particularly must have the consent of all municipalities affected by it. Now we look at the proposed relocation route; as I recollect, it travels through the RM of Springfield, the RMs of East St. Paul, West St. Paul and Rosser. Now I'm not saying those municipalities would not consent to it but, again, it's certainly one of the problems that would have to be considered very seriously in the long run because so many people have referred to the fact you are merely transferring a problem from one location to the other.

If we consider, Mr. Chairman, the development of vacated railyards as a priority, then we have to face up to the fact we have a vacated railyard in downtown Winnipeg at the present time, in the east yards. As I have indicated earlier, we do have coming forward within the next few months, a draft master plan on river bank acquisition which deals with river bank acquisition from the mouth of the La Salle River and the Red River, all the way along the Red River up to Selkirk, but a major focal point of that whole acquisition program is the development of the CNR east yard site.

Part of one of the factors to be considered in the development of that site is certainly the southwest rapid transit corridor, but we do, Mr. Chairman, have, I believe it is 90 vacant acres at that site — (Interjection)— Pardon me, 66; with the possibility of some development and certainly development of parklands along the river, an historical site at the junction of the Red River and the Assiniboine River, possibly associated with some commercial or residential development; with a further possibility of the initial development of a rapid transit corridor. It is a matter that will have to be dealt with and the master plan will be . . . There will be a process of public meetings and public participation in that draft master plan before any recommendations by the technical people are made to the federal and provincial governments in consultation with the local governments involved, but I simply cite this as an example of a significant area of vacated railyards that is in the process of being developed.

So that would confirm, to some degree, the comments of the Member for Elmwood with respect

to the difficulties involved in further development of another vacated rail yard. While still saying of course, as we've always said, Mr. Chairman, that there's no question relocation is the most desirable alternative, as it is, not only in Winnipeg but in so many other major Canadian cities that Mr. Ppin has had to deal with, and as a principle it's a difficult one to argue with. It would appear in any event the federal government has, in fact, made a decision on that and the matter of the overpass will, subject to whatever information Mr. Ppin comes back with, is something that is going to be dealt with.

But I simply cite, Mr. Chairman, the present vacated CNR rail yards as an area that will be dealt with during the course of the next year in terms of a number of programs coming forth and I cite it because that land itself has been vacant for some time now and has been subject to a lot of discussion for at least five or six years; I cite that as an example of perhaps some of the problems in dealing with vacated rail yards.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, yes, thank you very much. I just wanted to ask the Minister, since he said that Mr. Ppin had absolutely refuted the validity of The Rail Relocation Act, he indicated that Mr. Ppin said he would not be compelled by 50 percent provincial and civic funding for the project, to contribute an equal level of funding to the railway location project, I'm wondering whether he wants to make that statement definitively and categorically for the record; that Mr. Ppin said he would not be moved by the section of the Act being invoked as to 50-50 funding? Just before we recess, is that for the record, Mr. Chairman? Because I think Mr. Ppin should be polled on such a serious remark.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, committee, the hour is 4:30 and there are people wanting to take part in the Private Members' Hour, so I'm leaving the Chair and will return at 8:00 o'clock.

SUPPLY — HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, Abe Kovnats (Radisson): This committee will come to order. I would direct the honourable members' attention to Page 61 of the Main Estimates, Department of Health. Item under discussion is Resolution No. 78, Clause 4. The Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba. Item—pass — the Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairperson. When we broke on Friday, I was commenting that the increase in the program is being carried by the federal government providing an increase in their funding of some 250,000 while the province, while admitting that we have a problem of near epidemic proportions, has only increased its share of the funding by 4,000.00. This is another example of the provincial government doing its own cosmetic bookkeeping whereby it gets money for Health from the federal government, and health purposes, and then diverts its own spending to other activities in order to try and balance the budget. Meanwhile, the Alcoholism Program and the program dealing with

drug addiction is under-funded, and this is rather hypocritical in a sense, because we are indeed increasing the revenue, as a province, from the sale of alcohol very significantly.

The federal Conservative budget increased taxes on alcohol products. The Liberal government has reintroduced those measures and, as a result, taxes on alcoholic beverages and alcoholic products goes up, and I'm quite convinced that the amount that the provincial government gained as the monopoly seller of alcohol products in Manitoba over the last year surely was far greater than 4,000 for the year. And I would think that just today, Mr. Chairperson, the prices of liquor products in the liquor stores are going up substantially and the province's share of that is significant and I would judge that today, just today, the province has made more than 4,000.00. And because it's making a lot of money from liquor, it really can't turn around then and say that it's not in a position to provide funds to deal with some of the problems that are created because of the sale of liquor and the consumption of liquor in Manitoba.

I think the province is really taking the wrong approach here with respect to this appropriation. It should be increasing its funding substantially. It should be trying to do a number of things that I don't think it's doing sufficiently well. I don't think it's got an adequate program in schools; I don't think it's got an adequate program in community clubs; I don't think it's got an adequate program to try and inform young people of the perils of alcoholism and use of drugs. I think that the government's program with respect to its own employees is woefully weak. I think that governments often aren't particularly far-sighted employers in this respect. I think that the federal government has tried to establish a program of diagnosing alcoholism amongst its own employees. I think that their results indicate that a surprising number of employees do indeed suffer from alcoholism or alcohol related problems and that their program has had a bit of success in trying to turn this problem around amongst federal employees and I think it's time that the province launched such a program itself. The province is one of the largest employers in Manitoba and I don't know if it's a good example and if it shows much leadership if it doesn't undertake a program of alcoholism treatment for its own employees; of doing checks to ensure that their employees know that there are facilities and programs available so that these people may in fact partake of them.

There may in fact be a few programs available through the Alcoholism Foundation but I don't think the employees are very aware of them and, frankly, they tend to try and hide their particular problems; rather than trying to come out in the open, admit that they have a particular illness, and then try and have that illness treated. I think that we won't try and resolve problems of alcoholism by trying to sweep the individual problems under the carpet and try and keep mum about this. I think it's important for employees to understand that it is an illness; they will not be fired if they come forward admitting that they do have problems with alcoholism; and it's important for these employees to have enough confidence to do so, and to feel confident that there is a sufficient program in place to try and meet their needs.

This may in fact be a bit more expensive in the short run, but surely over the longer run it will increase productivity of government employees and surely show some leadership to other employers in the province. I am hoping that the government could have undertaken something like that; and from the Minister's comments to date I don't think much in that way is happening. I think that the Minister hasn't talked very much about problems of drug addiction and drug usage, especially among younger people. I know that the federal government is providing its share of funding, I think primarily through the non-medical use of drugs committee or the funds that developed in federal programming as a result of that committee. I'm wondering if the Minister is in a position now to indicate what is the significance of the drug problem in Manitoba; is it one that's increasing, decreasing; in what age groups is it more prevalent; and what types of programs does the government have in place to try and deal with this, what I think is a growing problem, especially amongst younger people?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just clarify, if I may, one or two aspects of the debate that have occupied the attention of members opposite up to this point in time. First of all, I don't accept for one moment the argument of the Honourable Member for Transcona that because the estimate shows a federal recovery of 1,350,000 projected for 1980-81 that can be translated into the particular improvement and expansion that is made in our budget in the Department of Health and in our budget for the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba. One has to consider, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure the Honourable Member for Transcona understands this fact, that we deal with the amount of money that the Minister of Health and the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba can have made available to them against the canvas of the government's financial and fiscal condition, input and outgo, and we work on the basis of our own appropriation and our own budget, independent of calculations that involve other jurisdictions such as Ottawa and obviously are taken into the overall balance sheet of the Consolidated Fund of the government. We're looking at a budget for the Alcoholism Foundation this year of 4.8 million against one in the previous year of 4.536 million. And those are the mathematics that I live with as Minister of Health; that Mr. Cruickshank lives with as Executive Director of the Alcoholism Foundation; and that the Foundation itself lives with regardless of what's coming back in recoveries from Ottawa in cost-shared programs; in transfer payments; in equalization payments. We live with the amount of money we are able to get out of the globe that is available to Manitoba to live on in a given fiscal year. We get what we can; we get every dollar that we can. In that respect we are given, I think, very generous consideration by my colleagues in Treasury Board and in Cabinet and we have, in looking at our budget in total for Health, one-third of the expenditure dollars in the province of Manitoba in 1980-81 and that was the case last year too. So that what's coming back in transfer payments or recoveries or equalization payments doesn't enter into the calculation that the Minister of Health and

the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba are concerned with when we are sitting down to develop our program for the coming year and going forward through the government channels that one must go through to fight for and obtain every dollar that we can get. We are looking at 4.8 million out of a globe. Now on that same point, I would also like to say that the argument of the Honourable Member for Transcona is reminiscent to me, and reflective to me, of an attitude that I think most political parties in Canada, or at least some political parties in Canada, have moved beyond and put behind them as impractical, unrealistic, unworkable thinking; but apparently the New Democratic Party has not put it behind them as unrealistic wasteful thinking or at least the Honourable Member for Transcona hasn't put it behind him. What he's saying is that there is not enough money going into the fight on alcoholism and all we have to do is throw more millions at the problem and that will solve it. Well, I want to tell him that there are people in the field of alcoholism — I don't necessarily subscribe to their position but I want to say for the record and so that we understand each other here — that there are people in the field of alcoholism who claim that we could be doing more, it would be possible to be more effective, with less money than is in the budget at the present time. I don't necessarily subscribe to that. I think that our new board and our new administration are doing an extremely capable job of getting a hundred cents worth of value out of every dollar. But there are people in the alcoholism field who say that there are still dollars being inefficiently spent and you find that, of course, throughout the health and community services spectrum.

So before we start talking about boosting and expanding the budget and throwing more millions of dollars at the problem, let us determine to the satisfaction of Manitobans that the 4.8 million that's going in there is being effectively spent and that is what the current administration and board of the AFM is all about; that is the job they're engaged on. On the Recovery from Ottawa, I might say that last year when the final AFM budget was approved by Cabinet, staff of the Department of Health calculated the shared-cost receipts to be 1,090,000 and that's what shows up in last year's estimates and that is the answer that the Member for Fort Rouge asked me for the other day. At the start of the fiscal year, the final cost-shareable expenses were negotiated with Ottawa and then the cost-shared receipts were calculated by AFM staff to be 1,214,800, not 1,090,000 but 1,214,800.00. Our latest revised estimate is 1,124,800, slightly lower. A more accurate comparison to the 1,350,000 that we're looking at as a projected Recovery here for 1980-81 would be that 1,214,800 that turned out to be the Recovery last year. So that what we're looking at here is an increase of 135,200 in shared-cost receipts on an increased expenditure base of 354,400 and that, sir, is reasonably close to long-term averages.

I would just say in one final note on that point, that this 1,350,000, which is projected in print here as our Recovery for this year, is only an estimate that's subject to negotiations with Ottawa and it may, in the final analysis, be quite different.

Now with respect to what we're doing in the challenge facing us in the field of alcoholism at all

levels and with respect to some, perhaps, concern that was generated on Friday due to the position of the government and the AFM as it is now being shaped and defined and as I articulated it with respect to the Main Street Project, let me just ensure that there are no misunderstandings on that subject. The reason why the Main Street Project's share of funding from the provincial agency, the provincial body, the AFM, is under some close limitation at the present time is that we have, as I said in my opening remarks on this appropriation, put in place a major special needs survey of a provincial nature and of a Winnipeg core area nature. We want to assess and evaluate the size and scope of the problem and the best way of getting at it, the most effective way of getting 100 percent value for our dollars in the core area and that downtown study as I said the other day, is being conducted by Mr. Jimmy Toal, and we would expect to have results and recommendations from that study by this coming fall; late summer or early this fall.

In the context of that, while we undertake that study and arrive at those definitions and arrive at some conclusions and recommendations, we have said that the street patrol aspect of the Main Street Project requires some intensive evaluation and some intensive review and we're holding the funding line on that part of the Main Street Project.

I think it's important to point out that nowhere here have I suggested that we have any concerns or doubts about the Lydia Street Detox Centre. That is a vital part of the Main Street project, the Lydia Street Detox Centre, and it remains a priority enterprise, as far as we and the AFM are concerned, in the fight against alcoholism.

But the street patrol aspect of the Main Street Project does deserve some examination, sir. It does raise some questions and we do have some concerns. And I want to emphasize that I don't make these decisions arbitrarily or make these judgements unilaterally. We have an AFM board and an administration experienced in the alcoholism problem, experienced in the fight against alcoholism, who bring forward the results of their expertise and the results of their examinations to me. I assure you I'm acting on expert advice when I propose to my colleagues in government and we define a course set out, as I set it out on Friday with respect to a project like the street patrol aspect of the Main Street Project, a course which calls for holding the line substantially while we evaluate it and review it and determine just how effective it is.

The conclusions that we found late last year when the overnight sanctuary, the so-called flop house for the street patrol customers, was closed for four months, was that there was very very little, if any, impact in terms of the problem of street drunks in the core area of Winnipeg. The street patrol was shut down for approximately four months and that resulted in the 40,000 surplus that I referred to the other day. My chairman tells me that during that time there was apparently no increase in problems relating to this area or any increase under The Intoxicated Persons Detention Act with the city police. You'll recall, sir, that that particular facility, as I say the overnight sanctuary or fondly and frequently referred to as the flop house, lost access to its former premises and was moved to a site on James

Street or James Avenue and there was a gap in the period of its operation there. The results of that gap of that period of a temporary suspension are, as I've described them, virtually nil.

But I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the government and the AFM both are deeply committed to resolving the problem inherent with the core area, inherent in the core area and we, at this juncture, question the effectiveness of the Main Street Project's street patrol only from the point of view of experience and from the point of view of the Special Needs Study which is being launched in that area, and from the point of view of the cost effectiveness of the dollars being spent. Our experience and the professional commentary and advice offered to me is as I described it on Friday, that the street patrol function is not necessarily productive. In some ways it is self-defeating and we must assess it; we must evaluate it. If our examination and evaluation demonstrate that the street patrol project is absolutely essential and demonstrably effective and needs to be expanded, then that will be done; that will be done. We want to find those areas that are useful, find those areas that should be served, those mechanisms that should be in place, identify those that should be expanded, so that we can do the job that needs to be done. But this is a legitimate question that has been raised about the effectiveness of the street patrol side of the Main Street Project and we would be less than responsible if we didn't follow through on it.

The point that the Honourable Member for Transcona makes with respect to public servants, persons in the Civil Service, and assistance that they may need, I think, Sir, is a point that has no basis in fact; that emanates from an unfamiliarity on his part with the services and the assistance that are available. There certainly is assistance in this area available through the Civil Service Commission. Indeed there must be broader more intensive education, broader more intensive awareness campaigns, through the public generally but particularly among our young people, our school age population, with respect to the dangers and the damages of alcohol use and abuse and drug use. But that is the reason why this government has moved to reshape and recast the Alcoholism Foundation, and its board, and its administration; that is the reason why the AFM has taken some of the initiatives in the past year and put them in place that I outlined in my opening remarks on this appropriation a few days ago; that is the reason why these need studies are now under way; so that we can develop a cohesive approach to the problem from the youngest of ages through to the oldest of ages; from the centre of Winnipeg through to the remote pockets and regions of our province. It will be a considerable journey and a journey of considerable length and effort but it can be launched and it can be productive provided it is organized properly, provided we know what we're doing, provided we've identified the problems in the most effected means for getting at them, and provided that we have tied that whole approach together cohesively.

And that is what we are embarked upon at the present time and I have great confidence that in the rethinking and the new thinking and the restructuring

that has taken place in the last year, under the Chairman of the Board and the Executive Director, that we're on the right track. And by this fall, when we have the results of some of those need studies and we have been able to measure the effectiveness of some of the dollars being spent in some of these past traditional areas, we will be in a position to move into a major campaign that will show results of a, I think, pretty compelling nature through the 1980s and it won't necessarily come from throwing more money at the problems. If more money is needed I will seek more money next year, but I have a responsibility to the Legislature and to the province to ensure this year that the money we've got is being effectively spent and that's the job we're embarked on at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUKE: Mr. Chairperson, we've just heard the Minister trot out the old argument that you can't solve these problems with money and there's an element of truth to that. I think he has to understand, however, that this program is undergoing a de facto cutback if you look at inflation. There's a 5.5 percent increase in funding and we've got an inflation rate of 10 percent so we've got a cutback taking place. Secondly, I can't understand why the Minister would then not turn around to the federal government and say we don't need this type of money. We are getting more money from the federal government; we are getting 250,000 more and beyond that. The Minister is now trying to tell us that maybe the printed estimate of Recoveries from Canada might be too high, it might be 1,214,000, that may be the more operable figure. Well that's not true. If he's saying that we had an increase from 1,090,000 last year, surely what we're going to get this year is higher. He's not been able to deal effectively with the whole criticism of a number of people that this government has in fact been getting a lot more money from Health, getting up publicly stating the argument, well, you can't solve these problems with just more money. But they've never said to the federal government, no, we don't need more of your money for health care funding; they've been getting health care funding money and they have not been matching it with contributions on their own side. And you know we have the Minister now saying, after three years in office, that, well, you know, we're going to reconsider the Main Street Project. I don't know if the Minister has gone and looked at the Main Street Project at 1 in the morning, or 1 in the morning; I wonder if he has determined what other alternatives you want; whether in fact he is promoting a bowery type of mentality and approach for that area; whether in fact it's best to give people little pieces of cardboard and have them sleep on the sidewalk or sleep in the doorways; and whether in fact that constitutes a type of improvement; whether indeed he is advocating that we just leave people alone because that is a very dangerous, a lot of argument to take, on the part of the Minister, especially a Minister of Health. On the river banks, let us look at the river banks too. We do have a severe climate. Those cases of alcoholism that Main Street Project street workers

pick up are desperate cases; they are frustrating for the workers. The workers are incredibly dedicated in my estimation; that is not an easy job. The facility of the Main Street Project is not a hotel-like facility; I don't know if he's ever seen it. There are garbage cans lined with garbage bags, and the smell in that place from people vomiting is horrible and it's no hotel-like atmosphere. I'd prefer having that than having them do that on the streets and I'd prefer them living through a 30 below night than dying on a 30 below night. I think the Minister, before he throws out those generalizations about something like the Main Street Project should sit down and spend some time with John Rodgers, the incredibly dedicated director of that program who I think has had a lot of street experience, has I think the respect of the people on there, and we're dealing with a critically problem. And it's not a matter of turning one's back and becoming a Spartan on this. The best way to deal with it, of course, might be to take people and take them out on the prairie, the way they did it in Sparta, but we have come some way, we think, in civilization since that period of time.

And I object to the Minister's attitude on this. I don't know, I think he's not getting good advice on this matter and I think he's charting a very very dangerous course. I think the people of Manitoba, frankly, would prefer a humane approach and if they're going to err, let us err on the side of generosity as opposed to erring on the other side because the consequences, in terms of people being left overnight, in terms of people coming down to the river bank and dying there are just too severe. And I think the Minister is taking far too blas an approach to this matter and I think at the same time that he's completely ducked the whole issue of drugs. I know that the Act was changed so that the AFM deals with assisting individuals with problems involving the abuse or misuse of alcohol and other drugs and substances; and I think we have a tremendous increase in problems with drugs; I think we have a tremendous increase in problems with alcohol, especially on the Main Street strip. The Portage Avenue strip is becoming a bit similar and the Minister is not acknowledging the extent to which we do have this problem, and I think is trying to trot out the old Conservative arguments, well, you can't just pour good money after bad, what you need is to have a whole set of studies. After two and three-quarter years surely it's the time for action. And if the Minister is going to tell us that the problem hasn't gotten worse over the last two and a half years he's dead wrong and I think his arguments just won't wash.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. ROBERT G. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, I picked up the paper on Saturday and I read a particular article which prompted me to leave the Consumers estimates and come in here and offer what I feel are my suggestions and observations for the record inasmuch as this problem is one that I have had a lot of personal experience with, with a great number of friends who have tragically come down with this disease — and I do call it a disease.

I've had occasion to tour all of Oregon and Washington and all the island, the Ladysmith and down in Seattle and my observation is that I think we have come on a long journey and I welcome the Minister's comments that we hope to show results. But I can't help but feel, are we getting the right type of results from the present narrow-minded possibly ill-informed, or possibly there's some secret reason why we don't seem to want to tackle this problem? We spend millions of dollars in different research; we have huge projects going up for hospitals in the core area, Seven Oaks and in the suburbs. I think we're getting poor advice. I don't see any effort on behalf of our government, on behalf of the breweries, on behalf of the federal government especially, to build the type of institute — I think there's one just south of here called Hazeldale or some name similar to that — in which for about 750 the more affluent people and the more elitest people of our society can go down there and get cured, and this cure is so simple. It's based on vegetables and it's based on companionship and its encouragement and it's based on vitamins. Failing that they're sent out on an Antabuse Program, which if they touch a drink of alcohol, become violently ill.

It seems to me that there's a lot of our types of people, middle class people I call them and maybe below that, who might, with the help of relatives and family, be able to also afford to go to Minnesota. But I would like to see our government deal with this Canadian problem, this Manitoba problem, this Winnipeg problem, right here in our own province. And while I was shocked at the comments about the Main Street Project, I probably felt a lot of the things bordered on partial evaluations that may have been correct. I would like to see possibly the Main Street Project, if it continues, maybe stop this patrol system and concentrate on the cure system during the summer months, from September to April. But if anybody has any value for human life at, unless they're willing to find some civil servants who are willing to go out and prevent these people from freezing to death, then I think we have to fund that project unless we can come up with another one.

I think we have to also look at the absolute, it's there every day of the week to see. I go for a Sunday cruise, I can seem them right near the ski club by the hundreds — maybe that's an exaggeration — maybe 15 or 20. They have their hobo village there on the riverbank. They have to keep the rain out; they have blankets spread over trees; and in there you'll find every sort of mixture you can think of. But then, 200 or 300 yards from my own home at the Cornish Library, Mrs. Matheson filled up two garbage bags full of lysol tins, where they go to Gibson's grocery and buy skim milk or something and away they go. They haul all this debris that they pick up in the lanes, the mattresses and that, to build their temporary two or three-day shelter and there they are at the Cornish Library with their lysol, right in Wolseley constituency, and we alert the people and there has been some indication —(Interjection)— the city in their wisdom has moved the entire City Welfare Department so now it's becoming more obvious to us; they've moved it to 705 Broadway and now we see these poor unfortunate individuals walking in a stupour any time after 12:00 noon,

sometimes early in the morning, down to the Welfare Department to get their money.

I think that there should be workers from our government there to say to these people, no welfare today, you're coming with us, we want to get your history, we want to find out why you're self-destructing and why you're involved in this disease. That's what I would like to see. But getting back to my suggestions as an alternate to the Main Street projects which I, at this particular point in history, have to support because those making the Needs Study have not come up with a suggestion, have not come up with the brave individuals, the dedicated individuals, willing to go down in this particular areas that so far have been hidden to the taxpayers of Manitoba because it is on Main Street, because it is in the back lanes, because it is down there. But I'm telling you right now, it's moving in on us and you can see it. I'm telling you, we're going to see it more and more because the City Welfare Department is only one of them and they're located on Broadway. We have clinics which serve some of these unfortunate people and we have the type of rooming houses in this particular vicinity in the core area which are the only type of facilities these people can afford.

I remember before the Great West Life tore down all these homes I used to visit all these poor souls, and we used to have a program on Thursday afternoon funded partially by the government and funded by Clinic, where we took 15 or 20 of these attempting-to-reform-alcoholics and fed them once a week on a Thursday afternoon and showed them a movie, and so on and so forth, right at Broadway Optimist Community Club. And I was surprised when I did a study of these poor individuals and their black and white T.V.s that didn't work, all alone in these rooms; they were not from the area where they were working and attempting in a society to get from the low income to the middle income. These were people that had been at the top that were on their way down.

It reminds me of Ecclesiastes in the Bible which says, a man walks through life alone and if he falls down, nobody will pick him up; but if a man walks through life and he's got a friend, that friend will pick him up. It reminds me that the government has to be that friend to so many of these individuals. The Main Street project is a friend to those people that are referred to in that particular story. And I would like to see, unless the government can come up with something else, and our government has to look at the dollars spent because these people who are now getting 4.5 million a year, where has their request to the federal government been to take one of these buildings they're tearing down and turn it into the type of Hazeldale and the type Ladysmith, or whatever type of other hospitals — I forget the name of the one in Seattle that I spent two days at — and the people sit around there and they share each other's problems. Not too many people want to get involved. There's quite a few because they become desperate.

But think of how many of us in this particular Chamber want to stand up in a front of a meeting, in front of everybody, in front of our peers and everybody and say I am an alcoholic, there are other people out there who, even though they recognize

they have a disease, would want to cure that disease in a more dignified, in a less public way. There are large corporations, investment places and large oil companies and that, that send their people to the Hazeldales — and if I've got the name wrong I apologize — but those type of institutions. Why should only employees of large corporations be entitled to take that treatment? And that's the thing that bothers me.

I would like to see a greater share of our revenue on alcohol go towards funding this institution right here in Winnipeg, or let's have it out in the country so it doesn't become a flophouse. Let's have it somewhere out there where there's a nice surrounding . . . I'll tell you what; we've got an industrial park up in Gimli. Maybe one of those barracks up there or some of those huge government federal buildings up there could be put to use. We're always having trouble foreclosing on those things at Gimli. Let's put it out at Gimli, that's a good area for it. —(Interjection)— Well, I'm not saying it has to be Gimli. All right, if the people in the area won't accept it, I'm willing to accept it. If they want to put it in Wolseley, we have an apartment block we're going to tear down on the corner of Lenore and Wolseley. If you want to renovate it and put them right in there, I'll welcome them, because I know this is the answer. The answer isn't throwing money at archaic programs that have proved that they won't work and they just are a band-aid approach to some of these things. And I can see the day when this facility will be available, and I know from personal experience — I won't name them - but I know many a good person in this community that has had to go down to Minnesota. Why shouldn't they be able to take that treatment in Manitoba?

I babysat a fellow for a week, when I sat around here last April and everyone was talking about the floods and the only thing that was in the paper was the floods, I bought myself an airline ticket and went to Ladysmith and babysat a friend of mine for five days so that he could turn around and overcome the problem. And that's the type of thing that I'm talking about. There has to be a friend and the friend can be government, the friend can be a civil servant, but if it has to be Mr. Rogers and there's nobody else wants the job, put him on staff or something and give him the job of going out in the winter months to rescue these fellows, because our climate calls for this type of situation. And there again we have two different departments.

I know my Minister is dedicated to showing results, but on one hand you've got the liquor commission, you've got the Main Street hotels and everybody pumping that stuff out. The people can't even hardly walk and the only thing that keeps them upright is a 12 in each hand. That's the balancing act that they're faced with down in the Leland Hotel and some of these other hotels and it's very convenient. Winnipeg's finest very seldom ever patrol in any of these hotels between the hours of 11:30 and 1:30 in the morning. It's a convenience because they say it's not part of the job to put my head on the chopping block. And I say to them, they'd better get down there. We don't have the probation officers and the alcoholic workers and the staff on our Health Department. I think there's a law somewhere that

says, a person that is intoxicated on a public street that can't walk and the only thing that's keeping him up is two 12-packs, then there's got to be somewhere that we can deal with that individual.

Okay, if certain individuals want to put this into a particular categorization where we have this particular facility here; where we have to recognize the biases and maybe the bigotry of certain people. If you want to have two types of facilities, both offering the same service in different parts of town, maybe we can have one out in Gimli and maybe we can have one down on Ellen Street or down on Main Street or in Wolseley, that will deal with the less fortunate people. But it is something that I feel should be paid for by the government and I apologize if I've covered area that has been covered before, but I had to respond to the article because I tell you, this Antabuse Program works if a person really wants to get off it, and he has some kind of a reasonable intelligence, then he becomes violently ill if he drinks with that type of a drug program. The others do not get involved in that because they claim you go from being hooked on alcohol to being hooked on that.

So what they're suggesting is that at Hazeldale or these types of institutions, the people sit around and they have those meetings where people stand up and tell you the stories of how they came from the top to the bottom, or how they became violently sick. But, Mr. Chairman, they also have the quiet rooms, the dietitian's advice, the vegetables, the fresh fruit and vegetables, the sunshine and the rest that's required, and believe you me a person has to be given a chance to put his life back together. What we do, if we don't recognize and spend this 750, we then get a wife and children who leave the husband, who have no job training, who go on welfare and then they become wards of the state anyway and figure out the cost over a year to the state of that particular cost to that woman and her three and four children who has to leave this — in many cases they call them animals — because the person has a disease and he's out of his mind and he can't recognize that he has an illness. He lives for that drink in the morning or whenever. I say that the cost to curing this disease is one of the best bargains that we in government have, because the costs of health care in the hospitals at 100 to 150 a day for that bed, the costs in welfare to the man's family, the cost of the fact that maybe these kids get pulled out of school and they could have graduated as an engineer or an architect, and they could have contributed large amounts of taxes in the future. They then become stifled; they aren't allowed an education because they are pulled out of the mainstream because the person in their family got sick with alcohol. So, remembering that story about Ecclesiasticus and if you have a friend you will always survive, and if these poor alcoholics don't have a friend and they don't have a Main Street Project, and they only have people with special need studies who aren't down in the trenches, then government has to be that friend.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, in listening to the debate on this resolution dealing with the

Alcoholism Foundation, I listened to the Minister very carefully and intently last Friday and today. He did speak of the need to reshape and recast the Alcoholism Foundation and he also stated, in the same breath, that the solution to the problem is not necessarily found in throwing more money at the problem.

But I think it should be noted, Mr. Chairman, that there is one point that the Minister did not mention and it was dealt with in a book by Marian Sandmaier, who is the chairperson of the National Womens Health Networks Alcoholism Committee entitled, *The Invisible Alcoholics*. The most recent issue of the January-February issue of *Social Policy* publishes a brief summary of her book and the article is titled *Alcoholics Invisible, the Ordeal of the Female Alcoholic*. I think that by and large, Mr. Chairman, and this is common not only of our province but I think of the world at large, that there's a tendency to think of the male when one thinks of the alcoholic and ignoring the female. That's number one.

Number two, proceeding on the assumption that the identical type of program is suitable for both, the female and the male. In fact Marian Sandmaier says that a study that her organization did discovered what most alcoholic women who seek help are forced to recognize, and that is that contemptuous attitudes and sheer ignorance about women with alcohol problems pervade the health system as thoroughly and destructively as any other segment of society. There, as anywhere, the real needs and the very humanity of alcoholic women remain invisible.

She goes on to say, Mr. Chairman, that this isn't only typical of the attitude of the man on the street but this, in fact, is typical of the professional, of the doctor, and perhaps is also typical of the politician, as the Honourable Minister is attempting to help me, and he is probably right. Ms Sandmaier makes mention of a 54-year-old woman who recalled that, in all of the times I landed in the hospital during my drinking years, no doctor ever said anything to me about alcoholism. I always either had colitis or a kidney problem or pneumonia and when they couldn't think of anything else I would have 'nerves'. Twice I attempted suicide and once wound up at a hospital afterward for three months and, in those three months, I saw a psychiatrist everyday and not once did he say a word to me about being alcoholic. And at that point, I had been drinking almost round the clock.

Mr. Chairman, when they say that, well, this is not a problem in Canada, this is a problem in the United States, but I will suggest to you that this is just as much a problem in our country, in our province, as it is elsewhere. My daughter, who is a nurse, has been working in the medical ward of the Misericordia Hospital for the past year and from time to time she comes home and tells us about cases of this very kind, cases who end up in the hospital being treated for various symptoms of alcoholism but not being treated for alcoholism, in itself, which is the root of the problem.

Ms Sandmaier goes on to say that the primary reason for many doctors' failure to confront alcohol problems in their patients is, perhaps surprisingly, sheer ignorance of alcoholism itself. And because of that, Mr. Chairman, what frequently happens is

this: That if a doctor is unable or unwilling to diagnose a woman as alcoholic, he may give her condition another label instead. All too often, a physician notes the distraught state of his alcoholic female patient, makes a primary diagnosis of depression or anxiety, and proceeds to prescribe a pill to alter her mood, most commonly a tranquillizer, a sedative or anti-depressant. Consequently, many alcoholic women walk out of their doctors' offices not only with their alcoholism undiagnosed but a second powerful potentially addictive psycho-active drug in hand.

This in turn, Mr. Chairman, leads to a further problem because the most obvious danger is that of mixing a mood-altering drug with alcohol. The combination of alcohol and certain psycho-active drugs produces a super addictive effect, substantially more powerful than the effects of any of the drugs taken alone. The other major danger of prescribing mood-altering drugs to an alcoholic is the possibility of cross-addiction; that is, dependence on both alcohol and one or more drugs. Anyone who habitually uses psycho-active drugs may become addicted to them but the alcoholic is particularly a high risk as she has already established an addictive drug-use pattern with alcohol. And yet, despite these multiple dangers, many physicians distribute these drugs to alcoholic women with an alarmingly free hand. It's so easy for alcoholic women to get prescriptions for these drugs, that once addicted, many obtain their maintenance supply from several positions simultaneously.

As Ms Sandmaier says, if a doctor is giving an alcoholic woman pills, don't imagine he is her only source. He is probably part of a long succession of people who are prescribing for her. For instance, the gynecologist is frequently capable of writing prescriptions for librium and valium. A general practitioner, if there is one, will hear some of her problems and prescribe pills, too. If there's been an emergency room afterward, that may result in yet another prescription for tranquilizers. And even the ophthalmologist taking care of the glasses, can prescribe drugs. The possibilities are endless.

And given this state of affairs, Mr. Chairman, the sad fact of the matter is that at the moment there is a scarcity of space or the proper treatment to which an alcoholic female could turn; that is the major problem facing the female alcoholic, finding a place that has a room for her. The scarcity of treatment space for women stems largely from the longstanding assumption by the health system that alcoholism is essentially a male illness. In the United States, where in 1970, Congress passed legislation requiring alcoholism programs to offer services to women as a criterion for receiving federal funding, even given that legislation, many programs added only a few token beds for women, rather than providing space on a par with the actual numbers of alcoholic women in the population. As the author says, it is not uncommon even today for a 30-bed treatment centre to reserve only four or five beds for women clients. Consequently, some women seeking help for alcoholism become names on waiting lists or are forced to travel far out of their communities to find programs with room for them and needless to say, Mr. Chairman, at tremendous cost. Others, like the many women in our society, who are considered

troublesome and who lack other options end up in mental institutions. Although they are resorted to less often now than in the past, psychiatric hospital are still used as dumping grounds for some women with drinking problems.

Ms Sandmaier quotes a person whom she had interviewed who describes this very type of experience that she had. This was a businesswoman from Washington, D.C., and she said the following, My husband told me he was taking me to a hospital and I went willingly, no questions asked. I was diagnosed as alcoholic; my husband left and I was told to follow the man who was carrying my bags. As we walked along, I noticed that he was locking doors behind him and I said, what are you doing that for? He said, don't you know where you are, and I said, no. He said, you're at a federal facility for the insane. It turned out that the hospital had an alcoholism program for men but none for women. So if you were unfortunate enough to be taken there as an alcoholic woman, you got thrown in with the violently insane. I will never forget it; I was put in a ward where people were defecating in the corner and ladies were walking around nude, and the people working there were just brutal, really brutal, full of contempt. I was treated like an animal, just everyone else there. There were no doors on the 'johns'; you had to take a shower with somebody watching you. The blanket on my bed smelled like urine. For the first three days I just shook, I was having junior grade delirium tremens. I was withdrawing from alcohol for the first time in my life and they didn't give me any drugs or any other kind of help. I just lay on my cot and shook.

And even if a woman is able to avoid the root of the psychiatric ward, Mr. Chairman, and finds an alcoholism program that has room for her, adequate treatment is by no means guaranteed because for, by and large, the alcoholism treatment system is still very much a man's world with most recovery programs primarily used, staffed and directed by men and designed to meet male needs.

One of the suggestions that the author makes, is perhaps more than anything else, a woman beginning treatment for alcoholism needs to feel cared about and believed in. In most cases she has weathered years, sometimes decades of a brutalizing addiction that has left her overwhelmed with feelings of failure and hopelessness about the possibility of acceptance by others. Because of this, Mr. Chairman, because of the attitude toward female alcoholics, she said that it is possible that on the average an alcoholic woman may actually enter rehabilitation more emotionally impaired than an alcoholic man, due to the physic strain of the particular harsh stigma attached to female alcoholism. But it is also likely that the sicker label springs from deeply sexist notion about the psychology of women held by mental health professions.

It's interesting that in 1970 a couple of doctors asked a group of psychotherapists to define respectively a mature healthy man, a mature healthy woman and a mature healthy adult. This is the way they were defined, Mr. Chairman. The clinicians, who displayed a high level of consensus in their conclusions, described a healthy male and a healthy female in very different terms. Specifically, they

characterized a healthy mature woman as more submissive, less independent, less adventurous, less competitive, more excitable in minor crises, more easily hurt and more emotional than a mature healthy man. Equally significant, their description of an healthy adult closely paralleled their characterization of an healthy man and thereby differed radically from their assessment of a healthy woman.

Stereotypical views of woman among alcoholism professionals not only earn many women the damaging labels of sick and hard to treat but almost inevitably shape the criteria used for women's recovery. If a healthy woman is considered relatively submissive, dependent and non-competitive, such behaviours are likely to be urged on alcoholic women as evidence of emotional maturity.

One doctor employed on staff of a drug-alcohol program near Philadelphia, staff practically entirely male, says that this hospital within which he worked in a drug rehabilitation program had the following re-education program for women clients: Women were being taught a new set of behaviours to please males. They were told to give up their sleazy bitch ways. If a women happened to be naturally sexy and sensuous, she was accused of seducing the men and chastized. If she was unfemininely aggressive and angry, she was told she was treacherous and that she was losing her sensitivity and humanity. If she was lesbian, she was accused of being a man-hater and sick. In other words, she was learning again to repress a part of herself that belonged to her and to become an honest paper doll cut out in man's image. So pressure to conform to such narrowly sexist standards of behaviour is seriously damaging any woman but it is apt to be particularly destructive to a woman who is alcoholic. So indeed, Mr. Chairman, therapy that imposes a stereotype vision of femininity on recovering women may also intensify the very types of conflicts that triggered their abusive drinking in the first place.

Then the author concludes with some recommendations. One recommendation that she makes is job training. She says that the typical woman entering an alcoholism treatment program is in serious financial difficulty and badly needs job training. More often than not she is divorced, has custody of her children and is receiving little or no support money from her ex-husband. Her job skills are likely to be minimal and she probably has been unable to work steadily for some time and yet the sad fact is, Mr. Chairman, regardless of these stark, financial realities, few alcoholism programs offer serious job training to recovering alcoholic women, either within the facilities themselves or through arrangements with outside agencies. And even where job training is offered to women at all, it's usually for low-paying women's work such as typing and other clerical functions, while men in the same program are often trained for more lucrative, highly-skilled occupations.

Another feature which is lacking in our alcoholism program, and this affects women primarily, is the lack of child-care facilities. Child care is another service crucially needed for recovering women and almost never provided by alcoholism programs. Again, if one asks himself why; well, as most recovery facilities are designed for and by men, this

gap is not altogether surprising since men who enter rehabilitation programs ordinarily leave their children in the care of their wives, but women who begin alcoholism treatment have no such convenient caretakers. Even if a woman's husband is still living with her, which is unlikely, he is rarely able or willing to undertake primary care of the children while she gets help for alcoholism. Foster care is generally a risky choice since poor women, in particular, may be declared unfit mothers on the basis of their alcoholism and lose custody of their children, sometimes permanently. Day care centres, there again the services of our day care centres might not be adequate to meet the needs of all. So, as the author says, if you have a lady in need of immediate detoxification and other treatment and she happens to have children, you're really in trouble.

So what the author suggests is providing facilities where the patient, the female patient, could take her children with her and, Mr. Chairman, I will suggest to you that granted, it would be additional cost in terms of providing the physical facilities for the children, but by having the children there with the mother, the long-range benefits would by far offset the additional costs that may be involved. The chances of rehabilitating that type of women with her family with her may be far greater than by placing her in a rehabilitation institution, away from her children and, while the professional staff is attempting to rehabilitate her, here from day to day, hour to hour she is living with guilt feelings wondering about the welfare of her children.

Then she goes on to say, after the completion of the rehabilitation program, when you reach the point when you feel the woman could be allowed to return home, she says the realities of women's lives are such that they may also may need more intensive follow-up than men after completing a formal program of treatment. In general, women are likely to both face greater pressures than men and receive less support from others once they return from a rehabilitation program to the real world, because the sad facts are that there is much less support from the family of the alcoholic woman than the man. The acute stress and isolation faced by many women following treatment can seriously threaten their sobriety once again and, as she says, you can't just treat a woman, show her how to stop drinking and then tell her to go out and do her own thing. You have to go step by step, follow through and keep in touch with her so she knows she has a home where she can get support at all times.

Then she concludes by saying that since alcoholism programs sensitive to women's concerns still comprise only a tiny percentage of existing programs, the vast majority of women continue to be treated in facilities that fail to meet many of their most pressing needs. Many women drop out of these programs before completing treatment. The reasons they cite are varied: lack of emotional support from staff; an inability to make suitable child care arrangements; diffused feelings of alienation and isolation; sometimes simply an overwhelming sense that it's not helping. Occasionally women leave because of sexual harassment or abuse from male staff or residents.

So there you are, Mr. Chairman, wouldn't it make more sense to provide a more adequate program

and hence have a program that may be more successful in the long run, rather than a half-baked program and spend funds . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member has five minutes.

MR. HANASCHUK: Thank you. And spend funds only to end up with results such as I've mentioned. So you've really accomplished nothing. If the woman has only been there for a portion of the rehabilitative term and has not completed it, you really have accomplished nothing.

So then what happens, as the author says, is a revolving door syndrome. A good number of women who resume abusive drinking after leaving treatment become part of the revolving door syndrome, making their way in and out of treatment programs, over and over again for years, endlessly searching for a way of their addiction and endlessly failing to find it.

So I would suggest to the Minister that if he is at all serious about reshaping and recasting the Alcoholism Foundation program, that he do address himself to this problem and do recognize the fact that all alcoholics are not male, that many are female, and that the female alcoholics need and deserve a program designed for them and the Minister ought to recognize that the program that is designed to treat, the minimal program I would say that is designed to treat the alcoholic male, is ineffective for the alcoholic woman. I would like to hear the Minister's response to this and I think the Minister ought to indicate to the people of Manitoba whether he is concerned about the female alcoholism problem and also indicate what plans he has to cope with that problem and assist those poor unfortunates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. A. R. (Pete) ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, looking at this item, I notice that actually there is a cutback when you take into consideration the escalation of costs over the years and I'm particularly concerned with . . . We have a facility in our constituency in the village of Ste. Rose and I would like to ask the Minister, in view of these cutbacks of funding, I would like to ask the Minister if he is satisfied that the Alcare Rehabilitation Centre in Ste. Rose is providing a good adequate service; if he could give us an overview of what's happening there and perhaps indicate if there has been any evaluation of this facility. I would ask the Minister what the success rate is; what is the percentage of success of the patients going through this facility. Perhaps he could give us some statistics of how many repeats. My colleague referred to the revolving door syndrome; perhaps he could tell us what the situation insofar as people having to come back. Perhaps the Minister could tell us how does this facility compare with others in the province. Perhaps the Minister could tell us also what is the per diem cost of the patients going into that facility and how the Minister's allocation of funds to the facility has provided this very essential service to the parkland region, how increasing costs have affected this institution and whether the Minister is providing extra financing in order that this facility be maintained.

I would perhaps sit down at this time and allow the Minister to respond to some of the comments I made and some of the comments the other members have made. I have a few more questions to follow up after I've heard the comments of the Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I appreciated the comments of the Honourable Member for Burrows. I just want to assure him that I am aware and we are aware that there are different categories of alcoholics just as there are different categories of citizens, and the approach and application of treatment is not discriminatory. I believe that productive and positive efforts are made to address the problems as they can be differentiated between male alcoholics and female alcoholics, and certainly there is no experience in my knowledge in this province that would be comparable to any of those that were contained in some of the horror stories that he described in his report on this subject that I assume was based largely on some situations in some other jurisdictions.

We address the problem of the female alcoholic from the perspective of the context of her life in the same way as we address the problems of the male alcoholic from the context of his life. And we recognize that there are many people who are so-called white-collar alcoholics as there are many blue-collar alcoholics, and there are many businessmen and professionals who are alcoholics. There are many women and many housewives and many women from relatively affluent strait of society who suffer from the disease, who suffer from the problem, as there are youngsters, children, and each must be addressed with a particular sensitivity that is shaped according to that person's age, sex, and socioeconomic position. So I think I can assure him that the kinds of circumstances and the kinds of conditions that no doubt have existed in a great many jurisdictions in the past and that obviously from the material that he read to us still exist in some jurisdictions, but those conditions and circumstances do not exist in Manitoba.

Now certainly there are unpleasant environments that are almost unavoidable in the cases of acute alcoholism. There is the traditional drunk-tank that still exists. There are detox and dry-out centres that require some rigours and some agonies on the part of those persons, male or female, who are in them, referred to them, and who are housed in them to address their problems, but I think I can assure him that on balance the approach and the treatment is compassionate and fair and is enlightened insofar as our alcohol treatment facility spectrum in Manitoba is concerned.

One major initiative, and I referred to it in my opening remarks on this appropriation last week, in the field of women alcoholics, is the conversion of our facility at River House into the River House Women's Centre. We have redeployed staff and monies and treatment capabilities to develop the River House facility as a River House Women's Centre for non-resident treatment programs, evening programs, and day programs, for females, including day care facilities for their children. These new initiatives at River House, I think, are going to produce benefits that will be visible to all and that we can all be proud of as representative of a major

step forward on that problem of the female drinker, who, I think, probably has for a variety of reasons received less attention, less focus of effort in the past than she deserves. There has been a tendency for the female drinker, particularly if she is a housewife, to be what is known as a so-called secret drinker, and there has been a social attitude which is militated against her seeking help, against her identifying herself and her problem, and we are trying to break down those archaic attitudinal barriers. We are trying to say to women as to men, if you've got a problem, identify it, face it, come and seek help for it, come and avail yourself of the facilities that are here and let's try to conquer it. And we're making headway with the so-called secret drinker, the female drinker, the housewife, who has been reluctant in the past, because of the stigma, and as I say, because of social attitudes and because of the fact that most of the attention has been focussed on treatment for males, unfairly.

At River House, I might just say, for the reassurance of the Honourable Member for Burrows, that all our counsellors there, our entire counselling staff is female, so they are not exposed to the possible harrassment and the possible difficulties that he suggests have been in evidence in some treatment centres and some other health institutions in some other jurisdictions in the past.

With respect to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, the budget for the Alcare Resort Centre in Ste. Rose is reduced this year from 192.7 thousand to 176.7 thousand. The number of beds that the AFM has committed to funding has been reduced from 25 to 22. The per diem paid by the AFM for those beds at Alcare is 22.00. Now, let me say that the reason for that reduction on that side of the spectrum is because of improvements and initiatives and expansions on another side of the spectrum.

We have put in place what has proven to be a very highly effective treatment program at Headingley Jail. It used to be that inmates suffering from alcoholism at Headingley were referred to Alcare, which was one of the factors, of course, undeniably, in keeping the Alcare patient volume at a certain level. But we have developed through the AFM and the expertise that it's been able to call upon, a special treatment program that is conducted within Headingley Jail. It's a 21-day treatment program which handles approximately 15 inmates at a time. Thirty inmates have completed the program as of December, 1979, and the response from the inmates themselves and from officials of Headingley Jail and from the system, the police and law enforcement system, has been very gratifying, Mr. Chairman. It is a program initiative that has already demonstrated its value and its effectiveness. So with that redeployment of staff and capacity and capability to handle the new Headingley Jail treatment program, there has been at the other end of the equation, a reduction in the number of beds being funded at Alcare.

On the questions that the honourable member raises with respect to my attitudes and our attitudes towards Alcare, let me say that the subject of Alcare's operation in its present form is a subject of debate in the Department of Health and in the Alcoholism Foundation. I respect, and have no hesitation in saying so for the record, the effort that the operator of the Alcare Resort Centre has put into

the field of service in alcoholism and into treatment of alcoholics who are referred to Alcare and need an intensive 28-day treatment program and need the kind of commitment and the kind of intensity of treatment that can only be provided in a residential setting, that can't be provided as successfully on a day-patient or out-patient basis.

I also think that the plant, the Alcare Resort Centre facility, is an extremely valuable one and a well ordered one, and I am grateful to the Community of Ste. Rose for the support that it has always given that enterprise. But the actual form of operation at Alcare is a subject of debate in my office and at the AFM, and the operator knows that, and we have for some time, in fact, I would say virtually from the day that I became Minister of this department, have been in consultation, not only with the operator of Alcare but with successive executive directors and chairmen of the AFM and others in the alcoholic field, including a number of citizens who are members of Alcoholics Anonymous, on whose counsel in alcoholism we rely to some extent, on the role of Alcare, under its present operator in the existing alcohol treatment facility spectrum in the province.

That question will be resolved this year. We need a residential treatment centre where referrals can go, male and female, in their own quarters, in their own sections, of the facility, and undergo an intensive 28-day treatment program. The Honourable Member for Wolseley was speaking a few moments ago about Hazelton in the United States, about the necessity for that kind of a centre. We recognize that. We don't think the whole spectrum should consist of that kind of facility. We think the kinds of facilities that we have in place, including 4 in Winnipeg, 2 in Westman, 2 in Norman, 1 in Parklands, and 1 in Interlake, and now additional service coming in Rosssburn, provide the fundamental kind of service, counselling and treatment service that is necessary for a successful anti-alcoholism program. But there has to be, certainly, somewhere, an intense treatment referral centre, and it may be that Alcare becomes that unit, that facility, in the provincial spectrum. It may be that it becomes that kind of unit under its present operator, under a different operator, or under the operation of AFM, and therefore the province of Manitoba. I can't answer the honourable member's question on that point yet, but I say to him that I am committed, I am determined — I didn't mean to say committed — I am determined that question be resolved this year. And I think I can say that the operator of Alcare is very concerned that it be resolved this year too, because I appreciate that he's operated under a question mark for some time.

But there has to be that kind of centre, whether it should be operated as a specific part of the provincial spectrum under the AFM or whether it should be operated independently, as it is in its present manner, is a question that has not been resolved up to this point in time but will be resolved this year.

I can't give him figures on throughput at Alcare. I can give him figures on throughput generally among external agency facilities in Manitoba across the board, but they're not broken down for individual agencies. I can tell him for example that in 1978-79 the total number of treatment services provided by external agency facilities in Manitoba in this field,

that includes detox, inpatient, outpatient and crisis intervention. The total number of those services was 11,378 in 1978-79 and in 1979-80 the comparable figure was 13,505 — that's services. My officials have just advised me they can give me the figure for 1979-80 for Alcare for services and the total number was 379. I can't identify individuals for the honourable member — 379 services for 1979-80 at Alcare.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. ADAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think the Minister is comparing the Alcare Centre to other services that are provided by other institutions. I understand the Alcare Centre is providing the kind of service the Minister was indicating should be available, the kind that would provide the maximum return on the dollar investment when he was referring to comments made by the Member for Transcona. The Alcare Centre in my understanding is a rehab centre. It has a program to try and reduce people from falling off and having to go back to these centres, whereas a detoxification centre is completely different. That's just a place where you get dried out and you're thrown out on the street and come back in again. I would think the Minister would want to, before he crosses the river, that he shouldn't burn the bridge before he gets across and I think this is what he is doing, because the Minister has had almost three years now.

And he indicated in his comments that as soon as he was elected he started looking at this and we are now three years later and the institution, I understand the facility is on the verge of closing up because of the fact they have been on the same per diem for quite some time, if not from the outset. There has been no increase regardless of the cost, all costs having increased in, no matter where you look at, costs have gone up for food for energy, for fuel, for heating, for taxes, for whatever you wish to look at, costs have gone up. And it seems to me that either the Minister is trying to either bleed the centre to death or starve it out of existence.

It seems to me that there is a contradiction in his comments when he indicates that he wants to get the most value out of the dollar spent, and to me the best return on your dollar spent would be those kinds of dollars that once you have put a patient through, that the percentage that have to come back is very very small; once you have got the cure, you have got these people through that they don't come back. I know there are going to be some that will come back, but it seems to me that the path that the Minister is following is not the right path. He could perhaps explain why the per diem, perhaps he could tell us how long the per diem has been at 22 per day so that we can know whether the cost of inflation over the years has not almost put this facility out of business, that they just can't continue under these circumstances and especially with these long delays. We are talking about three years of study to find out whether this is the kind of program that the Minister wants to proceed with. Surely the uncertainty for the village, for the community and for the owner of the facility should be respected, and the Minister and the government shouldn't be dragging their feet at least this long in coming to a decision on what they intent

to do, because I can assure him that the information that I have is that they just can't continue very very long under the present circumstances. Hopefully the Minister will address himself to this problem as soon as possible to see that this facility remains, because, like I say, the Minister is trying to burn out all his bridges before he gets across the river.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I just want to advise the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose that we don't fund the Alcare Resort Centre. We provide for that kind of funding through the Alcoholism Foundation and its board, and that is what it is for or that is in part what it is for. Those agencies are at arm's length from the government and a certain budget is struck for the Alcoholism Foundation, and they determine within that what they need for external programs, what they need for provincial treatment programs, what they need for administration, etc., and within that external program spectrum they fund various external agencies. Two AFM Boards and two AFM Executive-Directors have responded with something less than enthusiasm to the continuing plea from Alcare for increased and continued funding. All I can say to the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose is that it was not a decision by the Minister, naturally I act on advice, and the board that was in place when we came into office and the Executive-Director who was there then and the board and the Executive-Director who are in place now, who are new, who are replacements for those earlier personnel, are demonstrating that they are pretty much of one mind with respect to questions about Alcare. It has not been simply a decision on the part of the Minister. We will resolve it this year, however.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 4.—pass — the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (Bud) BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, there is only a minute left and I am certainly not going to miss an opportunity —(Interjection)— Twenty seconds. Maybe if I just stand here for twenty seconds that will spin out the clock. Can we call it 4:30, Mr. Chairman, for the few seconds that are . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30, I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' Hour. The Committee will resume at 8:00 p.m. this evening.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 4:30, we are now in Private Members' Hour. On Mondays the first order of business in Private Members' Hour is resolutions. The first resolution is Resolution No. 24.

RESOLUTION NO. 24 — DUAL LICENSING OF MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATORS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Transcona that:

WHEREAS many individuals in our province are required to operate motor vehicles during their working hours, and

WHEREAS some of those individuals have perfect on-the-job driving records over many years; and WHEREAS some of those same individuals appear to have difficulty with the rules set out in The Highway Traffic Act and the Criminal Code when they are pleasure driving, and

WHEREAS it is not in the public interest to cause individuals to lose their employment for misbehaviour which did not involve their employment in that alternate jobs are difficult to find and employers must frequently go to some trouble and expense to obtain suitable replacements; and

WHEREAS a great deal of time and money is spent by individuals and taxpayers in Manitoba in dealing with Licence Suspensions Appeal applications at the Licence Suspension Appeal Board and our Courts in order that individuals may be permitted to operate motor vehicles limited to their employment requirements; and

WHEREAS a dual licencing system would permit an individual to have a licence for the purpose of pleasure driving, and a further licence for the purpose of operation of motor vehicles during and in the course of employment or business, permitting action to be taken against the pleasure portion only of such a licence in the event that regulations are breached during pleasure driving; and

WHEREAS a dual licencing system would cause automatic removal of all licencing privileges of individuals convicted of breathalyzer, impaired driving offences or other serious offences in the course of their employment with right of appeal;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Highway Traffic Act be amended to allow for dual licencing of motor vehicle operators in the Province of Manitoba. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that upon a second liquor related conviction by any driver, no licence will ever be issued to such a driver until such time as the Registrar of Motor Vehicles is satisfied, based on medical evidence, that the individual is not suffering from an alcohol problem, or if the individual is suffering from an alcohol problem, that such a problem is under arrest.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of this resolution is to save working people in Manitoba money, effort and worry regarding licencing requirements. It is to ensure that people do not lose their employment unless their continued employment in their chosen field of occupation is demonstrated to constitute a threat to the public. It is to ensure that the state does not tamper with the right of a person to earn a living unless there is just cause.

I have been involved in dealing with drivers applying for Licence Suspension Appeal since I graduated from law school in 1973, first on the prosecution side

and since 1974 on the defence side. I have some experience with these matter. I would like to, first of all, discuss exactly what happens to an individual on conviction for an impaired driving or similar offence. To begin with there is a fine, assuming it is a first conviction, of approximately 350, although it can be as little as 50 or as much as 1,000, and there is a criminal record. We could compare that to other first offenders such as people convicted of possession of marijuana for the first time, or minor shoplifting for the first time. Those kind of offences ordinarily will attract, on a first offence, a discharge, i.e., no fine and no criminal record, and I do not say that there is any impropriety in the differences between the penalties on impaired driving as opposed to those other charges, because impaired driving is a serious offence.

The point is however, that there is a criminal sanction dealt with in our courts at the time of conviction. Beyond that criminal sanction, our Highway Traffic Act requires the judge on sentencing an individual for this type of an offence, to remove his driver's licence. There's no discretion. The licence must be removed. The judge does have a discretion to issue a 45-day permit to permit the accused to appeal to the Licence Suspension Appeal Board in order to obtain a licence to operate his vehicle in the course of his employment or to and from his place of employment. So during that 45 days the person can drive as though he has not been convicted and that 45 days will be tacked onto the end of his suspension. He applies to the Licence Suspension Appeal Board; he is told of the hearing date; he goes down there and explains his problem to a board consisting of between one and three people, and if he's lucky he gets his licence; if he's not he takes it the next step, and that is to the County Court.

He begins usually by getting a lawyer, because it's fairly complicated. You prepare a Notice of Motion and you file that in the County Court District in which you reside; that Notice of Motion is served on the Attorney-General's Department, on the Motor Vehicles Branch and on the License Suspension Appeal Board. You then obtain an appointment for trial from a County Court Judge, and that document is filed in the County Court and served on the same individuals, again, on the Attorney-General's Department, the Motor Vehicles Branch and License Suspension Appeal Board. Then you prepare an affidavit stating that you've done all these things, and you better have done them at least two weeks before the proposed trial date, because if you haven't, the recent amendments to The Highway Traffic Act will put you out of time and you're going to have to wait until the next time a judge comes to town. In our rural areas, judges come to town for County Court purposes once a month, and not in July and August; in the city of Winnipeg, these matters are heard once a week.

At the hearing itself, the Crown Attorney basically presents the accused's driving record, and the accused and his lawyer attempt to convince the judge, first of all, that it is not contrary to the public interest to issue a permit; and secondly, that it would create an exceptional hardship if such a permit is not granted. Assuming you are successful in obtaining a licence, you then get your lawyer to prepare a written order. That written order is forwarded to the

Attorney-General's Department for consent; the Attorney-General's Department forwards it back to your lawyer. Your lawyer then brings that order to the judge for signature, then he takes it over to the County Court for filing and he then provides the Motor Vehicles Branch with a copy of that order. At that point in time, the Motor Vehicles Branch will allow the individual to be tested, and assuming that the test is satisfactorily completed, he gets his driver's licence, for work purposes; I emphasize, it's not for pleasure purposes, it's purely for the purpose of operating motor vehicles in the course of your employment or to and from your place of employment.

If you change jobs during your suspension, then you have to go back to Square One, make a new application to County Court and have a new explanation to the judge as to why you want a change in the restrictions on your licence.

Meanwhile, especially in our country points, people are frequently without a licence for a period of a month and more while this is going on. That frequently means that they don't have a job. If they are truck drivers, they can't operate. If they have any kind of a job requiring a licence, they can't work. They are paying substantial legal costs, and their employers are inconvenienced.

I would also observe that very few people are ever turned down when they appeal to County Court. Just for instance, last Thursday, at the County Court of Beausejour, there were some six applications for licences to the County Court. All of these people had been turned down by the Licence Suspension Appeal Board; all were successful at the County Court level. All of them were successful, and I believe appropriately so. I believe that it's a fairly serious matter to take the right to earn a living away from an individual.

One other observation I would make with respect to the current process, is that it is more likely than not the small farmer, the minimum wage earner, or the low wage earner, who doesn't appeal a turndown from the Licence Suspension Appeal Board to the County Court. It is the middle-class and upper-class individuals who are entitled, because they have the funds, to go to this court to get that licence, and I see that as being somewhat unfair to those in worse circumstances.

I would also suggest that there are very few people at County Court appealing on the basis of having been convicted for impaired driving while on the job, and I suggest there is quite a difference between driving a truck or other machinery, impaired on the job, as opposed to having a social drink in the evening and driving a car while off the job.

I would also say that the ones who do drink while on the job are the ones who don't get a licence from either the Licence Suspension Appeal Board or the County Court. In almost all cases of that nature, it is clear that the public interest would not be served by allowing the individual to operate a motor vehicle unless he has demonstrated very clearly that he has changed his ways.

As a result of the amendment, if such an amendment were approved, if one were convicted of an offence while on the job, there would be no change from the current circumstance. If one wanted to obtain a licence, he would have to go to the Licence

Suspension Appeal Board and to the County Court, if necessary. There would be no change from the current circumstances in that case. The change would come in where, if an individual is convicted of this type of a serious offence while driving off the job, and this is by far the majority of the cases, there would, in that case, be an automatic loss of pleasure-driving privileges, as there is now, at the time of the court hearing. The difference would be that the individual would be entitled to continue in his employment as a trucker, or as a farmer, or as a contractor, or whatever, without any appeal. And that is the end result; that's what is happening now anyway for those who have good on-the-job records. The ones who don't get licences are the ones who have bad on-the-job records.

I would suggest that this would be a net saving of cost to the taxpayers in terms of time and effort spent by the Licence Suspension Appeal Board and the courts. It would certainly be a saving of costs to accused and to employers, and would put people in a position where they don't lose their employment even temporarily as a result of this kind of conviction; it would put truckers and cabbies and farmers on the same footing as legislators, dentists, lawyers, electricians, none of whom lose their jobs as a result of impaired driving convictions while off the job. There is no automatic assumption that somehow an individual who is a dentist, who gets caught for impaired driving off the job, would therefore be drinking on the job and therefore there is no removal of the dentist's right to earn his livelihood. If, on the other hand, a dentist or a lawyer or others drink on the job, that is certainly a different matter, just as it is a different matter for a truck driver to be drinking on the job, and a trucker who is careful on the job should be treated the same way as a dentist who is careful on the job. There should be no difference between the two of them.

I would suggest that there is no proven relationship between drinking off and on the job. There are thousands of people who drink off the job who do not necessarily drink on the job, and therefore there should be no need to take one's livelihood away as a result of a conviction for something that occurred while pleasure driving. In fact, I would suggest that there are some legislators who probably drink occasionally while they are off the job, and sometimes it may well be that the occasional one may have been over .08. I'm sure that would have happened a long time in the past, but I'm sure it has happened. We certainly wouldn't suggest that that means that they drink on the job; to the contrary, it doesn't mean that at all.

Again, this proposal would not disband the Licence Suspension Appeal Board, although it would drastically cut down its workload and it would drastically cut down those costs to the taxpayer. It would still, however, be needed for cases where people are convicted on the job, and it would also be needed where people required transportation to and from their place of employment. In Winnipeg, most people can obtain public transportation to and from their place of employment. Farmers and very many other self-employed people have their place of business right at home, so the problem doesn't come into existence now and wouldn't come into existence with this type of an amendment.

Under this proposal, as now, there would have to be medical certification, that in fact an individual was not suffering from alcoholism, after a second conviction for impaired driving, even in order to retain the licence to drive in the course of his employment, and that is for obvious reasons.

I recognize there are some administrative difficulties with this proposal. However, I suggest that it would be more appropriate to allow the Civil Service to worry about the difficulties as opposed to the many individuals and families and employers who are suffering as a result of the current legislation, and I would ask for your support. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are several aspects to this resolution that the Member for Rossmere has brought before the House for discussion. It's a very complex situation, and there are no easy solutions to the kind of problem that he has attempted to identify in presenting this resolution.

Dealing with some of the technical aspects of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Rossmere indicated that no one should have their driver's licence suspended, and hence run the risk of losing their employment without just cause. And one of the major areas that he has dealt with throughout the resolution has been compliance with the Criminal Code dealing with the breathalyzer and offences involving alcohol and the driving public.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit to you and to members in the House that the laws of the land which were developed around the breathalyzer in an attempt to curb the use of alcohol while operating a vehicle, or a vehicle, any vehicle on our highway system, our road system, was considered just cause some ten years ago, for suspension of a person's driving privileges. That just cause was determined by the parliament of Canada and by people of Canada. We have had it adequately demonstrated that that law, despite the unpopular nature of it for those who get caught and are subject to its penalties, is a very, very popular law, and quite often you will receive the criticism that, indeed, that law may not be adequately enough enforced at present, because we still have considerable number of drivers on the road who are under the influence of alcohol.

So Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the just cause that the Member for Rossmere presents in his resolution, I believe we have got just cause for removing a person's driving privileges when he violates the law that was established some years ago to deal with the blood-alcohol level whilst operating a vehicle.

The second aspect, Mr. Speaker, along the technical side of this resolution, is to whom this resolution should apply, this dual licensing procedure, and there's where you run into a very very difficult area which involves judgement — in whose judgement is it going to be? And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you're not going to relieve very much of the workload at some stage or some level of the Civil Service because someone is going to have to make a judgement as to whether a person's vehicle is necessary for his continued employment, and many many people, not only the truck drivers, the bus

drivers, the taxicab drivers, the delivery van operators, need their vehicle to retain their job. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that many classes of salesmen, indeed, as the Member for Rossmere has mentioned, politicians in this Chamber, need their driver's licence to effectively carry out the responsibilities of their job. So Mr. Speaker, we have a very simplistic solution of dual licensing, but it gets very, very complicated when we determine to whom it should apply.

The Member for Rossmere also mentioned that it should apply for a person who has come under the jurisdiction of the Criminal Code for drinking while driving, under the influence of alcohol. Well, if you introduce a dual licensing program as he suggests, you cannot tailor it specifically for Criminal Code offences involving the breathalyzer. You have to expand it into all suspensions, just as we have had to extend the appeal process to all suspensions of driving privileges, and that includes extending the dual licensing privilege to those people who have garnered up, through their personal driving career, considerable points, and a considerably bad driving record, speeding offences, accidents, etc., etc. Those are also offences which eventually will accumulate sufficient points to have that person's driving privileges suspended. The dual licensing system is also going to have to target them.

So what we are getting into, Mr. Speaker, is a larger and larger and larger group of people who are going to be subject to the dual licensing system that the Member for Rossmere has simplistically presented to us as a solution for preventing a person from losing his job because his driving privileges have been suspended. To get into some of the logistical arguments in the Member for Rossmere's resolution; for instance, he wants to assure that a person having a dual licence, in other words, one for his on-the-job performance and one for his personal or pleasure driving, he wants to assure that should a person in the course of operating his vehicle in that pleasure driving category, and being caught and convicted of the breathalyzer, or the Criminal Code, will only lose his license for pleasure driving and not his on-the-job licence. One of the major flaws in that argument is that in the event that that person, that truck driver, loses his license and he lives in the country and he has to commute to and from the city to work, and his personal driver's licence has been suspended, that he has no method of getting to and from work, because there is no public transportation system available to him. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, we're going to have to develop a third system in dual licensing in giving him the authority to drive to and from work. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit to the Member for Rossmere that that's exactly what we have in place today with our Licence Suspension Appeal Board, and the appeal one step further, to the County Court.

So the logics of his resolution just aren't there, Mr. Speaker, because most people are going to find public transportation either unavailable or very inconvenient to get to and from work. So despite the fact that a dual licence system will retain that person's on-the-job driving ability, but only remove his pleasure driving ability, the person without access to public transportation still will have no way to get to and from work.

Now, the other area that is extremely troublesome in the logicalness of this resolution is that should dual licensing be brought in, the sole purpose of it is that the driver will know that his driving licence, in other words, the licence that he requires for his job, will not be in jeopardy should he be convicted of either a breathalyzer offence or of a serious driving record. He will not lose his job licence, the dual part of the licence. The job licence will remain intact.

So that what we have here, Mr. Speaker, is a situation where a person driving on pleasure no longer has anything to lose in his driving habits, if his driving habits should err whilst he's pleasure driving. There is no threat to his employment opportunity or to his responsibility to the public while he is pleasure driving. And that's one of the major flaws in the Member for Rossmere's resolution here. And it has been proven, Mr. Speaker, through research, that it is not only the suspension that is affective. It has been proven, Mr. Speaker, that the effectiveness of the suspension system is that the threat of suspension is more effective than the suspension itself, and by the fact that the Member for Rossmere would like to delete that threat of suspension from the working licence will remove some of the onus and the responsibility on the individual to assure that at all times he drives in accordance with the laws of the land.

Mr. Speaker, he also mentions several financial implications, and I want to deal with a couple of those right now. He indicates that the people, under the present system, undergo considerable costs in retaining a lawyer to go from, if they should have to, the appeal board to the County Courts. Well, Mr. Speaker, in Clause 7 of the member's resolution, he has indicated that the person whose job driving licence is suspended because of the breathalyzer, that he shall have the right of appeal, and he indicates that that is a very limited number of cases.

Mr. Speaker, we're still going to have to maintain the operation of a licence suspension appeal board, albeit it will be a smaller one, but inherent in his resolution is the retention of that board. Also, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that because of the point I made earlier on, that the person who has retained his job driving licence will appeal to the Licence Suspension Appeal Board for the ability to drive to and from work on his pleasure licence. Those cases will all go before the Licence Suspension Appeal Board for hearing, and for reinstatement of limited pleasure driving privileges. So we will not reduce any costs, or very minimal costs, in the Licence Suspension Appeal Board.

One of the major costs, Mr. Speaker, in implementing this dual licensing system is in the computer mock-up to make that system available. The present system that we have cost the government, cost the taxpayers of Manitoba, approximately 1 million to institute. It is guesstimated that it will cost upwards of 2 million to replace that system with a dual licensing system in the province of Manitoba. That is a one time direct start-up cost of a dual licensing system. Now, after you have a dual licensing system, your yearly operating costs are increased considerably, because operating costs in the Motor Vehicle Branch drivers' licensing is an operation which functions on the number of licences issued. If you have a number of dual licences, you

will increase the amount of work the department has to do, and increase the costs to the taxpayers of Manitoba.

So Mr. Speaker, we are going to end up with a system that is indeed much more costly than the present system. It's going to be a system that is going to not eliminate any of the net costs of the Suspension Appeal Board, which I indicate in last year's fiscal statements, the gross expenditures of the Licence Suspension Appeal Board were some 150,000, with recoveries in the neighbourhood of 135,000, so the net cost to Manitobans was only 15,000.00. The Member for Rossmere is indicating, Mr. Speaker, that we should introduce a dual licencing system with a start-up cost of 2 million, and an annual operating cost above and beyond what our present licensing system costs to operate, for the saving of a portion of 15,000 net cost to the Licence Suspension Appeal Board. It doesn't make a great deal of sense, Mr. Speaker, and it doesn't make a great deal of sense, Mr. Speaker, because the dual licensing system will give us nothing that we don't presently have in the system of appeal to the License Suspension Appeal Board and to the County Courts that is present today, to deal with all suspensions for all causes in the province.

And Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that some people may lose their jobs because of driving privileges. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that removing the onus on the individual and removing the threat that he may lose his job may well cause some people to more blatantly flaunt the driving laws in the province of Manitoba. And who, Mr. Speaker, will that affect? That will affect you and I, Mr. Speaker, and everyone else in the House. And indeed, every Manitoban who uses our road system. We cannot have, Mr. Speaker, a system in place whereby there is no onus upon the individual to properly control not only himself, but his driving habits whilst operating a vehicle on the public highway system.

What the Member for Rossmere basically is attempting to get us to agree to today extends far further than the technical aspects, the logical aspects and the financial aspects of this resolution. What the Member for Rossmere is really proposing is a change in the moral standards by which we judge driving habits in this province. What the Member for Rossmere would have this House and this government do is relax the laws of the land as they apply to the driving public in this province. The Member for Rossmere would have us, I suppose, directly condone the use of alcohol by driving public in the off-hours when the person is not operating a vehicle in direct relation to his job; he would have us introduce a system, Mr. Speaker, where there would be no punitive action taken as far as the job goes, only pleasure driving privileges would be suspended, should a person be convicted under the Criminal Code, the breathalyzer, for excessive use of alcohol in his off-hours, in the evening hours when he's not on the job. Mr. Speaker, that is a moral issue to which I do not want to give my support, and we on this side of the House will not give our support to, because we do not believe that is in the best interests of the driving public of Manitoba, to create a privileged class of people, whoever they may be, whether they be members of the truck driving

association or unions, or whomever, who depend on their driver's licence to maintain their job.

What the Member for Rossmere is wanting us to do is give them, establish them as a special, privileged group of people, who no longer have to worry, Mr. Speaker, on the weekends, of watching their alcohol intake, or in fact, if we wanted to deal with other areas of suspension, they don't have to worry about reckless driving, speeding, all of which, Mr. Speaker, are known and proven hazards on our highways, and they have caused frequent deaths on the highways.

I find it a little strange, Mr. Speaker, that the Member for Rossmere would indicate as justification for this resolution that a person who has a perfect driving record, for instance in his truck whilst he's on the job, should be given special privileges and be able to enjoy the social graces of the hotels and the private parties in our province and drive his car under the influence of alcohol. Because that's basically, Mr. Speaker, what the Member for Rossmere is proposing; to remove the moral compunction that person has in his pleasure driving hours to abide by the laws of the land and to assure, Mr. Speaker, more importantly, rather than just simply abiding by the laws of the land, but to assure, Mr. Speaker, that whilst he is under the control of a motor vehicle on our highways that he always be under the best of control, that he operate that vehicle in the safest way, not only for the protection of himself, but for the protection of others on our highway system.

What the Member for Rossmere's resolution will do, Mr. Speaker, is remove the threat of suspension from a pleasure driver on the weekend or in the evening. Removal of that threat of suspension, Mr. Speaker, will not create safer highways; will not reduce the accident rate caused by the reckless drivers, the impaired drivers, the speeders; in fact, Mr. Speaker, what may well happen under the dual licencing system as proposed by the Member for Rossmere, and seconded by the Member for Transcona, is that we may well see on the weekends our highways being a more hazardous place to drive because those people depending on driver's licences will have no more compunction, will have less compunction, Mr. Speaker, to abide by the laws of the land and operate their vehicles safely and courteously on our highways.

Mr. Speaker, I find I cannot and we cannot support the resolution as put forward by the Member for Rossmere, and would not recommend its passage.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. BILLIE URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hadn't anticipated speaking on this resolution, but hearing the Minister of Highways raise some of the issues which I believe are not relevant to the issue, I thought I would rise this afternoon and contribute a few remarks to this.

First of all I have to say, Mr. Speaker, I hadn't anticipated that I would be, at this point in time, sitting on the same side of the fence, at least on the issue of dual licencing, as the Minister of Highways. To find us on the same side of the fence can only mean trouble and I may have to look at where I and next to whom I sit on this very issue. But there is no

doubt, Mr. Speaker, in my mind that the issue of dual licencing, if presented, will I believe create some hardships, some, I think, administrative nightmares. I think the Minister of Highways in his remarks pursuant to this resolution are not only stretched out a bit, they go beyond that, I believe, Mr. Speaker. They border on the — well, not only unreasonable, they go on beyond unreasonableness. I think the Minister of Highways in trying to make his point stretches his point to the limit that a point can be stretched. But he does make the point that dual licencing will become an administrative nightmare. I believe a problem that will be created if we bring in the two systems will be who do we allow to appeal in cases of being charged? Do we allow an appeal to take place on both licences or do we then become very rigid in our approach to the licencing system and say there will be no appeals against an infraction, against a license, and the individual will have to tough it out. As it exists now, the system exists now that regardless of the offence there is an appeal mechanism that the driver is granted and is able to apply for a work permit pending the outcome of his appeal.

I believe that if the dual licencing system were brought in, I think the system would then become very very rigid. If the individual was charged for some offence while at work, as unusual the circumstances as they might be at the time, I believe that if we had a dual licensing system the individual would have to be suspended automatically because I don't believe that you then could open up the appeal procedure for both of them unless, if the Member for Rossmere has suggested it, I certainly take issue with that because certainly it would open up the area whereby drivers with two licences would be granted a privilege that would not be open to most of us. Then the other problem comes up, Mr. Speaker, and that's the problem of who do you grant the two licences to? The Minister of Highways now, I believe he has some interest in a farm on which he would have to drive a truck. Do we grant him two licences, one for pleasure and one for possibly driving a truck on the farm — or any of the others? Do we grant the Attorney-General, who has a law practice, or was involved in a law practice and has to drive to and from court; do you then allow him to get a dual licencing system? It becomes a very difficult problem as to who you allow the second licence to, Mr. Speaker.

Many of us, like the Member for Minnedosa has a farm, albeit possibly he might consider it a hobby from time to time and a place to relax. Do you grant him a second licence? And then if he's involved in a traffic offence, an infraction, albeit let's say for consuming alcohol over, or his blood alcohol content over .08 and have an automatic suspension, do you then allow that individual to appeal that decision if he has two licences? Mr. Speaker, do you then allow that individual to appeal? With the dual licensing system, if you allow the motorist to appeal either on his pleasure driving licence or on his work licence, if you allow it, then I believe you would be allowing motorists some additional freedom or at least driving privileges that they now do not enjoy and they now would have a greater responsibility to be careful as to how they handled their driving privileges.

I, Mr. Speaker, don't believe that there is a great problem in terms of motorists obtaining or not obtaining a work permit. I think it is automatic in terms of the possibility of a suspension now for 45 days. I believe that the Licence Suspension Appeal Board, if there is an undue hardship imposed by the Licence Suspension Appeal Board against a driver whose job is in jeopardy as a result of being convicted for a suspendable offence, if his job is in jeopardy, that individual has the right of course to challenge the decision of the Licence Suspension Appeal Board and go to the County Court and have that decision overruled, so that in the event that his job might be jeopardy that avenue is still open to him.

I believe, although the system itself sounds fine in theory, Mr. Speaker, that those professional drivers who drive for a living should not be scrutinized to a greater degree than the average motorist is, Mr. Speaker. I believe also that those drivers who are professional drivers have a greater onus of responsibility as to how they discharge their duties on the highway. Because they are on the highway for so many more miles, there's no doubt that their attention and their skills have to be superior and should be superior, or at least as superior as they can be in comparison to the average driver. That's not saying that the average driver should have less skills. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the government has a responsibility in terms of providing and assisting drivers, both and young and old, in obtaining better skills so that they can meet the challenge of the highways.

We have an educational system, Mr. Speaker, that allows youngsters to take courses, many of which are used to a very limited degree when they leave the school system, and yet when it comes to driving, the majority of our young people will be on the highway. They will be on the highway, Mr. Speaker, many of them will not have had the basic skills at least given to them to be able to cope with the traffic and the type of conditions that they will face on the highway. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Highways should, while this resolution calls for a dual licencing system, should have got up and said, look we are very concerned about the quality of drivers and the quality of driving habits of our motorists in this province. Statistics have shown that motorists in this province do not generally meet the standards of motorists across this country, and that we would propose that any young driver that wishes to obtain a driver's licence has to go through a recognized driver training program. But no, he has been asked, his predecessor, the Minister of Highways, has been asked. The discussions and negotiations between MPIC or Autopac, the Motor Vehicle Branch and the Department of Education were begun. Yet in 1976, Mr. Speaker, while there was reluctance between those two groups, between Education and Motor Vehicle Branch as to some professionalism in the driver education field, surely if the government was intent on raising the standards and the abilities and skills of our drivers, they would have moved along this line.

But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this Minister is really not concerned about the quality of young drivers in this province. I believe this Minister, Mr. Speaker, is really reneging on his responsibility to the young

people. While it is true in the city of Winnipeg most of the high schools offer a course to young driver's on a voluntary basis, many of the young drivers, and primarily the males, are not the ones to take the course. It is the girls who opt to take the course to try and improve their skills and of course have taken part in this program.

But I believe there is an onus on the government, Mr. Speaker, and I don't think the Minister of Highways is living up to his responsibility. The onus that I speak of is, that if we are going to grant a licence to an individual, to grant him the privilege to drive on our highways, that there is a responsibility on that individual, and I think the government has to clearly outline its position, that that individual should be prepared to take a recognized driver-training program. What better way, Mr. Speaker, to bring this about but through our educational system, to be able to provide to all students, and I would say the majority of whom will be drivers from time to time in our society, the Minister should be able to bring forward a program. I believe it will result, if there was a program in this province that would call on young people to have a driver-training course prior to obtaining their driver's licence, it will result in fewer accidents in the long term, better driving habits, because I think all of us pick up poor driving habits from one another and from ourselves, and we pass them on to our young people who, of course, while we may say, Don't do as I do, do as I say, and that normally doesn't happen. We normally pick up the bad habits of people with whom we associate, and it's the same thing with respect to driving.

Mr. Speaker, while I do not support the resolution that has been presented by the Member for Rossmere, I do believe that his intent to bring forward a matter in terms of desirability, while there may be some desirability to bring forward a dual licensing system, I believe the problems that will associate with it will far outweigh the benefits that will accrue to Manitobans.

Manitobans and Canadians have just gone into a licensing system that has been in the developmental stages for many years, and that is the class licensing system. I think the system in itself, while I don't believe it has been adopted by all provinces or put into place by all provinces, I believe the concept has been adopted by all provinces in this country, so that before too long, the system will be uniform right across Canada. We'll be able to judge drivers, not only ability, but the vehicles that they handle; it will be uniform right across this country.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that we have moved into a system that has been, I believe, relatively costly, but I think it was necessary to bring in, and that is the class licensing system. I believe that in itself, it will bring about a more refined system of licensing which will call upon those drivers who are in a professional position to be able to not only live up to, but require them to have more frequent medical checkups, be more physically fit, because of the job that they have undertaken.

Mr. Speaker, while the resolution indicates that the dual licensing system would permit an individual to

have a licence for the purpose of pleasure driving and a further licence for the purpose of operation of motor vehicles in the course of employment or business, permitting action to be taken against the pleasure portion only of such licence in the event that regulations are breached during pleasure driving, while in theory it sounds fine that that's what will happen, but then the problem arises, how does that workman get to work when he loses his pleasure driving licence? He may live 20 miles from work, and if he loses his pleasure driving licence, how does he get to work? Well, yes, he has a work permit to drive his truck at work, but then the problem arises, how does he get to work? Do we then say, well, his work permit can be used to and from work as well as at work, or do we clearly distinguish between the class system and say pleasure is for pleasure, and work is strictly for work, Mr. Speaker?. Those problems, I am sure they can be addressed; if one went about trying to address those, I think it can be redefined. I would hope that the Member for Rossmere would throw out some of those solutions, or at least some of the suggestions that he has, or possibly even further, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways might want to consider a legislative committee of the Legislature dealing with, not only the dual licensing system, but highway safety in particular, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Highways may want to take under advisement the possibility of forming a legislative committee to look into . . . There are so many areas where the Legislature and Members of the Legislature should be doing some work in terms of safety on the highways, Mr. Speaker. We have had a very difficult time, and we haven't done it as yet, to pass helmet legislation, Mr. Speaker. And there is the issue of seat belt legislation, where there are opposing views of members. I think the Minister of Highways should undertake a legislative committee to look at some of these problems, the issue of speed limits, and even the issue, Mr. Speaker, of dual licensing. While I, at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, speak against this resolution, I think the government should seriously consider setting up a legislative committee to look into these areas and examine them. Many provinces, Mr. Speaker, have legislative committees dealing with safety, and I think the Minister of Highways should be prepared to consider a legislative committee dealing with highway safety in this province. Heaven only knows, that the formation of such a committee can only bring attention to the many problems that we face on our highways, and the government should seriously consider such a move and not just simply get up and vote against the resolution. While there may be opposing views on both sides to this resolution, certainly some work can be done and possibly this issue could be included in such a committee review.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rossmere will be closing debate. The Honourable Member for Rossmere.

MR. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a couple of comments with respect to some of the statements from the Minister of Highways. I would like to repeat, that it is my understanding of the

Monday, 28 April, 1980

entire purpose of the current legislation, the purpose of it is to ensure that the public is safe on the highways. Certainly that is something that I would not want anyone to feel, that I would want to endanger the public's safety. The Minister suggests that if . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hour being 5:30, when this matter next comes up, the honourable member will have 19 minutes.

The Honourable Government House Leader.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, that this House do now adjourn and resume in Committee of Supply at 8:00 'clock.

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