



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

31-32 Elizabeth II

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



MG-8048

VOL. XXXI No. 44B - 8:00 p.m., TUESDAY, 12 APRIL, 1983.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Thirty-Second Legislature

Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation

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

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 12 April, 1983.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - LABOUR

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: The committee come to order. At 4:30 p.m. the leading opposition critic, the Member for St. Norbert, has moved that the Minister of Labour's salary be reduced to \$1.00.

The Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I couldn't let a motion like that go to a vote without making a few comments, particularly given the tenor of the comments made by the opposition critic in the half hour before we broke at 4:30. In fact I would say, Mr. Chairman, after hearing his attempt to establish the thesis that the Jobs Fund is a fraud, I would say the only thing that is fraudulent, is the opposition attempts to discredit that Job Fund and also the opposition's attempt to discredit the job initiatives of this government. I think if one looks at what the previous speaker said as a package, I think you'll see how little credit that statement has because that previous half-hour speech was full of inconsistencies and I would say, Mr. Chairman, it is nothing short of a series of hypocritical statements.

In looking at it, Mr. Chairman, I would first of all look at some of the specific inconsistencies that were in the statement. The speaker touched on the area of jobs, job creation, brought in the area of plant closings. He also brought in the area of taxation. In looking at it, I first of all see a number of big inconsistencies with what they did when they were in office. The previous speaker, in some of his comments, was trying at times to come on as if he was proposing that the government should take upon itself to be the sole provider of full employment, if necessary. That certainly was the tenor of his comments with regard to summer employment. I mean, that's a nice position to take, Mr. Chairman. That means that no matter what a government does with its limited resources, that one can be critical because obviously it hasn't done enough.

The member should know that quite fully himself because his government certainly didn't do enough in that area when he was a Minister of that previous government. For four years, there was unemployment. I know of unemployment in the North, specifically, Mr. Chairman — (Interjection) — well, the member says, what was the rate? Well, I saw my constituency, the constituency of Thompson, how the population of the city dropped by half, by 50 percent over that period. It dropped by 50 percent. Did his government step in and guarantee the jobs of the Inco workers when those jobs were eliminated? It certainly didn't, Mr. Chairman. But going further than that, did his government do anything to uphold the number of jobs in the public sector in the North? Hardly, Mr. Chairman. They

destroyed the Department of Northern Affairs; they cut back literally hundreds of jobs and this came only months after we, in Thompson, had faced cutbacks at Inco. So what they did was in complete reversal of what the member is somehow trying to suggest, at least implicitly, that they do now or that we should do now. They know it's nonsense, Mr. Chairman.

Let's go a little bit further. The member made some comments about plant closings. Well, I remember some plant closings; I remember some layoffs; I remember some cutbacks. I remember seven or eight days after the previous government was elected in 1977, the cutbacks at Inco. Now, did they say anything about that, Mr. Chairman? No, they said nothing. As I said, they proceeded six months later to add to the problems for the Constituency of Thompson by bringing in their own cutbacks. So let's not forget their past record on that particular question.

Going a little further, Mr. Chairman, let's look at what they've said about the levy for post-secondary education and health, at the payroll tax, as they would call it. Well, in looking at some other aspects of what they've said, what alternative do they propose? Here's a revenue source. What cutbacks would they introduce to compensate for taking away that tax as the member suggested? What would they do in that regard? We haven't heard anything about that.

MS. M. PHILLIPS: Medicare premiums.

MR. S. ASHTON: Well, perhaps as the Member for Wolseley suggests, they'd bring in Medicare premiums — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, the member says, the typical kind of NDP scare tactic. I would suggest

MR. CHAIRMAN: I cannot hear the member who has the floor. Please state your point of order.

The Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, I realize that on the Minister's Salary we can wander a great deal, however, it isn't a cover-the-waterfront debate and I would suggest you might recommend to the Member for Thompson that debate still has to be relevant to the department and the Minister under review.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The message is being conveyed to the Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the Member for Springfield I point out that the opposition critic made various references to the levy, the payroll tax, and that he made several references to the Minister's position on that tax and I would consider my comments on that tax to be more than relevant, particularly in pointing out some of the inconsistencies and hypocritical statements that members opposite have been making.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, these are topics, I'm sure, that will come up in debate at a later time, I don't want

to dwell on them too much at this point in time, but I merely want to point to some of the inconsistencies. But, let's get down to the Jobs Fund, that's been an item that been discussed rather considerably in this committee. Let's get down to the general concession of . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Thompson should be reminded that anything about the Jobs Fund would be out of order in this committee.

MR. S. ASHTON: Mr. Chairman, we have had various commentary on the . . . not the appropriations of the Jobs Fund, but of the credibility of the Fund itself. Mr. Chairman, the opposition critic kept talking about the jobs fraud fund. I just want to point out that statement is inaccurate. I am not debating any appropriation of the Jobs Fund on any specific program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Thompson may proceed as long as he stays relevant.

MR. S. ASHTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I've said, they've suggested that it's a Fraud Fund. On what basis? Well, the basic thesis of their argument appears to be that not all the money in that program, not the entire program, are new job initiatives. Now that argument surprised me somewhat, Mr. Chairman, because that's been stated quite clearly by the First Minister, by the Minister of Labour, by others who've described the Jobs Fund and its purpose and what it will be doing. So why are they arguing this? I would suggest it is because they know that this fund is a job creation fund, that it aims at two basic things, one is to create a significant number of new jobs, and the second is to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the member again talking about the Jobs Fund? The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, it is with regret that I draw to the attention to the Chairman that we did object to discussion about Jobs Fund Estimates. I agree that the Member for Thompson has a right to be concerned because the opposition critic and others did, despite our interventions and your rulings from time to time, continue to talk about the Jobs Fund in terms that were far from reasonable and that's a matter of public record, but two wrongs do not make a right. They were out of order then and we are not going to be out of order now in talking about them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair thanks the Minister of Natural Resources. If there is one thing that the Chair can maintain is authority, it is to make a ruling that is correct, and a ruling that is correct is that all items that are discussed in this committee should be relevant to the Budget item. We have ruled that before and I rule the same again.

The Member for Thompson may proceed.

MR. S. ASHTON: Well, it makes it very difficult, Mr. Chairman, when one is responding to a half hour attack on the Minister of Labour, in which all these particular points that I am addressing now were raised. However,

if members of the committee want to avoid discussion on those particular areas, I have no objection to that.

My basic point is to prove the fallacy of the arguments presented by the opposition critic and thereby prove, by reference to those fallacies, that this motion to reduce the Minister's Salary to \$1 is nothing short of frivolous and vexatious, Mr. Chairman, a totally frivolous waste of time of this committee.

I will perhaps then, Mr. Chairman, turn more to the positive side. My intention in getting involved in the debate on this particular motion was first of all, to show these fallacies and then show the positive side and why I feel the Minister deserves more than just a pat on the back at this point in time, but deserves every penny of the salary placed in the appropriations on the Estimates for her activities as Minister of Labour. That is, because she has shown a very flexible approach in regard to a number of areas, most importantly, I think is in terms of job creation because that's the No. 1 issue we're faced with in this province today.

Now I've seen that flexibility in my own constituency, Mr. Chairman. Her department, through her good officers, co-operated with the Department of the Minister of Energy and Mines and with the Federal Government, through the Employment Immigration Commission to put into place one of the most effective short-term job creation programs that I have seen in this province. That program was the Thompson Improvement Project.

To give some very brief explanation of the extent to which it was an overwhelming success, it created over 370 short-term jobs. It created \$2.7 million worth of assets for the community of Thompson. It created employment on a wide variety of projects from hospital projects, school projects through to community groups and city projects in the City of Thompson. It captured not only the involvement and imagination of the 370 people employed on the project, but the imagination of the entire community.

We started off at the beginning of the program with, I would say, not even half that number of projects, not even half that number of jobs and, because of the spirit of co-operation that was engendered by, first of all, the departments of the Provincial Government sitting down and co-operating and, second of all, co-operating with the Federal Government, it spread, Mr. Chairman. It spread to the unions involved; it spread to the companies, because INCO was one of the integral parts of that; it spread to the city council, the school district; it spread to the hospital board and it spread to the community organizations. That is the kind of thing I would like to talk about, programs like that which have worked, which could be applied elsewhere, other ideas that the members opposite might have in this regard because I'm sure they have something to contribute in this way.

I don't want to talk about what I realize is a traditional motion, this reduction of salary to \$1.00. It's priced for — (Interjection) — well, Mr. Chairman, the member opposite said, it's not tradition. I have noted that it's been used in various times in this House before. It has been used at the Federal House of Commons, often as a way to highlight a particular issue or something of that nature. But, rather than do that and do it in a negative way, I would like to see some suggestions, some ideas in this regard.

In terms of unemployment for youth, it is a crisis situation. There's no doubt about it. It's a crisis situation. I don't think anybody in this Legislature disagrees with that. The question is, how do we tackle it. Let's recognize, in terms of the Careerstart which was a subject of some discussion in general terms under these appropriations, let's realize what that kind of program is aimed at doing. It is aimed at doing what it can. It's a flexible program. That is why it's placed under Jobs Fund. It's a flexible program as through past experience. If the jobs are there, often the deadline is extended; the program is expanded. It's the kind of program that is aimed at creating however many jobs can be created in that regard. By having it in the Jobs Fund, that only reinforces it. When you have a \$200 million fund to draw on potentially and that program clearly will not draw on that entire amount, it is obviously so that you can have that flexibility. So long as one business or one community organization creates a job, then that fund will provide the funding for it, will make sure that that one person, that one unemployed student, that one unemployed youth will have a chance at that job. Let's recognize where that's at.

Let's look at where we need the help as a government. As a province, we need the help. The help is in terms of making sure that fund, that appropriation is used to its absolute maximum. That is one way in which suggestions can be useful. I know that members of this Assembly, whether they be opposition in government, have been very good in the past of publicizing these government programs. I hope that would be part of it, but I hope it will go a little further than merely taking forms out to businesses, as I'm doing. It will go to the point of their recommending to businesses in their area potential projects, because that is one way of tackling the problem.

Of course, that's working within the confines of one particular job creation program. Other kinds of ideas are needed in terms of other kinds of programs. If members opposite have ideas in that regard, I'd sure like to hear them as an MLA for a constituency where people are unemployed. You know I'm looking myself, I'm looking at experiences in other provinces. I'm trying to find out information from Western Europe, from the United States about other Job Creation Programs because the money is there - the \$200 million is there - and we can use it if we have the right kind of ideas and I think we can come up with some damn good programs, but we have to have the ideas.

So that is basically why I have a great deal of difficulty debating this particular motion because it phrases everything in a very negative sense. It phrases everything in a very personal sense. It implicitly says somehow that the Minister is responsible for unemployment in this province. Well, that clearly is not true, Mr. Chairman. We all know the Minister is responsible for employment, employment services, job creation. It should be phrased in that sense, rather than bringing in these tired arguments that the members opposite have brought in about - which I perhaps shouldn't mention because it might create some controversy again - but which the member opposite dwelled at length with for half an hour.

Let's look at the Job Creation aspect. Let's hear the suggestions for it. There is a time for debate of the broader principles, The Jobs Fund Act, the specific

appropriations later. There is time there for criticism of any particular projects which might not be considered that good, or any suggestions in terms of the general principle of the Jobs Fund. Really, under the Estimates of the Minister of Employment Services, we should be looking at Job Creation and suggestions in that regard.

I would therefore, Mr. Chairman, in concluding, say that I reject these statements, not simply because they're negative because I realize that all oppositions to a certain extent have to be critical and have to be negative, but because the statements the members opposite have made are, first of all I think, inconsistent; secondly, they really are of very little assistance to this Legislature and to the people of Manitoba in terms of providing potential alternatives; and thirdly, are directed at the wrong side of things. We should be looking not at unemployment but ways of finding employment in this province at the present time and that's why I would reject this particular motion and wholeheartedly support the initial steps that the Minister of Labour has taken in this very critical area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Transportation.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I missed the occasion when the motion was put before 4:30 with respect to the Minister's Salary, and had I been here I think I would have been appalled at witnessing that spectacle because Manitoba is not the example over which such a motion would be in order and the members opposite know that. They know that it is exactly the area where this government's strength lies, at least to date, and therefore it is their desire to take the underpinnings away from the Government of Manitoba on this very important issue.

It's important, Mr. Chairman, because everyone recognizes and it's quite popular out there to talk about the vast number of unemployed and I don't believe the Minister of Labour has denied that we have an unemployment problem. But I think that in light of the position that Manitoba finds itself in with respect to unemployment, comparatively speaking with the rest of Canada, that I would have thought the motion would have been to commend the Minister for having influenced decision-making processes within the Government of Manitoba that indeed were stimulative, in order to maintain as many jobs as possible and, Mr. Chairman, that would have been quite in order.

I want to remind members opposite that they put the arguments forward for a very constrained Budget; they put the arguments forward for lowering provincial spending. They said let the private sector do it, it's not government's role to do anything about the economy other than to assist the private sector, that they would not want to get involved too directly - all of those things which are not working in the rest of Canada.

Mr. Chairman, it so happens that Manitoba today is the second lowest province with respect to unemployment in Canada, second only to the Province of Saskatchewan. Alberta is now in third place and they were usually in first place and they have a Conservative regime, which has been newly re-elected and they have their problems, Mr. Chairman. So I think it's wrong to reflect in the way that is being attempted here, on a Minister whom I think has done an excellent

job, so far, since she has undertaken these responsibilities. I think it's fair to recognize that this Minister has been extremely innovative with respect to what can be done with the job problem, innovative in the sense of being able to bring forward some reviews of existing policy with respect to in-house government employment initiative, with respect to encouragement for early retirement, all sorts of options have come out of the woodwork in order to deal with the problem of the unemployed. I think this is not a Minister that has stood still, but has indeed recognized very much the burden that is on her shoulders, along with that of the Minister of Economic Development and others, that we indeed have a serious problem and it's a crisis that must be dealt with in some form.

Now, I believe that members opposite prefer to be very good socialists when they debate Estimates, because all of their logic is on doing something through the public system about the problems in the economy. Their Budget Addresses are very conservative, because they say you musn't spend any money, and I want to repeat the Member for Sturgeon Creek, who says you can't have it both ways, and that's right, you can't have it both ways. If we're going to maintain a low deficit or a zero deficit position, then we know what the options are vis-a-vis the status of the employment within the Civil Service, vis-a-vis Government Services throughout the various departments, and by the way, I want to remind members opposite that they will be screaming on the other side of the ledger when we get to the Department of Highways, which has really been singled out as one where a cut has been made. I suspect there won't be one voice raised from members opposite when we debate those Estimates, in opposition to the cuts in that department, given the logic of this motion, Mr. Chairman. I'm looking forward to a very easy debate, Mr. Chairman, in recognition of the fact that members opposite are talking about management, and in recognition of the fact that we tried to do some of that by repriorizing, even though we had to take some cuts in certain departments. Naturally departments that are relatively Capital-intensive are easy candidates in those tough times. But I think that this particular motion is uncalled for, Mr. Chairman, on the basis of where Manitoba stands relative to the rest of Canada; what we have been doing to try to ameliorate, to a large extent, the problem that is out there, and we haven't finished, we have only begun. I think that's a fair statement of fact.

I'm not going to talk about the Jobs Fund because it is not appropriate at this time, only but to indicate that there will be an opportunity to debate that in due course. The members opposite will be able to exercise their lungs for all they're worth on that issue and compare what we are doing there with what they have done over the years in that same area, Mr. Chairman. I don't believe that they will be able to say very much negative about the thrust of the Department of Labour through this Minister or the government on that issue, because that is the number one issue which we have decided must be dealt with, in recognition of the fact that provinces have very limited scope in which to function and cannot impact very significantly percentage-wise on the reductions that we would like to see in the unemployment scene. We can be cosmetic at best, even if we spend hundreds of millions of dollars and everyone on the other side recognizes that.

I believe it's fair, though, that we can zero in on pockets of unemployment, and we can zero in on unemployment where it is a case of expired UIC beneficiaries that are affected. There, the numbers are much smaller than we must work with. There, it's required that the Government of Manitoba synchronize its efforts with the Government of Canada, to some degree, so that we simply aren't spinning our wheels and spending provincial dollars which are, in essence, reducing the spending of federal dollars through UIC benefits. But rather we deal with the question of those people that have nowhere to go because the jobs aren't there, but who have expired on their UIC benefits. That's the direction that must be taken.

Mr. Chairman, I want to suggest to whoever moved that motion - and I don't know who it was - that they rethink their position and vote against their own motion because this scenario here today is absurd, to say the least, having the record of this administration in comparison with those across Canada on this very issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I must say that as persuasive and as eloquent as the Minister of Transportation is, he has come just a little short of convincing me not to support the motion of my colleague, the Member for St. Norbert. I believe that my colleague laid out a very very strong case for it, and it is unfortunate that the Minister of Transportation was not here from 4 o'clock until 4:30. He was obviously otherwise occupied in the other committee, because he wasn't able to enjoy the benefit of having the case put forth in a very logical, reasonable and rational manner by my colleague for St. Norbert.

My colleague, I think, laid it all out very very well for members opposite and I think that, rather, those members opposite, perhaps with the benefit of reading Hansard tomorrow, might be persuaded that there is some merit to the motion. I think it would be wise for us to carry this forward so that they have the benefit of reading that tomorrow before they vote on it, because it's a very important motion, Mr. Chairman. There is no question that we want well-informed people voting on this issue.

I know I won't be able to reach the heights of eloquence that my colleague for St. Norbert did, but I'm prepared to try and I'm prepared to give my best effort at putting the case forward, because I know the Minister of Transportation, being the reasonable individual that I know he is, will probably want to listen at least. He may well be persuaded. But I find it interesting that so many members of the government are here now with us to listen to the debate, to jump to the defense of their Minister of Labour, and indeed she is a good person, as the Minister of Natural Resources has said. She is a person who came to the job with very great expectations. She was someone whom, we on this side, said probably represented in many ways an improvement over what we had been experiencing before in the handling of . . .

M/S. M. PHILLIPS: Ken MacMaster?

M/R. G. FILMON: No. I'm thinking of her immediate predecessor at the moment, for the Member for

Wolseley, but the Member for Wolseley insists on naming names and I guess this is show-and-tell, so I'll have to say that the person that she replaced was someone who had a very heavy load in looking after Finance, and Labour didn't seem to be something that merited enough attention, and I realize that he had many things to look after.

So this Minister came to us with great promise and great expectations. But, just as Linus has said in the cartoon that I'm sure members opposite are familiar with called "Peanuts" - there is no heavier burden than a great potential. This Minister is finding that, indeed, it's a heavy burden that she has on her shoulders, because she has to live up to the expectations that were created by her party during the last election. So the mistake and the crime is not that she hasn't fulfilled the expectation. The crime and the mistake is that those expectations were created and this Minister has to live with them.

You know, the members have made some comparisons. It is not just a question that this Minister is a poor minister. The question is that, by comparison to the expectations that were created by that government when they were running for office, she has not been able to live up to those high and lofty goals. That is a problem that she is going to have to live with and that's a problem that this government is going to have to live with throughout its term of office.

When the public, the electorate, is made to believe by a party that they can do all those things, then the public has a right to criticize, through its opposition, that party as a government for not reaching those expectations that they created themselves. I speak specifically when I address the comments of the Member for Thompson, who said that he was aware of layoffs that occurred under our administration. Indeed, I'm sure that there were layoffs. In fact, I can remember some. His colleagues in opposition, took great delight at pointing out and going into the kind of hypocritical grandstanding - and I'm glad that the Speaker ruled that term in order because I think it is very appropriate for talking about some of his colleagues when they were in opposition - that they used to exercise in the House every time there was a layoff in any organization, in any business, in any industry in this province. That sort of hypocritical grandstanding now, of course, today looks so foolish when you compare it to what they're dealing with.

Layoffs in this province in the past year-and-a-half under this administration have been unprecedented. The loss of jobs has not been seen before in any time, perhaps back to the Depression in this province. This government has to take some responsibility for not meeting the expectations that it created when it said that it promised, under the now Premier's signature, the Honourable Howard Pawley, then Leader of the opposition, who said, I guarantee it, that no Manitoban shall lose their job, if they were elected to government. Well, here it is and the opportunity is there to fulfill that promise, and this government cannot and this Minister who is, unfortunately, placed in the position of having to match that expectation cannot do it. So we have every legitimate right to deal with this Minister in the manner in which we are, and that is to say that she is not performing or fulfilling the promise that was laid out for her by her colleagues when they ran for office just a scant year-and-a-half ago.

Mr. Chairman, you know, the Member for Thompson spoke about the Jobs Fund and referred to the "fraud fund," as was mentioned by the Member for St. Norbert, when he outlined — (Interjection) — no. The Member for Thompson proceeded well along the way and the Minister of Natural Resources gave us a criticism or at least a lecture about two wrongs not making a right, and I say, Mr. Chairman, that carrying on with that, I suppose, three wrongs don't make a right. So we will carry on with our discussion of the comments that were made by the Member for Thompson who objected to the term of "fraud fund" being used. But it's quite obvious, Mr. Chairman, that over half the money that is in that fund has come from ongoing projects of the Provincial Government. Over half the money is not money that would not ordinarily have been spent on those ongoing built-in programs and this government

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the member talking about the Jobs Fund?

MR. G. FILMON: I'm talking about this government's actions in job creation. This government is taking the tack, rather than being open and up front of having jobs created in the normal way that they would be, rather acting like a squirrel preparing for winter and hiding away from each little area a little bit of funding from this department, a little bit of funding from that department, from ongoing departmental Estimates and programs, ongoing programs, that provide long-term, full permanent jobs and taking it away and putting it into a so-called job creation initiative. It's a charade, Mr. Chairman, because the fact of the matter is that they are just taking out of one pocket and putting into another. In fact, they're destroying. Now, we find out that there is a decrease in funding at the community colleges of \$4.5 million. Of ongoing programming, we're taking aside 38 . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. We are discussing the Minister's Salary and we have the consensus, I hope, that there is a separate item for the Jobs Fund. When the time comes, that's the time to talk about the Jobs Fund. If the member will persist, I will call him out of order.

The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, we listened to a dissertation about fees being charged for medical care and all sorts of things from the Member for Thompson. In order to make my case, I may stray just a tiny bit, but I'm going to stick largely to the point at hand which is the manner in which this government is attempting to take a high profile, take a great deal of public credit . . .

MS. M. PHILLIPS: It's not an attempt.

MR. G. FILMON: Oh, the Member for Wolseley says it's not an attempt. They're being successful. They're taking political credit for ongoing activities of the government that have been carried on by every previous government in succession that have been built into the ongoing line activities of every department and they're

trying to take that out and somehow convince the public that this is a separate new job creation activity and it is not, Mr. Chairman. It is just what people have a right to expect out of any government worth its salt, but this government is trying to make cheap political Brownie points out of what it says is legitimate job creation activities.

We have demonstrated, Mr. Chairman, that over half of the activities are built into the system and are there and this government can't take credit for them as new initiatives. I'm sure that as time goes on and as we go through department by department we will find even more evidence of the fact that this government is doing nothing new, Mr. Chairman, that it is in fact just simply trying to change the appearance. It's the old shell game, as the Minister of Transportation used to say when he was in opposition. — (Interjection) — Oh, sorry, it was the Minister of Municipal Affairs who liked that that term, the old shell game, of just rearranging the pieces under different covers, but they are the same ones there and there are no new initiatives out of this whole thing and this Minister is going to have to answer for that.

I think one of the tragedies is that with respect to the administration in the job creation activity in her department under the Department of Labour she cannot tell us, or at least maybe she has chosen not to tell us, some of the specifics about the real job creation activities. She talked today of the appointment of a senior manager of the Jobs Fund from her department, and this senior manager is someone who has been hired with, I assume, good qualifications and I'm prepared to accept that, except she can't give us a job description. She can't give us a rundown item by item of his responsibility. She can't tell us what he's supposed to do in this job and I think that is a tragedy because he has a central responsibility in job creation activities under Employment Services, and yet under questioning today . . .

HON. M. B. DOLIN: On a point of order. I clearly delineated the job of that particular manager and told you exactly what his responsibilities were. Perhaps the member was not present during Estimate debate at that time, but to say that I refused to do this is an inaccuracy. If the member will check Hansard, he will find the job of that senior manager clearly defined.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to check Hansard and I'll take the Minister's word for it.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, I have to say that the Minister is not able to delineate criteria, is not able to delineate prioritization or any numbers of things about the Jobs Fund at the present time, certainly that she hasn't been able to do that to the satisfaction of members on this side.

The Minister seems to be more interested, Mr. Chairman, in issuing news releases, in appearing at announcements, at having signs put up that say the Jobs Fund makes it happen, advertising and all those sorts of things than answering legitimate questions about the job creation activities that are under her administration and under her jurisdiction.

The members opposite have said this Minister can't be held responsible for the unemployment levels, and yet in the same breath the Minister of Transportation wants to immediately take credit for the fact that Manitoba has the second lowest unemployment rate in the country as a province; and yet they're not supposed to have to take the responsibility for unemployment per se, but they want to take the credit for it being the second lowest. Well, you can't have it both ways, to repeat his words back to him.

There were times, Mr. Chairman, when during our administration we were the second lowest level of unemployment in the country, but our Minister of Labour, a good Minister of Labour, declined to take the credit for it at that time. When people asked, well, isn't this a reflection on the wonderful programs you're doing? He said, look, the difference between second and fourth is usually not that great. Manitoba has traditionally slipped back and forth between second, third and fourth lowest. We've stayed in that bracket; we've moved very little. He said, I would be wrong to take the credit on behalf of myself, my department, or our administration. That's the kind of sensible, sane and rational approach we would like, not the kind of approach that we get here - where looking for any opportunity for cheap political gain, people will take credit for a little statistical change.

Mr. Chairman, the members opposite have talked over and over again about asking us what we would cut, what programs would you cut, where would you make your savings, how would you do that? Mr. Chairman, they're in government and as a government they made some promises. We thought they were foolish promises and right now as time progresses it's being proven how foolish those promises were. But all they have to do is compare those promises, Mr. Chairman, to what is happening today. — (Interjection) —

I thank the Member for The Pas for offering me that olive branch in a form of a glass of water.

Mr. Chairman, I know that members opposite would like to divert me from the topic at hand but I won't . . . — (Interjection) — Right. We have some very interesting things happening. We have all the outrageous and outlandish promises that were made before in the pre-election document that was signed by Howard Pawley, that no Manitoban would lose his job, no Manitoban would lose his home, no Manitoban would lose his business and all of those things. "I guarantee it", he said.

They also said that they would institute a system that would protect Manitobans from layoffs requiring one year notice and all of those things. They said that they would improve the health care system. They said that they would improve job creation. They said they would do all of those wonderful things that they're now not able to do, Mr. Chairman.

Then we have the Minister of Transportation today as the stark reality of today's times of the real world hits home, he says provinces have a very limited scope in which they can act. He says they cannot impact substantially on all of the major problems affecting our economy no matter what they do. He says their efforts can be cosmetic at best. My, oh my, oh my, how times have changed. How the mighty have fallen from those grandiose promises, to come down to that kind of approach.

Mr. Chairman, it's quite obvious that the problem is not necessarily what this government is doing. The problem is what it's not doing. It's not living up to the expectations that it created. And more so than that, it's sending signals to the economy out there, to the real world, that are counter to what is happening in the economy. It's sending signals out that says, you can still spend anything you want.

They increased their spending last year by 18 percent, this year it's going to be as high as a 20 percent increase over that and they're running on borrowed capital, they're raising deficits, they're fueling the expectations out there, through their own settlements with their own employees, through their own attitude towards staffing and towards spending. They're running counter to what everybody out there is doing in the private sector, in the real world. Yet at the same time they're saying, well we can't do anything about it. Where would you cut, you tell us, you can't have it both ways.

Mr. Chairman, we are looking at programs that are under this Minister's jurisdiction and we find them wanting in a variety of ways. We look at the unemployment statistics for youth under 25 years of age, and we find that it's running very high. There are 25,000 youths looking for employment today.

We find that this Minister comes forth with a program, Careerstart, a different name to a program that was offered last year, to a program that was offered two years ago. We find that despite the fact that unemployment in the youth is substantially up over what it was two years ago we are, in fact, putting forth no more money and our expectation of creating jobs is less than the jobs that were created under the program two years ago. Five thousand jobs were created. This Minister is saying that there isn't enough money for 4,000.

The Member for Thompson goes on to say that what we should be doing is going out and stimulating job creation by going and talking to the businesses and the employers in our area and giving them creative ideas of how to employ youth and take advantage of this program. If we were to do that, Mr. Chairman, there wouldn't be enough money in the fund to create those jobs because the program doesn't meet the kinds of levels that are out there of need. As a consequence here you have a Minister who talks mightily about the great initiatives, and the great initiatives don't even reach the same levels that the programs that she criticized two years ago, or her predecessors criticized two years ago, did.

So, Mr. Chairman, in summary I feel badly about the fact that the onus of responsibility for all of this self-created activity within the government, all of these self-created expectations and problems rest with this Minister, but she has to bear the brunt. She's the lead Minister in terms of unemployment, job creation activity, all of those things and she can't meet the expectations that her own party set up for her. So as a consequence, judging against that backdrop, this Minister's record is to be found wanting; and as a consequence I must, with regret, support the motion put forth by the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next on the speakers list is the Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I, like the Member for Lac du Bonnet, find the motion put forward by the members opposite to be somewhat, not only bad timing and with the wrong Minister, but also with the wrong province.

When one looks - and I've put it with the Minister of Labour in the Province of Alberta, I've put it in Ontario, and I would put it in other provinces and federally as well - (Interjection) - I know we're talking about Manitoba. But let us look at how Manitoba is doing in comparison in the past year, with other provinces. We see that in the past year across the country as a whole unemployment has increased by 3.4 percent.

In Manitoba it's up and we don't take any happiness in the fact that it is less in the other provinces and it was still up above what it was last year. But to look at the Province of Manitoba with the resources that we have and the way we are trying to use our resources, the way we're trying to use not only revenues raised responsibly, they're going to taxation to try and maintain some levels of employment and maintain some government services in this province, instead of trying to go a short-cut route of trying to push a string with tax cuts.

We see in British Columbia, a province certainly that has historically - and I would maintain to some degree even today has greater resource strengths to build than we have here in this province being a much larger province in British Columbia and being far more resource-rich at least - you have an unemployment rate there of 15 percent. That's almost about 4.3 percent higher than what ours is. In the past year their unemployment rate has increased two times the factor that we have here in Manitoba.

Look at glorious Alberta, Tory-true Alberta, Tory blue and true as well. That province has had its unemployment rate doubled and that is a province sitting on a Heritage Fund that is, I believe the last I heard, it was somewhere around \$7 billion, it was growing quite rapidly - I don't imagine it's growing quite to the same extent it is now because a few years ago it was criticized as the biggest savings account in the world because of its not being invested properly within the province - the Province of Alberta whose unemployment rate, the wealthiest province in the country whose unemployment rate is above ours; ours at 10.8 and Alberta's at 12.3. - (Interjection) - I'm not proud of ours, no, I'm not proud of ours being as high as it is. I'm even more distraught, for the Member for Arthur's sake; I'm even more distraught at the Province of Alberta sitting on their Heritage Fund and not having any kind of long-term planning whatsoever of trying to put that money to work for the employment of Albertans.

We have in Manitoba, with our increased rate of unemployment, something we have to look at very carefully as well, in comparison to the Conservative years. During the Tory years in office from 1978-81, we had somewhere in the vicinity of darn near 10,000 people a year, primarily younger people with young families, leaving this province. But we've had an increase in population in the past year for the first time in numerous years in this province. It's been the first time since - when? - 1971, 1961. It was the first net increase in population and it's due, to some degree, to people

moving back to this province, fewer people moving out of this province because they don't have the golden gate to go to in the west anymore, which the previous government was more than happy to see people go through, going out to Alberta and to the oil fields and to the oil-stimulated jobs in what was really a very artificial economy and being happy about the people leaving, to a fair degree. Never once in their four years of office can I recall them having decried the people who were leaving Manitoba, because they know if they would have stayed in Manitoba, or if they would have had net immigration in Manitoba, their unemployment rate would not have been among the lowest in the country, they would have got up into the mid and upper ranges.

So for a province such as ours, in comparison with the other provinces across the country, we have done just simply remarkably in the past year in terms of job preservation and in terms of job creation. No other province of our size, of the financial restraints that we have and the financial capabilities that we have, to move towards job creation to the extent that we have in the past year; be it in the North, to try and tide people over a long-term layoff, which they had in a community like Thompson, to try and put some infrastructure, to try and rebuild the infrastructure of the services in that community, to try and use public funds responsibly at a time when people were out of work, in need of employment, try to tide them over a bit of a crisis, and at the same time, have the community come out of the period of three or four months with something of a benefit rather than just having more people leaving the communities. And that's something you have to recognize as well, when dealing with northern communities, in mining communities, where there is a fairly long-term shutdown for several months. Some people, sure, can take the time and are able to withstand that and maintain their homes or stay in the community, but there's been a historic level of people with a high turnover in those communities anyway, and to have a disincentive for them to stay, by saying you're going to toss them out of work and not do anything for a three-month or a four-month period, whatever the shut-down may be, or even towards six months as they had in Sudbury - or was it nine months, I think, in Sudbury? You lose those people and the chance of getting them back to maintain that community once the mines are back in operation, is darn difficult. And the company recognized that; Inco recognized that. Why the members opposite can't recognize it, I don't know.

When you look at the unemployment rate for cities across the country as well, the City of Winnipeg has done remarkably well. Look at places like Edmonton; Edmonton's unemployment rate of some 2.4 percent higher than ours, and Vancouver, the city and capital of British Columbia, it's being almost 2 percent higher than ours. How those people are coping there with such incredibly high costs compared to the cost of living here in Manitoba is hard to imagine.

But let's look at some of the scenarios that we've had, the higher unemployment rates coming in Manitoba as well. Let's look at what the Federal government has been playing around with in their tight monetary policy and the impact that has had and it's been getting tighter for several years. They're starting to loosen up now

just in the past couple of months and it's starting to turn around, there are some possibilities that you're going to start having a little bit of growth in the country again. But to look back at the years 1979-80-81 when money was getting tighter and tighter, interest rates were going higher and higher, and into '82 as well, then you had companies that were able to sustain that for a couple of years. They were able to hold off the creditors for a couple of years, but as those high interest rates maintained, more and more were going to fall by the wayside. And as those more and more started to fall by the wayside, Mr. Chairman, I would say to you that a good number of those that were just holding on by their teeth for a couple of years finally had to give up the ghost in the final year, in this past year and that has contributed, to some degree, to the increased unemployment in Manitoba. Probably not too much more than has the increase and the influx of people moving back into the province, but it certainly has been a very significant player in the factor of increased unemployment in Manitoba.

But an awful lot of people - what I get people in the streets saying, quite frequently is, what would it have been like, what kind of a position would we be in, what would it have been like if the Tories would have been re-elected in the fall of 1981? What kind of situation would we be in now? Would we have the job creation, or would we be trying to throw money after ill-thought and uneconomic mega projects, for the basis of trying to create jobs or a symbol of creating jobs, tying us into something that we would have been subsidizing for the next 20, 30, 40 years. And that is what the opposition members are still hollering across at me, that that is what they would have been wanting to do had they got back in office, to go ahead with Hydro projects, which are clearly uneconomic at this point in time. To go ahead, although they wouldn't have had a willing partner in Alcan, although they probably would have try and pushed them into it, to move in and expand an industry, an industry that is contracting, rather than an industry that is expanding.

As far as their other wish, and that's all they were, and the population recognized them very clearly as wishes, that the potash venture - why the companies would have moved into Manitoba if the Manitoba Government wasn't going to take all the risk in the project, and even the - what was it? - MCI, no . . .

A MEMBER: The Nicaragua Trading Company.

MR. D. SCOTT: Not quite, no. They send over coffee. But that potash venture that the Province of Manitoba and the Manitobans, the taxpayers across the province would have been taking the total risk in the project and would have gotten a very small piece of the equity action out of it. That's something that you have to be very careful when you move into those sorts of ventures, is that when the public is going in as a joint venture, that the public isn't there simply to take the risk for the other sector. It's got to be an economic project; it's got to be a project with a future.

So what we have had in this past year and I'd like to give congratulations, not only to the Minister of Labour, but to the whole Cabinet and the whole government, that we have been trying and we have

been succeeding at a level that the members of the opposition are clearly embarrassed at, when they can see their Tory-true provinces elsewhere in the country, in Ontario, in Alberta — (Interjection) — Well, the member opposite from Portage la Prairie talks about deficits. Did he ever look at Alberta's Budget this year? Did he ever look at Alberta's deficit for last year? What we're talking about, Mr. Chairman, is governing in a period of a very serious recession, the most serious recession that this country has ever seen since the Dirty Thirties.

We have a province here and a government here that is committed; that is, not going to just hang the people out on a free enterprise limb and let them dry. We see a role for the Province of Manitoba, we see a role for government in getting in trying to protect jobs and getting in trying to create some jobs, and to maintain the standards of living for Manitobans and the services that they get, instead of just hanging them out on a limb to dry with the winds and the breezes or the hurricanes that the so-called free market system that they tie themselves so totally to would provide.

Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman. It's been a pleasure to have had a chance to address this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: At this point in time, the Chair wishes to exercise its own discretion and recognize the First Minister, if he wishes to speak at this time.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to wait . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MR. W. STEEN: Mr. Chairman, it was almost an hour ago when the Minister of Highways and Transportation said how shocked he was that at 4:30 this afternoon the Critic from the Department of Labour moved a motion to reduce the Minister's salary to \$1.00. I would like to remind, through you, Mr. Chairman, that Minister that he was Minister of Agriculture for an 8-year period and his first year in opposition, as Agriculture Critic, he reduced the Member for Arthur's salary to the price of one — (Interjection) — he tried to - to a rate equal to the price of a bushel of wheat.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: I cannot hear the Member for River Heights.

MR. W. STEEN: I said, Mr. Chairman, that he, as Critic, in his first year in opposition, went on to try and reduce the Minister of Agriculture's salary at that time to a price equal to one bushel of wheat, and he sits here and has the audacity to think that we have done something that is so unorthodox and shouldn't be done and that the opposition Critic for Labour should withdraw his motion, or at least should vote against his own motion. I have seen hypocrites in my past, Mr. Chairman, but I have never seen a statement like that.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The meaning of the word depends on the context. The word "hypocrites" appears on both

lists, parliamentary and unparliamentary, so it depends upon the context.

HON. M. B. DOLIN: So what's the context?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River Heights.

MR. W. STEEN: Members opposite, Mr. Chairman, wonder why the motion was placed before you prior to 4:30. If you will recall, when we started this department's Estimates some 10 days ago, we started off with the Minister giving the customary Minister's report with a reply from the opposition Critic. Then, for the remainder of that first day, the Minister of Finance and a few other Ministers carried the ball for the present Minister of Labour of which, I am sure, that she was most embarrassed having those people sitting in here and trying to defend the department, because I am sure that if she had have wanted to, she would have done a lot better job than the Minister of Finance did.

Anyways, then for two or three days, the opposition critic did his very best to ask questions and get some answers, and he had great difficulty getting straight answers. But until the First Minister made the statement one day that it would be kind of nice if the opposition would leave the flag-burning issue alone and talk about economic and employment problems and concerns that are facing Manitobans - and they are issues that are on the front pages of the papers every day of the week - it was about then, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister started to answer the opposition critic's questions. I imagine that someone like the Deputy House Leader said to her that you won't get very far unless you start giving a few answers, so she did come through with some answers.

The opposition critic constantly wanted to know things about that super job - you know what department - and couldn't get any answers. It was the government's use of their majority that they were going to steam-roll through with the concept that the great job scheme would not be discussed in these Estimates, but would be discussed at some later date. It was often asked, well, what are you going to do about the high unemployment for the under-25 age group which, by next week, will be on the job market as university exams will be completed for most students within the next seven to 10 days? But no, no, you can't discuss that until about June or whenever that department comes up.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the Minister of Transportation being surprised and shocked at such a motion being placed before the House because he, himself, has exercised such a practice in the past. I am not surprised that the opposition should choose this Minister to be the one who has a salary motion placed against her, because the economy and employment are the two greatest concerns all members of the House, I'm sure, would admit to. I know that, when I was present in this committee - and when I wasn't, I was reading Hansard - we were not satisfied that we were getting answers from the Minister. We were also upset and disappointed that the government used their majority to steam-roll through, so that we couldn't discuss the job scheme concept at this time,

but wanted us to discuss it later in the year. We also felt that with the university students coming on the job market that this is the time that the matter should be discussed and, obviously, it's the time the government has chosen not to have it discussed. So I'm certainly going to support the opposition in their motion, that is, to reduce the Minister's salary to \$1.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I enter this debate just to indicate my concern that the opposition should endeavour to be fair in their comments. Anyone who, like myself, sat in in the work of this committee over the previous sittings could not help but agree that the Minister was always polite, always fair, always very reasonable in answering to the fullest extent possible the questions that were put to her.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is true that the opposition were concerned to try and examine in detail not only the Estimates of this department, but also using the Minister as a vehicle for examining into every detail of job creation in Manitoba. The Minister quite rightly pointed out that was not within her jurisdiction. She could not, under her Estimates, deal with the entire spectrum of job initiatives that the government was responsible for. So, given that context, one would have believed that the opposition members, recognizing that there was an opportunity to go into that question at length, would not have persisted, but they did, Mr. Chairman.

Now let's look at the role of the previous administration in respect to job creation. We heard the Member for St. Norbert talking at some length about their efforts to fuel the engine of the private sector in the province. Well, what were the results? We had four years of severe protracted restraint. I should say, three years, Mr. Chairman, because, as we know, the year before the election, something changed. Because the province embarked on a spending program and a promising program and a commitment program to large corporations, the like of which had never been seen with the exception of the Churchill Forest Industries promises and undertakings that were made some years ago in this province. Mr. Chairman, it was severe protracted restraint.

This government curtailed all public initiative. It decimated the planning sector of government and left this government not only without the balanced budget they had promised without reducing deficit, but with increased deficits with a public planning apparatus that was non-existent and no way to cope with the problems that would be facing, not only this government, but all governments in Canada.

Mr. Chairman, you know when we went to the polls in November, 1981, we heard on the other side a government party saying that, you know, people should not leave Manitoba, it's a land of opportunity, we're sitting on a gold mine. Well, Mr. Chairman, we came into office and found that there were no committed megaprojects, they were megapromises, and we know what's happened to megaprojects and megapromises throughout Canada. They have been discarded. They have been discarded in Alberta, they have been discarded all throughout and the demands and expectations of the private sector went with those promises.

Mr. Chairman, we inherited . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are discussing Minister's Salary.

HON. A. MACKLING: Yes. The Minister of Labour inherited, along with her colleagues, an atmosphere of government relations so soured by repetitive attacks by the previous administration on the Federal Government that they turned deaf ears on pleas from our administration to ameliorate or at least to change the severe fiscal constraints that they set upon us, because as you know, they have reduced the fiscal contribution to this province by over \$700 million over the next five years. That's the kind of atmosphere that we have inherited and that's the kind of problem this Minister has had to contend with in this province, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, this Minister has used innovative programming. She has spent hours in conjunction with Federal Ministers and her federal counterparts endeavouring to work out program, program that will have lasting benefits for people of Manitoba.

We know what happened in Thompson. In Thompson, this Minister, along with her colleagues, worked out techniques to ensure that there would be employment - yes, short-term employment - and we heard, Mr. Chairman, how members of the opposition criticized the efforts this government and this Minister were making in respect to short-term work activities. But, you speak to the people in Thompson, Mr. Chairman, speak to the people there about the benefits of the work initiatives that were undertaken and they will tell you that they have lasting benefits in their community from these activities. These activities would not have been carried out if we'd had any one of the members opposite as Minister of Labour in this province and in substitution for our present Minister.

Mr. Chairman, this Minister is involved in setting up new initiatives, training programs, looking at ways in which young people can be trained and there can be emphasis not on outmoded occupations, but ways in which to train young people for the opportunities and the challenges of the modern day, not as we've had in the past.

Mr. Chairman, we've heard members opposite, and I won't use the word that they're hypocritical, that's unparliamentary, but we've heard members opposite whenever there is a plant closure, whenever there is a layoff, be concerned to standup and ask what are we going to do about it. Mr. Chairman, I would expect that they would have some suggestions and I know the kind of suggestions they ought to make even at this committee, but they haven't got the integrity to put them forward. What they should suggest is that we should make grants to private enterprise to fuel the private sector. They haven't even made those suggestions, Mr. Chairman.

The attitude of the previous administration is, you give money to the private sector to get the private sector moving. Well, those efforts have been made by governments throughout Canada. This private sector has still hung back and in this context, Mr. Chairman, this Minister, with her colleagues, has been endeavouring to take steps to ensure that every opportunity is exercised to put people to work on useful public projects.

MR. D. BLAKE: Fixing fences and cutting scrub. Mowing grass.

HON. A. MACKLING: Well, the honourable member over opposite is talking about cutting scrub. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, he thinks it's demeaning for the students or for the people who do cut grass in our parks system. I'm proud of those young people when we hire them to do that work in the summer. Mr. Chairman, I'm proud of the young people and the older people, the exhaustees, that this Minister, through innovative programming, has put to work in removing diseased and dead elms in the Dutch Elm Disease Program. These are not just wasted efforts, they are positive efforts to make our community better.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am annoyed that this motion should be made against our Minister. I think, Mr. Chairman, it indicates the kind of contempt about the parliamentary system the members opposite exercise.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Who burns bloody flags in this province?

HON. A. MACKLING: Here's a new Minister who has listened to every argument, has answered every question, and despite all this she gets this motion to cut her salary.

MR. D. BLAKE: You forget about the former Minister of Labour and what you guys put her through. Short, short memories.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the honourable members are prone to criticize every effort that is made. They keep talking about programs, they offer no constructive alternatives. Mr. Chairman, we know that if a different Minister were in power, we would have a combination of government restraint and corporate giveaway, and I suggest that neither of those things are what this government will follow nor that this Minister will follow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next in my Speaker's list is the Minister of Transportation, but he has already had his say, so I'm going to skip him until everybody has a chance to speak. What is the wish of the committee?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. A. ANSTETT: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: State your point of order please, the Member for Springfield.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, the rights of members to speak in the committee is based upon their recognition by the Chair, not upon any ordering of priority or opportunities for all members to speak before a member gets a second chance. It's he who catches the Chairman's eye. If you maintain a list of those who caught your eye, then that's certainly in order, Mr. Chairman, but to deny a member an opportunity to

speak when he's indicated his desire to speak to the Chair, simply because other members haven't spoken, is certainly a break with the precedent we've been following in our Committees of Supply, Committees of the Whole and in the House itself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair is not denying the right to speak. He's merely postponing his right until everybody has spoken.

MR. J. DOWNEY: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On a point of order, the Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: The opposition supports you in what you're saying. You have made your decision. No, Mr. Chairman, we are supporting what you're saying. You have the prerogative to select who you want to speak and proceed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it is the wish of the committee, the Minister of Transportation.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since you have meticulously maintained a list of speakers and you've deleted the Minister of Highways and Transportation from that list and put him at the bottom, who is next on the list and who does your list have on it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina is enquiring into a matter beyond his jurisdiction.

The Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: On the same point of order, Mr. Chairman. Yes, Mr. Chairman, are you maintaining a list of speakers or is it just at the whim of the Chair when the speakers are selected to address the Minister? Are you maintaining a list or are you just alternating from one side to the other?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair is maintaining a list but is trying to balance it so as to focus on the points of issue in the debate, and the only reason why the Chair thought about postponing the right of the Minister of Transportation to speak is because he had already had his say once and there are other people who had not had their say. But that's only a matter still under consideration. The Chair hasn't made up its mind.

MR. D. BLAKE: On the matter under consideration, Mr. Chairman. To help you make up your mind, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Natural Resources has just delivered a fairly lengthy tirade that really had nothing to do with the debate on the Minister's salary, and I would suggest now that it would be courtesy to recognize a member from this side and then go back to the Minister of Transportation, or whoever is next on your list. That's just for the guidance of the Chair, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the Chair is to have a rule it has to be consistent. If I have to follow the list that I made

the next on the list, if I have to postpone the right of the Minister of Transportation to speak until everybody has spoken, the next on the list is the First Minister.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Are you refusing to give us your list?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, the Chair decides that tradition supports the member, an element of agreement of this committee, therefore we have to follow tradition. The Chair recognizes the Minister of Transportation.

The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

If the Chair has now decided for tradition in favour of some other method of dealing with the decision, then I would say the tradition is that you alternate back and forth, and since the Minister of Natural Resources has spoken then he should be followed by a member from our side.

Since the Member for Pembina clearly had raised his hand to speak then he should be allowed to speak. He can't catch his eye if he doesn't look at this side of the table. If he is looking at this side of the table then he will see that the Member for Pembina has his hand up and he wants to be recognized and tradition is that we alternate back and forth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair would like to divulge its list voluntarily. After the Minister of Natural Resources, is the Minister of Transportation, then the First Minister, then the Member for Pembina, then the Member for Arthur.

There are occasions where there are two in a row, or three in a row. So, it is because of this inequality that the Chair sometimes has to use some discretion. — (Interjection) —

The Chair decided to follow tradition. It's the safest rule and it recognizes the Minister of Transportation. — (Interjection) —

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I didn't want to really give up my right to speak because it is getting near 10 o'clock and I didn't want to miss the opportunity to respond to the Member for Tuxedo who very erroneously tried to mislead this committee, Mr. Chairman, erroneously for his own benefit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The word "mislead" is a dangerous word.

HON. S. USKIW: Of course it's dangerous, Mr. Chairman, but it's permissible. The Member for Tuxedo tried to impress upon this committee that because of the election campaign about a year-and-a-half ago, that there were expectations that were built up with respect to unemployment that this Minister is not living up to.

I'm almost quoting him word for word. I'm paraphrasing but it's almost word for word and the member concurs, Mr. Chairman. Well I don't know, Mr. Chairman, where the Member for Tuxedo came from, or where he was before he came into this Chamber but I would hope that if he didn't realize it, I hope he realizes it now, that an election campaign, part of the

campaign an important part of it, is to give a philosophical indication of one's political bent, philosophical bent and one's asperation, Mr. Chairman. The Member for Tuxedo now would like to enshrine that into specific commitments knowing full well, and not only knowing it but saying it, that those were expectations that could not be fulfilled, are impossible of being fulfilled - he said they were impossible - but he wants this Minister to have a reduction of salary because she can't fulfill an impossible task. That was what he had said. — (Interjection) — Yes, he said it was impossible to fulfill but notwithstanding that it was impossible to fulfill he wants this Minister to suffer a reduction in her salary.

Well that is a crock, Mr. Chairman, and everyone knows it including the Member for Tuxedo that this is not an acceptable rationale for the motion that is before us. One would have thought that he would have built a case on where Manitoba is relative to the rest of the world on this question and he wouldn't dwell on that, Mr. Chairman, because if he dwelt on that his case would not be supportable and that's his problem. So he tries to say well, you've built up these expectations, no one could have delivered on them, they are impossible and therefore because you can't deliver the impossible you must resign, or you must lose your salary. — (Interjection) — That's right.

So the member overlooked one important criteria and that is that political systems have to have a direction; they have to dream and everyone recognizes that there's no point in reaching one's ultimate dream because there would be no point in dreaming - and that's a saying that goes back a long way and I don't know who it is I'm quoting - but you're never supposed to achieve the expectations and the asperations that emanate from one's desire and from one's philosophy and from one's dreams.

Those are objectives that we strive for and we always must set objectives that are beyond our reach otherwise there would be no point in having them. That's what the political philosophy, that was espoused during the campaign, was all about and the member should know that. He should know that because he was part of the same campaign. His political party talked about these great things into the future knowing that they always have to be somewhat beyond what can be achieved in a short four-year period. No one can achieve these great heights over a year, or two, or three, or four years. You set a direction and then you try to meet your targets in that way.

Mr. Chairman, what the Member for Tuxedo also refuses to ignore and will not admit to, is the fact that what we are involved in economically at the present time, is a down cycle in the world capitalistic system and that's not new. That is not new. The whole western capitalist world is now in the midst of another depression - not a first one and not a last one, but just another one - just another one of the economic depressions that is part of the genetics of the system. Mr. Chairman, what we are experiencing now is in the genetics of the economic system under which we live.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, order please. The Minister of Transportation has the floor.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I find it very difficult to accept the proposition that we should vote to reduce

the Minister's Salary because of the world economy, which was not created by this Minister but which was created by colleagues of my friends opposite, worldwide. Yes, worldwide. They are proponents of that kind of system, of that kind of society, and they want this Minister who is challenging that very system that has brought upon these huge problems, to answer for those mistakes that have taken decades to get us to this stage. Decades, yes - since the 1930s, Mr. Chairman. It isn't since then that we've had this kind of a problem or a problem of this magnitude.

But let's talk about where we are relative to those problems. Let's recognize, Mr. Chairman, that contrary to what they were doing and would have done had they been re-elected, we did put \$50 million into a housing thrust and Manitoba has the record now of being a leader in new housing starts amongst the provinces across this country. Mr. Chairman, which government used the instrument of the government, which was their borrowing power, their central borrowing capacity, to put up mortgage money at an interest rate far below what the market was providing mortgage money at? Tell me, was it a Conservative Government of this province? Well, it wasn't. It wasn't because it is philosophically not within their system to do those kinds of things.

Yes, that's exactly what we're talking about, the \$50 million that are in the housing fund provides — (Interjection) — Well, the Member for Tuxedo says \$50 million is a fraud. I want to remind him, Mr. Chairman, that that member either voted for that \$50 million or voted against it, but it was there in the Estimates a year ago. It was there in the Estimates a year ago.

A MEMBER: But it wasn't used.

HON. S. USKIW: Well, the member says it wasn't spent. Yes, it took some time to put it together because, why? Because there was no housing program inherited by this government, left over from the previous one, because it wasn't in their philosophy to have one. So let's recognize from where we came, Mr. Chairman. We had to start from zero and we had to put together a program and it takes quite a number of months before you can put together that kind of a program and to get it into its implementation.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Labour, being part of the government system, obviously had to play a major role in bearing influence on the need for the program. Mr. Chairman, another \$50 million thrust - members don't want to admit to it, but it was not there - another \$50 million thrust was in the agricultural area, trying to bring stability . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The item under discussion is the Minister's Salary.

HON. S. USKIW: That's correct, Mr. Chairman. I am talking about the Minister of Labour's Salary. The Minister of Labour serves in Cabinet, the same as all of the Ministers and, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Labour was part and parcel . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I find it very, very difficult, although I'm sitting right

next to the Minister of Transportation, to hear what the Minister of Transportation is saying. I would suggest that there be a little bit of order.

MR. D. ORCHARD: On the same point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it is a point of order, the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the First Minister is complaining about not hearing the Minister of Transportation. The Minister of Transportation is now talking about Agriculture and Housing in the Minister of Labour's Salary, and he's justifying it by saying that she's part of a Cabinet. Mr. Chairman, you sat in this committee while this Minister of Labour, who is one of a nine-person committee on . . . Mr. Chairman, this is a point of order. Mr. Chairman, this is a point of order. You sat and listened to this Minister refuse to ask questions regarding job creation in Manitoba, when she was a nine-person committee and now we bring in . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member has no point of order. That's not a point of order.

MR. D. ORCHARD: . . . because she's a member of Cabinet? I have a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Transportation.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Don't you recognize points of order, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Tuxedo.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, if you're prepared to accept as justification that a Minister is a member of Cabinet . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Stick to point of order please.

MR. G. FILMON: Mr. Chairman, all I'm saying is that if you're prepared to accept as justification for somebody being able to talk about any department in the government on a Minister of Labour's Salary, just because the Minister of Labour is a member of Cabinet, then you are violating the very principle that you set forth, that responsibility has to be commensurate with authority. This Minister does not have authority for expenditures under Agriculture and Housing, and therefore we cannot discuss it under her salary. That's a rule that you made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair wishes to remind all members of committee to speak to the topic under discussion. The topic under discussion is the Minister's Salary.

The Minister of Transportation.

HON. S. USKIW: The Minister of Labour's Salary and the points that were made under that discussion by members opposite had to do with the employment opportunities or the lack of them in this province, as

a result of this government's policies, including that of the Department of Labour. It's in that context that I am making my comments, Mr. Chairman, and that is that we have, as a Cabinet, as a collective government - I'm not talking about the Jobs Fund - that's against the rules. I'm talking about a regular program, Mr. Chairman, of which the Honourable Minister was party to the decision.

Mr. Chairman, the \$50 million that was put into the agricultural industry is a job stimulation effort. Whether the Member for Tuxedo recognizes it or not, it is creating jobs in urban communities. Stabilization of rural incomes translates into jobs in Winnipeg, in Brandon and in Dauphin - the member ought to know that. — (Interjection) — It's not wide open. It has to do with regular programming and responsibilities of every Minister of the Crown.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Springfield has a point of order.

MR. A. ANSTETT: Mr. Chairman, with a great deal of respect, I would like to raise this point of order because I did raise, much earlier this evening, the question of relevance in debate, when the Member for Thompson was speaking. I raised it the other evening when the Member for St. Norbert was speaking and, with respect, I feel compelled to raise it now with regard to the remarks of the Member for Lac du Bonnet, the Minister of Transportation.

If we allow this kind of departure from relevance in debate, as the Member for Pembina suggested, the debate is then completely wide open. I realize, because of the tenor of the debate in the committee, members have been tempted to throw the debate wide open, but that certainly won't expedite the business of the Committee of Estimates. It will allow repetition on every single Minister's Salary of a totally wide open, "cover the waterfront" debate. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that you request all members to direct their remarks, as relevantly as possible, to the topic under discussion to avoid a complete destruction of the Estimates process.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The item under discussion is the Minister's Salary. Under Rule 64(2), "Speeches in the Committee of the Whole should be strictly relevant to the item under discussion." On that guidance, the Minister of Transportation may have the floor.

HON. S. USKIW: Mr. Chairman, I have no problem with that. I believe that members of this particular committee have strayed far beyond that all evening. I assume that's an accurate assessment and I am sure that there isn't one here that is going to challenge that, but I am willing to confine my remarks to a more narrow definition.

The problem that the members opposite have - and I'm going to repeat this because I think it is worth repeating. — (Interjection) — One of them, yes, the Member for Virden is correct. It's only one problem that they have. They have found themselves in a wanting position with respect to how to undermine and attack this government during this Session. They recognize that the unemployment issue is indeed the uppermost

issue in the minds of Manitobans and the minds of Canadians. They recognize that this government is dealing with it to the extent that we have fiscal capacity to deal with it. So they have no choice but to try to meet us head-on in our No. 1 program in order to discredit it in some way.

This is basically what is being attempted, and I don't fault them for it, Mr. Chairman. If I were on the other side, I think I would play the same game, but at least recognize what it is that they are attempting to do. To stretch that, though, to the point of asking for the Minister to take a salary of \$1 is indeed stretching the point and that is something that I simply want to mention, for whatever it's worth.

The debate that we heard and the resolution that we're dealing with, Mr. Chairman, the two don't coincide. The debate that was presented to us on this issue by members opposite doesn't warrant or support the motion that we are dealing with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next person on my speakers' list is the First Minister.

The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, first, I am certainly not surprised at the Opposition; anything that the Opposition would do wouldn't particularly surprise me at this point. I don't think any of our colleagues should at all be surprised, because the path indeed that the Opposition have been following has been a strange and weird path and it's been winding in many different directions, mainly because of their lack of sense of direction as to where they are indeed proceeding, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to first deal with the Minister and her responsibilities and her portfolio. She has been indeed the Minister responsible for labour and for employment, dealing with labour and employment during times that are very very difficult; difficult not only in Manitoba, but throughout the whole of Canada; times that have been difficult for some number of years. Mr. Chairman, we all know that in the period leading up to the 1981 election the Manitoba economy was just about the worst in Canada by way of indices.

Mr. Chairman, there is no difficulty insofar as substantiating that. That was substantiated at great length by my colleague, the Member for Brandon East. Though members did their best to attempt to discredit the statistics that were produced by the Member for Brandon East, they were never able to substantially demonstrate any inaccuracies pertaining to the statistics. Again and again, Mr. Chairman, whatever statistic one examined in regard to employment, it was the same - it was Manitoba was not doing well.

During that period of time, Mr. Chairman, we were unable to provide employment insofar as young Manitobans were concerned, and thousands of young Manitobans were leaving Manitoba for areas west of this province. In British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Alberta, there were substantial influxes of Manitobans and indeed the evidence will demonstrate clearly that during those years there was, in two of those years at least, a decrease in the population of the Province of Manitoba during those Conservative years, Mr. Chairman.

During the period leading towards the end of the Conservative administration in this province, there was suddenly an effort to turn the psyche of Manitobans about. I remember the Budget that was introduced, Mr. Chairman, dealing with the economy and future job opportunities in the province, a reference to "blue skies" ahead. Mr. Chairman, that prediction of blue skies was indeed at the time that the . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Then we got an NDP Government.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . Mr. Chairman, it was in spring of 1980, for the information of the former Minister of Economic Development. In fact, many people considered him to be the Minister of Economic Underdevelopment in the Province of Manitoba during those years.

Then we remember, Mr. Chairman, that in the days just prior to the election, in a hysterical move, the Conservative government of those days placed large full-page ads in the Winnipeg Sun and the Winnipeg Free Press suggesting that we were sitting on a pot of gold, leaving the impression that we were on the verge of an employment boom in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, what is substantially wrong with all these approaches is that the approaches that are pursued by the monetarists of this world and by the ultra-conservative thinker pertaining to job creation, has been abysmal failure. Their thinking has been a failure, Mr. Chairman. Their thinking has resulted in a bankruptcy insofar as policy development is concerned, and much of the plight that exists within the world community today is because of the bankruptcy of those ideas.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to be prepared to meet head-on. It has been the Conservative and Liberal Governments of Canada that pursued policies of monetarism, policies of tight money and high interest rates, policies pursued by Governor Bouey, policies followed by Federal Liberal and Conservative Governments in this country since 1975, Mr. Chairman. We have also seen, during these difficult times, the pursuing of policies that would be more reminiscent of the kind of policies that were pursued by ultra-Conservative Governments during the 1930s.

There is an alternative to this direction, and honourable members don't like the alternative, Mr. Chairman. The alternative is a government that is activist; a government that's prepared to take a lead insofar as ensuring that there is a promoting of economic activity; not a government that is passive, but a government that is activist. Mr. Chairman, if you examine those countries in the world that have demonstrated the best economic development, those countries that have the lowest unemployment rates in the world today, you will note that they are countries such as Sweden, West Germany, Austria. One could go on and on, Mr. Chairman, and do you know there is a common denominator insofar as all those countries are concerned. They are countries that during the past decade have mainly had social democratic governments.

Mr. Chairman, what is needed, not only in Canada but other countries of the world, in order to turn the economy around, and we owe a heavy obligation to

those that are unemployed in our midst. This is not something that we can take lightly because there are people that are being destroyed; a whole generation of young people are being destroyed because of reckless and irresponsible policies that have been pursued.

Mr. Chairman, what is required is, first and foremost, the kind of initiative that has been undertaken and that the Minister of Labour has been largely involved in, the initiation of a program of job creation within the province through capital works programs, other programs that have been developed. Mr. Chairman, second to that, what is required is — (Interjection) — well, Mr. Chairman, it seems that the members across the way find unemployment to be humorous. Mr. Chairman, I don't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. R. BANMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. We have repeatedly, tonight, been chastised for referring to the Jobs Fund. The First Minister of the Province, Mr. Chairman, has been talking about the Jobs Fund for the last . . .

HON. H. PAWLEY: I never mentioned it once.

MR. R. BANMAN: . . . and I would ask if it's good for the opposition to be held to that particular ruling then the government should also be held to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The item under discussion is the Minister's Salary. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. M. B. DOLIN: I wish to speak to the same point of order, Mr. Chairman. I have consistently said over the last week-and-a-half that we have been involved in discussion of these Estimates, that it is the discussion of the programs within the Jobs Fund that is out of order under my Estimates, not the attack on unemployment that the Jobs Fund represents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I would like to first propose that what we require in Canada is an effort on the part of the Federal Government and all 10 Provincial Governments in order to attack unemployment. There ought to be no question as to what is the principle target that must be dealt with. That target must be unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot hope for a return of investor confidence until there is a restoration of consumer confidence. Our forestry industry is in serious shape in this country; our mining industry is in serious shape; our manufacturing industries have been seriously damaged. Mr. Chairman, what is required is an all-out effort on the part of all 11 governments to build the kind of infrastructure during these times, rather than put off and delay until some future date, so that we can employ men and women again to the productive utilization of the goods and services of this country.

Mr. Chairman, Manitoba can't do this alone, but it can make a major effort in order to contribute to this total picture. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased by the fact

that we have made some progress during the last period of time. The latest labour force survey stats that were issued just the other day indicate that insofar as Manitoba is concerned we have moved from third lowest down to second lowest. We are the only province in Canada that has less than 10 percent unemployment and I'm not happy about that, Mr. Chairman, that is cold comfort to have less than 10 percent seasonally adjusted unemployed in this country.

The only other province is Saskatchewan that has a lesser rate of seasonally adjusted unemployed in this country. Alberta has moved further up; Alberta is now 11 percent, seasonally adjusted; British Columbia is in the range of 14 percent. Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman, I understand another Conservative Government in office, the first time apparently that it has occurred in any province, is at 20.3 percent. Nova Scotia, 13.9 percent, up from 13.1 the month before - yes, up .8 percent; New Brunswick, another Conservative Government, increased from 15.3 to 16.1 percent, seasonally adjusted. Quebec remains high - didn't increase, didn't decrease - at 14.6 percent. Ontario did a little better but it had a bad time for months before that, from 11.6 down to 11.4. Mr. Chairman, the rate in Canada increased from 12.5 to 12.6.

This is a scandalous situation and it's not easy for any government, whatever political stripe the government happens to be, whether it's Conservative or Liberal or New Democrat. But, Mr. Chairman, we can't afford to remain still, because we are dealing with families; we are dealing with human beings in this respect and the key word is co-operation, combined effort in respect to each and every Provincial Government in the country and the Federal Government.

The efforts that were undertaken in this province, I think, have contributed significantly to that situation. The Homes in Manitoba Program, mentioned earlier, demonstrated that in January and February of this year - I don't have the March figures but I hear that they also indicate similar kinds of results, Mr. Chairman - indicate that housing starts in Manitoba, January and February of this year, compared very well with any other part of Canada, in fact, I believe that we're ahead of each and every province in Canada by way of housing starts in January and February this year. Job retention, Mr. Chairman, we're the second best by way of job retention in 1982. We're projected by way of total investment to be the only province west of the Atlantic provinces to enjoy at least some nominal growth.

Population increase, Mr. Chairman, our record was, along with every other province in this country, every other province from Tory Newfoundland to Tory Ontario, yes, to Manitoba, was not good because of the recession, but at least, Mr. Chairman, there is some indication that Manitoba is more than holding its own. Mr. Chairman, we've moved from indices of ninth or tenth place in Canada during the time of the Conservative administration in this province to, again and again, positions of one, two and sometimes three under New Democratic Party Government, 1983.

Mr. Chairman, when I commenced my remarks, I referred to the fact that we had population decline for - I believe it was two years - under the Conservative administration in the Province of Manitoba, we lost our young people. I remember one of the slogans that

Manitobans were saying during those years 1980-81; it was during the time of the constitutional debate in Ottawa. They were saying, I wish we would spend more time in patriating our young people back to this province than worrying about patriation of the Constitution. What we had, Mr. Chairman, during 1982, was the highest increase in population in Manitoba in any year since 1972.

A MEMBER: And a loss to other provinces.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, yes, a loss to other provinces. Mr. Chairman, let me explain that. Manitoba dragged its feet during the time of the administration of the Minister of Economic Development and the former Minister of Labour in this province. We lost our young people; our population declined. At least 1982 and 1983, it's cold comfort, Mr. Chairman, because we still have thousands of unemployed in this province that I wish we did not have in this province, but at least we've moved from the cellar, from the debts of the cellar under a Conservative administration by way of economic comparisons, Mr. Chairman, to the top of the house by way of economic comparisons during the New Democratic Party administration in the province.

Mr. Chairman, I know the former Minister of Economic Development is thin-skinned, because during those years under his stewardship for Economic Development, we were moving backwards. We have no problem demonstrating that.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Wrong, wrong.

MR. D. BLAKE: We didn't have a \$7 million deficit.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I leave it with you that this Minister has demonstrated, as part of a Cabinet . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: What was manufactured . . .

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest you ask the Member for Sturgeon Creek if he wishes to put himself on the list, I would look forward to his comments. I would look forward to hearing his comments, Mr. Chairman, in a more orderly way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, this Minister of Labour . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: You can't standing being told that you're not telling the facts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister has the floor.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, this Minister of Labour is causing some consternation on the part of members across the way . . .

MR. D. BLAKE: There is no doubt about that.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . because this Minister of Labour has demonstrated leadership in her portfolio. Mr.

Chairman, this Minister of Labour has demonstrated indeed that she has taken her portfolio seriously, and despite the difficult odds that she is combating, she has made progress. The opposition in this Chamber are reacting the way they are because this Minister has demonstrated the fitness and responsibility of her portfolio. Mr. Chairman, I, for one, I'm proud of the Minister of Labour.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is the wish of the committee?

Those who are in favour of committee rise, say aye; those who are opposed, say nay. The ayes have it.

Committee rise.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, P. Eyler: Committee come to order. We are discussing the Estimates of the Department of Health, Item 5.(d)(1) - the Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The way I understand it is that this section is divided into eight different areas in the province. Is that correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Regions, you're talking about?

MR. A. BROWN: Regions, yes. Can the Minister tell me who is the head of this particular department of the Community Mental Health Directorate?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We have just had the approval of Treasury Board and we're opening the position now. We're still trying to recruit.

MR. A. BROWN: Can the Minister tell me how long that position has been vacant?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It's a new position, it's been vacant forever and a day, I guess. It's a new position that we're just trying to fill now. We finally got the approval of the Treasury. It's a new Directorate also, to work mostly with the community vis-a-vis the hospitals because of the change in policy, or the policy direction I should say.

MR. A. BROWN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I believe that this is an area in which we have great concerns, especially after the article that we read in the Free Press over the weekend, I think that none of us in Manitoba have any reason to take great pride in what we are doing as far as mental health is concerned. It was stated that we are 25 years behind Saskatchewan and way behind all the other provinces, then this certainly causes great concern, and especially if there has been no director in this particular area, then of course that explains why there has really been no policy forthcoming and why there has been really no overall direction, or why no

standards have been set. I certainly hope that once we get this new director, that this is going to come forward, that we are going to have policies and that we're going to have overall direction and that we're going to set standards, that we are going to have some kind of a goal that we will try to attain as far as mental health is concerned. What has been lacking over the past years is that we really have had no particular goal which we hoped to attain.

There were two SMYs listed in the 1982-83 statistics. Can the Minister tell me who they were and whether those have been fulfilled?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I covered that before the dinner hour. This is a new directorate. I would like to explain that. This is a new directorate that we're just in the process of organizing. It is false to say that there have been no policies, because we have created a new directorate. We haven't filled the positions yet. The policies have been under the direction of the Provincial Psychiatrist, the chief psychiatrist for the province.

I am very pleased that the honourable member chose to refer to the article in Saturday's paper, because I am not very happy with that article. I would hope that we are not going to jump to conclusions and think that because we saw it in black and white that it's the gospel, the honest truth. I think that we've admitted that we have had problems before, but that article is certainly biased and I don't appreciate it at all. I would like to say, I am not talking about the reporting, I'm talking about the statement that was made by Mr. Martin.

First of all, we've looked at the Barnes Paper - that's the one that was quoted in the Free Press - and the needs assessment were projected. There was a survey of 250 professionals across Canada, 30 from Manitoba, and all were selected by the various provincial community mental health association people. Manitoba was not, I repeat, was not identified as being especially deficient in mental health services. That doesn't make us that much happier, but it was not the poorest and behind everybody else. All provinces are described as uniformly poor in the report - I am talking about the report, not a comment of someone else. The survey found that the Canadian Mental Health Association - they are the ones that asked for this survey - had a poorly defined role in mental health affairs and it was suggested that they become advocates in the mental health field. The study has not been released or distributed as yet, so I would say that they took this quite literally and they've been advocates.

Now there is something else that is stated in that press release. That's the part that I object to and this is why I had this story checked. It goes on to say that, "We have been negotiating with mental health coalitions since December of 1982 until the present, in an attempt to resolve the issue of participation from these volunteer organizations." Community participation has been our watchword from Day One. We assembled a range of subcommittees whose members were drawn from Education, Psychiatric Nursing, Nursing, Continuing Care, University-based Disciplines, Psychology, Social Work, Institutions, etc. That was one of the first priorities that we defined. We instructed the Director of Planning to start looking at this immediately and this is what

happened. We anticipate further participation when we begin to analyse some of the subreports and briefs as we intend to circulate some of them for comments and additional ideas.

Now, let me tell you what happened because that same article, my honourable friend will remember, said that the Committee of Mental Health or the Executive Director said that he didn't think very much would be done, that they would not be consulted. I think it certainly is right to say what he wants, but I think it is mostly unfair after what happened, because we had a meeting with the group, the social planning council, but they call themselves the Coalition Study for Mental Health. We met in early December and we made a suggestion to them; we told them that we wanted to study this thing together, that the government certainly had a responsibility and that we were ready to have any people that had anything to offer, we would welcome with certain briefs and so on, but we were ready to have them join us in a combined study group. They said that it was a very productive meeting. They were very happy when they left and they agreed with the suggestion that I made.

Then we received a letter that they didn't want it quite like that. We should have a chairman agreed to by the two groups and the material would be publicized and all kinds of things. We had told them quite clearly what we wanted, so we told them that we weren't interested in that, that they could go ahead and do their own, we weren't stopping them. But if there was going to be co-operation, it wasn't a thing like that. After all, the people of Manitoba are paying the government to take a responsibility; we have a Director of Planning that we pay well and he had started his work and he was chairing this committee. We had kinds of subcommittees, as I mentioned, of all the people that we could find that had some expertise and we told them, well, good luck, we will conduct ours and you conduct yours. But then they came back and they wanted certain conditions, all conditions that were agreed to. They wanted some representation on there. They wanted other people for research and we agreed to that.

I'll give you the letter that we wrote on March 16th. This is to Dr. Tefft, Chairman of the Planning Committee, Coalition on Mental Health Reform, Social Planning Council of Winnipeg:

"Dear Dr. Tefft: This will acknowledge receipt of your letters dated February 24, 1983 and March 2, 1983 in which you will find a proposal whereby the Coalition on Mental Health Reform could join the planning process currently being undertaken by senior members of my department. With regard to the membership of the present Government Planning Committee I believe it is necessary to outline it's membership.

Under the Chairmanship of Mr. David Pascoe, the Planning Committee consists of, Dr. M. Kovacs, Chief Provincial Psychiatrist; Mr. D. McLean, Assistant Deputy Minister of Community and Health Services; and Dr. H. Prosen, Head of the Department of Psychiatry at the Health Sciences Centre.

Supporting the work of these individuals I have Mr. J. Kenny, of the Research and Planning Directorate; Mr. Gudmundson, of the Manitoba Health Services Commission; and Mr. Werbeniuk, of Community Health Services."

Then of course all the subcommittees were Dr. Bankier, Chair Day Committee and different people, the expert as I said, psychiatric nurses and everybody was involved.

"Your suggestion to have three coalition members appointed to the committee is accepted. To facilitate this, kindly forward to my office the name of six individuals that you wish me to consider for membership on the Planning Committee.

"Upon receipt of this I will announce the list of appointed persons as quickly as it is possible. With regard to your request to involve an additional three persons who would be resource people to three coalition appointed members, I am in support of this, and should you decide that it is a necessary support service to your group.

"However, I wish to bring to your attention that the process currently in place to support the Mental Health Planning Group will function as support for your group as well."

It was only one group. It wasn't that you were divorcing the two sides.

"Should you consider this as an adequate system of support you need not feel bound by having an additional three persons participating as resource people to this process.

"I wish to acknowledge your observation that the three appointed members from the coalition will serve as individuals representing the community and not as a representative of any given organization. I can support this approach as this will allow all individuals participating in the process to be without the constraint of having to adopt the prescribed posture on the issues that face the planning committee.

"Finally, with regard to the release of information I acknowledge your commitment to respect the confidentiality of the process. When the report is complete you may be assured that I will take whatever steps I feel are necessary before implementation of change.

"However, as this process was commissioned by me to provide the Ministry with timely advice on a variety of concerns, I am certain you will respect this in whatever decision I may make as regards both the release on information and the implementation of change."

We sent this letter and this was the reply.

MR. L. SHERMAN: That's the committee that is known as the Mental Health Steering Committee. Is that correct?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, it is. This was the letter that I received from Dr. Tefft on March 30th:

"Dear Mr. Minister: Thank you for your letter of March 16, 1983, agreeing to community representation on the working group on mental health. We wish to nominate the following six individuals for your consideration" - and their names. "As indicated in your letter you will appoint three individuals to the working group. We request that the remaining three nominees serve as resource people. We look forward to beginning collaborative planning as soon as possible and hope the advice produced will be both kindly and helpful."

Finally on the letter they received:

"Thank you for your letter of March 30th, proposing community representation for the working group in mental health. I am pleased to announce the appointment of the following three individuals to the committee: Sharon Gold, Brian Postl, David Waters." Brian Postl is an M.D. "And of course, at your request, I am pleased to accept the other nominees as resource people of the committee."

As I said, this was going to be ready, when they hesitated. We kept on working because it was a priority. The report would have been in my hand sometime in May or June and at their request - I didn't read all the documents - they wanted time to familiarize themselves. I agreed with that and postponed this and said that the date that we want the document would be July.

Now when I read this article I thought it was most unfair. It's true that these people are coming as individuals. At their request, they're going to work and if they accept this, they could accept it in good faith, the same as we're taking the trouble of delaying it, to make sure that they can participate. We're treating them as any other members of the committee. It has taken all the expertise that we can muster here in the province to bring in the best possible recommendations and the Executive Director of the Canadian Mental Health Association would make a statement like that and to say that - well, I've got the statement here somewhere. "He said a review committee which has been established to examine mental health care, would include representation from private groups. Martin, however, is skeptical. He is concerned the government will make major financial and policy decisions without public input. That appears to be precisely what this Mental Health Steering Committee is doing, it appears to be committed to working in secret. We believe that it should be a public study."

Well, I think that if they didn't want to participate in that, it was their affair. You have a group that is told that they should be more militant, that's their job. That doesn't mean that we have to go along with that. This is their job and we are working and if they want to keep us on our toes, fine. I think that we are supposed to do our job correctly and we'll see what the recommendations are. We haven't decided the next step. It might be that we will make it public even before the recommendations, that we will have public meetings. That's possible, we'll see what the recommendations are. I doubt that it's possible to keep the findings of that very secret for very long anyway. It certainly is not my intention to do that.

So I am very disappointed in this individual who, after we took the trouble of meeting with them at their request. We've had many meetings. They have met with Pascoe to sort this thing out. They make suggestions. We accept all their recommendations, the final recommendations that they make. We set up the committee. We postpone the date that we want the report for two months and this is the kind of thank-you we have, so I'm awfully glad that you brought this thing up.

This is not to say, of course, we're not going through all this exercise if we feel that everything is perfect or everything is fine. I have mentioned that. We're not satisfied; we have a lot of improvement to do but, having said that, we are not any worse than other provinces. They might be better in some aspects. We might be

better in some other area. On the whole, Canada is doing poorly in this field.

Let's remember also that the Federal Government could take part of the credit for that. You know, we've had medical and hospitalization here for a number of years now and at no time, no matter what the provinces tried, there was no participation of the Federal Government in this field of Mental Health. Now the Minister is suggesting to the provinces that, fine, they should have a new Act. They should incorporate everything. We must have a responsibility including mental health, but without any financial participation at all.

So, you know, that's very easy to wave the flag and say, you've got to do this, you've got to do that, but they have never showed us the colour of their money. As I say, when Medicare and hospitalization came in and it was a matching-dollar formula that, of course, it's the easy way and the way that the provinces went. They would much sooner spend a 50-cent dollar than a full dollar. In other words, if they can get 50 cents back, they would do it. That caused a lot of the problems, by the way, that we have now.

For instance, that's why we have had too many acute beds built probably in many of the areas like Ontario, where they were trying to close hospitals. Probably too many of the people are used to it now. It is a difficult thing to do. The guidelines are probably the most generous of any country in the world, or close to it. And we didn't have the personal care homes. This is why we're finding trouble now, because there was no help in those areas until about '74 or '75 - oh, yes, in '77 when they changed the formula, where they said it'll be block funding and now they want to tell us what to do with this block funding. So, I got carried away a bit, but I'm giving you the idea that is probably one of the reasons that all the provinces are probably not quite as advanced. You know, we're measuring that and what we're doing in other fields and we're doing quite well. Even the medical profession themselves have not always regarded the psychiatrists as equals and so on, so it's been a difficult thing to sell this. I think more and more people realize that there is a need for these people, a need for this care, that health is not just physical health, but complete health is medical health also. That's why, as I say, we're probably behind, but we're doing everything we can to bring in the recommendation and bring in policies, and we certainly don't need this kind of encouragement by people that are represented on our task force.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister said a number of times that he would like to have more community involvement in the entire field of mental health, certainly in the advisory capacity and from the names that he read from that Steering Committee, of possibly 12 names or so, only three are really from the community, from what I understand the rest of them are pretty well civil servants. I wonder if the Minister thinks that these three people, is that going to be adequate to carry the message into the community and to express the concern of community? We're talking about the entire province and certainly of those areas

in which we have mental institutions. I wonder if the Minister has taken this under consideration and maybe looking at appointing more people onto that Steering Committee from the community?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I wish I could express myself better in English or that the honourable friend could understand French. I didn't mention 12 names, I mentioned five names: Pascoe, who was hired to do research, it doesn't matter who he's paid for; Prosen, who is not a civil servant, who is the chief man here as far as the university is concerned in teaching; our own Dr. Kovacs, the Chief Psychiatrist, it would be a hell of a committee if we didn't have the Chief Psychiatrist on it; we also have the two, Don McLean and Werbeniuk, who are working in the community, who will have to work with the community and deliver some of these services.

Now, that is the Steering Committee, but I have also mentioned that they gave us six names, there will be three that will be added to that, so that will be eight. Then that's four and four, if you dock Prosen, if it's a stigma to be paid by the Provincial Government, if it makes their expertise less valuable, we'll have four and four.

Then there are all kinds of subcommittees. I haven't got all the names of subcommittees. I told you that there was one chaired by Dr. Arnot, this is the Steering Committee that is getting all this thing done. I don't know, how many subcommittees do we have?

STAFF MEMBER: At least 11.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There are at least 11 subcommittees. Many of them have people, and they weren't taking advantage of anybody that has any knowledge at all that is ready to work. Then, of course, we have added research people for the committee and resource people, and the group has named another three that we've accepted as that. So, I don't think that we're closing the door to the volunteers. We're not going to hire somebody, we're not going to take somebody just because he or she is a volunteer. They have to have something to offer and we have enough problems of our own. There are some of these groups that I could tell you why they are in deep water, but I'm not going to do that, that's not my role. But I do resent that article and that statement. From anybody else, fine, because people can get fed up and want to see the things moved, but not from a person that should know better and that has attended to these meetings and that belongs to a group that accepted this and requested it.

MR. A. BROWN: Well, I think, Mr. Chairman, it probably would be a little easier to understand if we had some kind of a graph for the entire Department of Health, if we could see how Mental Health, how it was structured, who was responsible to who. It would certainly make it easy for us to understand if we could have that type of a graph given us. It certainly would be very helpful.

Just before dinner, we were talking about de-institutionalization and I wonder if the Minister can give me some of the statistics on de-institutionalization. I

know it is something that has been going on for a number of years now. Can the Minister tell me how many patients have been moved from the institution to the community in 1981-82?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It is difficult as I covered that this afternoon and we also covered that when we had the hospitals earlier, and I haven't got that information now. Remember that we've had Brandon Mental Health Centre and Selkirk Mental, we passed all that already and I gave that information. I'm sure that you'll find this in Hansard if you don't mind reading it now. This is a bit different, this is more the Forensic Services here, the Children's Psychiatric Services and this is the new directorate we're looking at. I'll try to find it if you want to be patient, but we're spinning our wheels, we're going back to things we've covered.

MR. A. BROWN: If we're going to do any evaluation at all, Mr. Minister, then we've got to have some of these statistics in order to see how successful we have been, which direction we hope to go and what we hope to achieve.

It seems to me that there are a lot of statistics that are not available and we need these statistics in order to evaluate programs. We need to know for instance, how many have been de-institutionalized and how many had to go back into the institution. We need to know how many of these that have been de-institutionalized patients are receiving continuing outpatient care. We need all these statistics in order if we're going to do an evaluation at all.

I have received some mental health statistics from Statistics Canada and I was just looking through that the other day. This made me wonder really about how many statistics are we forwarding. I don't know if the Minister has had an opportunity to look through this. It's statistics that are sent out by Statistics Canada every year. This is for the year, 1979-80. It came out in February. That's the latest report that they have. But I notice that Manitoba is not really sending in the data that is required. There's a note over here in No. 1, and it says, it's only reported summary data only. It is not an accurate data process at all. On the other page where all the other provinces have listed the number of persons, male or female, Manitoba is one of the provinces that has not sent in any statistics at all.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: What year is that?

MR. A. BROWN: This is 1979-80. That's the latest report that is out on statistics. I know what the Minister is going to say. He's going to say, well, we were not in power at that time, that is correct. But I would like to know if something has been done about that since then.

I notice, Mr. Minister, that in last year's Estimates we have a Statistics Branch listed as under No. 2.(d). This year, we only have a very brief mention made of statistics under - what is it - 1.(b), I believe it was? We have no separate grants for statistics at all. How are we going to evaluate programs if we are not going to provide statistics and if we don't have the statistics that are needed? I am wondering what the Minister is intending to do with that entire section of statistics

which has always been in the Estimates book up until now.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I am too generous to point out that this was the year that you were in office.

MR. L. SHERMAN: We were busy doing other things.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, and so am I. Some of it, you should discuss under Vital Statistics, but I don't know what statistics you're talking about. I can say that we have looked at that though. I think I announced last year that we had amalgamation of the Planning and Research activity in my department and the Health Services Commission. Now this has been proven that we have been able to do it with less people and it's been much more efficient. We intend to do the same thing, as a sound statistical base is also, as the member said, an essential foundation for research and planning. The consolidation of the statistical function with the department and the Commission, we hope will represent a more efficient means through which this will be accomplished, but you've got to have these figures to be able to do that.

I would think that a lot of the statistics will come from the work of these different subcommittees, these 11 or more subcommittees that we have. They are out there to do the research and there is no doubt that has been discussed as my friend, the Member for Fort Garry, knows. We have had exchanges between provinces and that is in the process of being built up now by the different provinces and coordinated by Ottawa.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Excuse me, I should say, I'm sure that the statistics that you were after, I did answer that question earlier. So if you look in Hansard - we haven't had that many days - if you look under Brandon and Selkirk Hospital. But I can tell you this that in 1968, the population of Selkirk was 1,250; in 1982, it was 375, so that should give you a pretty good indication. Now in the same period, 1968 in Brandon, there were 1,800; in 1982, there's 550 in Brandon, so that's an indication that we are progressing, but I am not going to read all that. My colleague, the Minister of Community Services and Corrections passed this on to me but I had it in my notes.

I would like to direct you to the March 28th issue of Maclean's - it's not that long ago - and you'll see under Health, the article is, "No Room for the Disabled." I think that they have explain now that it's not that simple; that you don't just close the door of the hospital, put everybody on the street and think that things will be improved and it will cost less money. I think that it will certainly add a little weight to the statement that I made, that we wish to do it in an orderly fashion.

We welcome working with the communities. Whatever information, we will gladly share it with the Federal Government and the other provinces. As I say, we are trying to make this by coordinating the statistical branch of our department and the Commission. We feel that this will be done a little better.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Am I to understand then that the Statistics Branch as it was previously noted in our Annual Report, is not going to exist anymore, but it's going to be fragmented throughout various areas? I am not quite clear as to what the Minister said.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm not going to read it at all. I think that you have received the statistical vote in Volume 2, No. 4, October-December, 1982, from our department. This comes on a recorder and this is all on the Department of Health. They have the Brandon population, different quarters. They have all that, if you follow this. There is also the Brandon Mental Health Centre, separation, Selkirk. There is the community mental health active case load movement by region. So you might have to take those words back once you read this. There might be more information than you can read.

MR. A. BROWN: I suppose that's one report that I have missed somewhere along the line, that I maybe have not read. If all that information is in there, then of course I'm going to make sure that I am going to take a look at that report. But the Minister still has not answered the question. Where are these people going to stay in Statistics, that we had under last year's Estimates? We had a separate grouping, Statistics, in our Annual Report. From what I understand now from the Minister that this is going to be fragmented through various areas, or what's going on?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I just said that we are amalgamating the staff, the department of the Commission and also the ones of our department to make it more efficient, the same as we did with the Planning and we feel that this will improve it. I don't know if that answers the question. That's what we propose to do at this time. Then, of course, a lot of this should be taken with my honourable friend who is Minister responsible for Statistics in general.

MR. A. BROWN: Okay, I suppose my question really is then: Next year, are we again going to see in the Annual Report a special section on Statistics that we always used to see, or are we not going to see this?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You will, but probably not under the Department of Health. It will probably be at the Commission, but you'll get the same information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister to reconfirm what I think I heard him say a moment ago and that is, that he is realigning the Statistics Branch that was in his department and moving it under the Manitoba Health Services Commission. Is that correct?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm not talking about the Department of Vital Statistics now. But the branch, those that were accumulating statistics, there were a few people in the department and some at the Commission were co-ordinating and getting the two together in one department that will serve both. We did this with Research and Planning also.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm not talking about Vital Statistics either, that's in Community Services. I'm talking about the Statistics Branch of the Department of Health. There were four persons in that branch and the Minister uses the term "co-ordinating." What I'm asking him is, is he realigning it, moving it out of the department and into the Manitoba Health Services Commission?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes we are.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well then, Mr. Chairman, my next question would be to the Minister, why? Why is he doing that?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, my honourable friend will remember that there were people working on statistics at the Health Services Commission also. We're getting these people together in one department serving both. We think there'll be less duplication; we think that they'll be more efficient. We did exactly the same thing to Research and Planning. We filled the positions that were vacant because it was a priority and it is working very, very well.

It's not the easiest thing to get proper people for Directors also. You would have one Director instead of two in a smaller group and you'll have more people to do the work, so you might have more specialists. This was a suggestion that we accepted. For one thing, it will save some money and we're pretty well assured that it'll be even more efficient than it was and that's exactly what happened to the Planning. I know for a fact Planning because we've had it for a while now and it's working very, very well.

We might look at other areas. We might do some more of that. We might do some more of the Administration together. I think that the government, as such, should look to see a group doing the Administration for maybe five or six smaller departments. I think that's going to come. I think that is streamlining the operation and I think if you have the proper experts, it could be done. You have departments now that are sharing the Administration for Co-op Development and Recreation, Fitness and Sports and it's still a small department. I think that you can probably have more specialized service. That's my view, it's not necessarily accepted by the Cabinet as such, but we are going to look and it's possible we will do more.

We thought very seriously of doing away with the Commission, as my honourable friend did before us and as I did before him, and as everybody did. We felt there was some advantages of keeping it. For instance, in Planning, I'm not going to pretend that they never talked to the Minister - that's not true. But they are at least a more independent, probably less partisan facility. I think there are advantages in having at least a semblance of arms' length and certain things they can do because of the Act. If we got rid of that, we could get rid of the Act. There'd probably be more red tape in certain areas, so I think it's working well. We've cut the - well, we'll talk about that. The Commission - there is less of them and they don't meet as often, but the thing is if we can streamline, it's the same government and the same Minister and so on, so we

can streamline the two and co-operate between the two. We'll certainly keep on doing that.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister contemplating moving other components of the Department of Health into the Commission? The Minister's quite correct, of course, when he talks about the consideration that's been given to abandoning the concept of the Commission under two successive governments, the question as to whether the Commission should be eliminated and folded into the department. He's now talking about doing the precise opposite. Instead of folding the Commission into the department, he's folding the department into the Commission. How many other components of the department is he planning to move into the Commission? Actually this can come under the Commission item.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No the planning responsibility came to the department. There's probably more statistics to be had at the Commission and if it doesn't work like that, we can bring them back and they're working very, very closely with the people on the Research and Planning. That's what they're there for, to get this information so they can help in the Planning. So I don't think that it's all one or all the other that we keep the Commission the way it was for 50 years or more, or whatever, or that we take the Commission over.

I think that's the best bet, is if we can salvage the best of both worlds, if we can keep the Act the way it is and keep the situation, but I think it would be a big mistake if we do not try to co-ordinate things as much. It's the same Minister for one thing, we're doing more and more of that. No matter what happens, those that had a Commission and got rid of it are sorry, and the others are thinking of doing it. So we're very careful and the main thing is that they work together and that's being done very, very well at this time.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I agree with the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that one should not be hasty about dismantling one's Commission, or folding it into the department, or eliminating it. I agree with him that among those provinces that have done it, there is a split attitude and opinion as to whether it should have been done or not. Many who got rid of their Commission now would like to have their Commissions back again. When I was Minister, many of my counterparts from other provinces advised me not to disband the Commission; they told me the last thing to do was to fold the Commission into the department. We wrestled with the same question and I agree with the Minister that the Commission serves a very valuable function. I can see very strong arguments for retaining it in its conventional capacity and form.

But we're talking about two different things in the area of statistics or statistical responsibility, when we're talking about the Commission, which is the insuring agency and the agency that has responsibility for all the insured programs and statistics in the Department of Health, which has to do generally with public health and mental health and health programs and services delivered to the communities and the regions. It would

seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that there are specific individual responsibilities, statistical responsibilities, that are separate in the Department of Health from those that exist in the arithmetical, mathematical, insuring agency which is the Commission dealing specifically with insured services, the accountability of insured programs, the numbers of persons receiving insured programs and the costs of those programs, etc., etc. So it comes as something of a surprise that the Minister would be pursuing amalgamation of departmental statistics and Commission statistics, and it intrigues me that given the fact that he's considering amalgamation, that he's moving in the direction he is and folding the departmental people into the Commission, rather than going the other way and folding the Commission statistics people into the department. That's what gives rise to my question as to whether he's contemplating moving other components of the department, as such, into the Commission, or whether at this point in time he's just dealing with construction, planning and with statistics.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think I misunderstood the original question. As I said, one of the reasons we started is when we looked at the Budget, we wanted some funds to do certain things. We had seen that the planning was doing quite well and that's when we decided to amalgamate the two. Now there is a certain amount of data - I'm not talking about that - I'm talking about statistics for research mostly. So they would have access to some of that data that's in the Commission and so on.

Now as far as going to one instead of the other, that's the part I didn't quite understand. It is not officially at the Commission or at the department. Mr. Pascoe is looking at it, because it is very close to research and planning and it might be that it might go under the Director of Planning. It could very well stay with the - that's the part that I didn't understand - department. But the main thing is that they work together. I don't care what they call it, just that they work together.

MR. L. SHERMAN: In the change that's contemplated and the realignment that's taking place, Mr. Chairman, are the four personnel who constituted that Statistics Branch being retained and moving together into the new environment and the new context wherein they will be working jointly for the Commission and the department? I'll rephrase the question, Mr. Chairman. Are the four people in the Statistics Branch being retained, or is that number being reduced?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There were three or four at the Commission and there were four in the department. Three of the four at the department will join the others. Where they go, that's going to be decided later on. The person that was the director at the department is reassigned with Services for Seniors, I think, yes.

MR. L. SHERMAN: When the Minister and his officials look at amalgamations and realignments of this kind, do they detect any areas of duplication? Do they detect, for example, that in taking three of four people from the Statistics Branch in Health and merging them with three or four people in Statistics Branch or component

in the Commission, that it gives them seven or eight people where they may only need four or five? Is that the reason why the Director of the Statistics Branch of the Department of Health is being reassigned, or would there be other reasons for that reassignment?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, no. It might be that others might move, depending on the work that is needed. The situation is that you had two directors and now you have only the one department, if you want to call it such no matter where it's going to be, and you don't need two directors. So that is why we reassigned or redeployed one of the directors.

MR. L. SHERMAN: But definite plans have been formulated to reassign the Director of the Statistics Branch of the Department of Health within the Department of Health somewhere. Is that correct? There is a position of substantial responsibility, if not equivalent responsibility, being made available for that person, or is that person being phased out of the Department of Health altogether?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, there has been discussion with that person and the senior personnel in our department. He has been reassigned at no reduction in pay or anything. It's been red-circled, but certainly there has been no thought or no talk of phasing that position out or trying a power-play to get rid of him.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm satisfied with the Minister's answer. I appreciate it. The subject in general that I suppose we perhaps could have been discussing under the Commission section of the Estimates but, since we were dealing here with statistics it seemed convenient to explore it. I think we have covered it as thoroughly as I wanted it covered at this juncture, and I think my colleague, the Member for Rhineland, concurs in that.

So I want to go back to the subject of Community Mental Health and the integrity of our mental health services in general for a few more moments. My colleague from Rhineland raised some questions, and I think there are still some questions that disturb and concern a lot of us in this area. I would like to follow them up with the Minister.

He pointed out in response to my colleague from Rhineland, that statistics for discharges from the mental health centres had been provided in earlier discussions in the Estimates, and that's correct. On Page 1509 of Hansard for Thursday, the 7th of April, the Minister, in responding to questions from me, Mr. Chairman, provided us with the in-patient population figures and the outpatient population figures for both the Brandon and Selkirk Mental Health Centres for the past several years. They reflected a generally steady population but a slight continuing downward trend insofar as in-patients are concerned, and probably a stable population or a slight increase insofar as outpatients are concerned, so that aspect of my colleague's question was answered.

But I think there was another aspect to his question or at least there was an implication to it that I'd like to pursue with the Minister and that is, when we look at figures of that kind, admittedly we are looking at

in-patient populations and at rates of discharge, but it would not be accurate to say, I presume - and I put this in the form of a question to the Minister - would it be accurate to say that those who were discharged are going into the community health support stream? I doubt that it's always the case. In other words, if he is receiving treatment in Selkirk and I am receiving treatment in Brandon and we are both discharged next Monday, do we both go into the Community Mental Health Support System stream? That doesn't necessarily represent a clear transfer from institutionalization to de-institutionalization, does it?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, they'd be out of the institution, but some of them might need no care at all.

Most of them though will be followed through. They would go into mental health programs. Some of them might end up in Sarah Riel, for instance, for a short time. It serves as a kind of a halfway house.

Then we're opening another one of those - is it Linden? - Linden Place is another one. Or they might have need a foster home. That program my friend is familiar with, so, you know, it's pretty hard to tell exactly where they're going to be. Some of them might be treated by a private psychiatrist also.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman, but let me put it this way. It's my understanding that the concept of de-institutionalization is to take a patient requiring treatment out of an institution, release that patient into the community and give him or her treatment in the community. It's not that we are cured and we are discharged from the facility, it's that we are transferred from the institution into the community and then supported there.

So just looking at the in-patient population figures for Brandon and Selkirk doesn't really answer the question as to how successful is the de-institutionalization program.

I think that's one of the things that my colleague from Rhineland was trying to get at. How many patients moved from institutions to the Community Mental Health System in 1981 and '82, for example? Not just how many patients were released from Brandon and Selkirk. Does the Minister and his officials have any reading or handle on those kinds of statistics?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, I can give you an example on this December 22nd quarterly of the statistical bulletin. On page 6, for instance, they had in Brandon, they had for October to December a total discharge - male 32, and 19 were readmitted, some are readmitted, but there were 32 altogether. There were - well, I shouldn't say it's necessarily the same people, but others that were there before that might have been discharged a year before, or six months before. The female was 17, new, and readmission was 23. Total for male - 49; total for the female - 42, that was 91 altogether.

Now, some of them will, as I say, be private patients of a doctor of their choice. Others might go to some kind of a halfway house where they might not need a bed, but they come in and spend the day there, such as Sarah Riel. There used to be a drop-in centre at

the Canadian Mental Health Association, that's not there any longer. Others will be living with families in the - what do they call that program, those that are living with families - in foster homes. Then there is respite care for foster homes also. There's some that'll be in the programs, let's say, at Grace Hospital. Some will probably end up in filling beds in the acute hospital psychiatric ward. Yes, there is alternate day care programs.

Some others will probably not be treated, will walk the street, and that's where the problem is. Oh, and I forgot of course, some will go, they're still in some type of an institution, but in a community residence, I guess it's not considered - but they're still together.

So, the thing is that we could close the doors tomorrow, but if we haven't got enough of these people that can be treated as walk-in patients, and if we're not providing the service that's where we're going wrong, and I suspect that is what happened all across Canada and probably all over the world.

This is a fairly new field and we're going, as much as possible, to give the treatment for day people, but we will need some community residents also. I don't think that we'll be ahead of the game if we replace all the institutions by putting all community residents either. The idea is to try to give them the service and the encouragement that they need, and some of them are not quite ready, they're not sick enough to warrant being kept 24 hours-a-day. They're a little unsure, they need a place for a short time, a shorter time, some place like Sarah Riel, for instance, which is fairly small.

So, I think that this is exactly what that committee is going to do, I hope, is give us the recommendation of working people in the community also and if volunteer agencies will be able to tie up these programs to make sure that we're not getting people out of the institution with no place to go and no service, which would be worse than ever.

Generally, most patients that are discharged from either Selkirk or Brandon will always be in some kind of a program that requires continuing support. There's not too many of them, especially those that have been there for a while, that can go out and eventually they'll be on their own. They'll always need some kind of a program.

MR. L. SHERMAN: So basically, Mr. Chairman, what the Minister is saying is that the de-institutionalization stream is maintained for the most part in the community by the community mental health support system and that will always be the case. So the pressures, and priorities, and demands for better, stronger community mental health support systems and infrastructure will continue to build, particularly if we continue with the philosophy of de-institutionalization.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister is quoted in one of these articles as saying that mental health care facilities would be one of the government's major priorities for 1983-84.

Well perhaps before I get to that, Mr. Chairman, going back to some of the media reports, particularly the Free Press articles that were the subject of discussion half an hour ago, the Executive Director of the Canadian Mental Health Association, Manitoba Division, Mr. Martin, is quoted in one of those articles as saying that

despite the government's official support of de-institutionalization over the past decade and despite the feeling all across North America that community-based programs are superior when properly developed, almost nothing has been done. Then in a direct quote Mr. Martin is reported to have said, "There is a critical need for all kinds of services. Some people are just in desperate straits."

Then the Minister is quoted as admitting, "We're weak in that." Would the Minister mind explaining to the committee if he is quoted accurately and if Mr. Martin is quoted accurately what does he mean, "We're weak in that." Mr. Martin has said, "There is a critical need for all kinds of services. Some people are just in desperate straits." I'd be interesting in knowing what the Minister means by his rejoinder that we are weak in that. If in fact this is an accurate report of an exchange of comments by those two persons, Mr. Martin and the Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, there was an article written on Saturday, that's the article that I saw Saturday that kind of left me a bit incensed and I was called on Saturday afternoon during suppertime - not the best time to conduct an interview - by the reporter who asked me if I'd seen the article, if I could comment and he asked me questions. The first thing that I said is what I said here today, that I felt that it was quite unfortunate because these people had been invited, and I found it pretty odd that somebody who had accepted and who is now in the process - or at least his organization is in the process - of trying to do Research and Planning and prepare a recommendation for the government, should make a statement like that. I certainly won't back away from that.

Now, he mentioned that this person overgeneralized. You can make this statement pretty well in everything, in poverty, in pension, in home care. You could do it pretty well everywhere to say there are some people who are in desperate need. You name it, I'll find somebody in desperate need. We'll be looking at the Alcoholic Foundation pretty soon. I'm sure there are some people that are in desperate need there. There is so much human beings can do.

The member asked me to comment on where I said it was a priority. It has been and I've said that - I said it's a priority. First of all, we want to know that we're doing the right thing; it is fairly new compared to other programs. So that was the priority of our Director of Planning. That is what he's doing now. That's why the report was going to come so fast because we didn't wait. If the people wanted to join us, fine, if not, we still had to do the work. That's the first responsibility.

What I said, "We're weak in that," I meant - I'm talking about mental health, I don't know if those are the words, it could be that's the way I speak but I meant in the field of Community Services in Mental Health - compare. That's all relative if I'm talking about comparing what we do in some of the programs that we have in gerontology and some of the other areas and that's exactly what I meant. It doesn't mean that we're not interested, that we're not going to do anything, or nothing has been done. I know that my friend who was a Minister before me was quite interested in that also, but I think he would have to admit that if we

compare that to other programs in gerontology - and not necessarily the government's fault, it is a little harder to detect. One of the reasons I took the responsibility that in 1975 when I was Minister of Health when everybody was gung ho to close the institution, we caused problems because we were closing the door but there was nobody out there to receive them. The population that has evolved a lot since then, a community that now accepts more of these responsibilities, including the schools and the teachers who didn't want to see anybody. The society in those days used to say, well, get them out of town somewhere and that's the best place. We're not doing that. That has to change; society is responsible. Then we didn't have the proper staff and training, the people that we wanted to get involved and there weren't the facilities in the program, that's what I meant. I still say that compared to other areas we're weak, but we hope to beef that up and that being weak doesn't mean that nothing has been done over the years or that we have nothing at all. It is somewhere where we want to beef it up.

I guess maybe in 20 years, the Minister of Health might well say the same, that maybe they're weak in that because it's probably one of the most difficult things to do, dealing with these people. I think that we need for instance more community residences such as Sarah Riel in St. Boniface and Linden Place in Winkler - what's the capacity there? - 20 or 30 or something, 16 at Sarah Riel. In a population like we have, that's not that many. I think we need more of those, but they're costly also. Sarah Riel, we're asking for \$268.6 this year; it was 227 the year before. Linden Place was 137.6, so these things all add on. That's for 24 people.

A new community residence sponsored by the Friends of Schizophrenics will become operational in Winnipeg in July, 1983 and as I say, there is need for more community residences for Winnipeg and rural areas.

So, this is what I meant when I said that we can not compare it. I meant in my department, that's one of the places that I feel where we're the weakest, and also because of the difficulty to get the psychiatrists and the people in that field.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is reported to have said and he has indicated again in his comments tonight that mental health care facilities will be one of the government's major priorities for 1983-84. — (Interjection) — well, he's quoted as saying that mental health care facilities would be one of the government's major priorities for 1983-84.

Can he just elaborate on that point for the committee so that we understand each other and we understand where the government is headed, what the government is attempting to do and what may be in his Capital program which he will be announcing later this week? I put this question to him, fully recognizing the financial constraints under which the taxpayers of Manitoba have to operate and, as a consequence, he has to operate. I do not think we should be creating the impression, or a reporter should be creating the impression, or the Minister or I should be creating the impression that there is a great surge coming in mental health care facilities if there is not a great surge coming in mental health care facilities. I'm not insisting that there be a

great surge in facilities at this juncture, because it all takes money and I don't know where the Minister is going to get the money, but there's got to be something. If there aren't facilities there's got to be manpower and womanpower in the professional field in the Community Mental Health field to provide the necessary support that the field requires. I'd just like to be clear on where the Minister feels he's headed; where the department's headed; where his priorities are, and if he is planning to move vigorously in the building of new mental health facilities, or if he's planning rather to move vigorously in the expansion of community mental health supports and community mental health programs.

I know that one major facility is coming in the form of the Adolescent Psychiatric Facility which we've talked about and that will certainly be a very very welcome addition to our mental health spectrum in this province. I certainly greet it, await it and welcome it with considerable enthusiasm and also a considerable feeling of having a vested interest in it because as the Minister has done with his government, I with my government and my government colleagues when we were in office, played a significant part in trying to move the system along, the department along and the Treasury Board along to the point where we could build that facility. Now, through those combined efforts over a period of years, we're getting it, it's coming and we're all very glad to see it.

Over and above that, I think that I can point with some pride and satisfaction to some rather specific and rather important physical additions that we made to the mental health care plant spectrum in Manitoba. We built the new emergency psychiatric facility at the Health Sciences Centre. We converted the MacEwan Residence at St. Boniface into a psychiatric centre, a mental health centre with in-patient capability of some 55 to 60 beds. We ensured that a substantial number of beds at the new Seven Oaks Hospital were reserved for psychiatric purposes and I frankly would like to see a greater conversion of beds at Seven Oaks from other medical configurations into psychiatric beds. We approved and launched the new free-standing psychiatric facility, chronic care facility at the Grace Hospital. So I take some considerable pride in having been part of a government that did specifically go out and build mental health facilities and psychiatric facilities and buildings and institutions and plants that were needed and beds that were needed.

I would just like to know from the Minister whether he believes that he's got the capability and flexibility in his Budget and in his Capital Program, and I know what constraints he's under, to continue with that kind of thrust, if that's what he means when he says that mental health care facilities will be one of the government's major priorities for 1983-84, or, Mr. Chairman, failing that, if he's going to do the next best thing at least and pour as much energy, effort and available resources as he can into expansion of psychiatric programs and community mental health programs, and perhaps, expansion of community residences of the type represented by Sarah Riel.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, first of all when I said that it would be a priority, and we needed more. I'm talking about more programs in the whole thing and

yes, facilities also, but certainly not only facilities. All right, so far this is what we've done in the year, year and a half.

We're got this committee working on it which I keep repeating. I think it's one of the most important things we've done. A lot depends on what happens, what kind of recommendations, what we do in that. This other area my honourable friend mentioned - areas that they had planned - I don't want to take anything away from anybody but I think that if we're going to talk about things that a government is responsible, it's when does the actual construction start. I think that's the important thing. That doesn't mean I think that all governments keep on and work together if we're going to make a measurement.

All right, what have we done so far? There's been this hospital that start building - the Adolescent Hospital is one. We have the funds over - I know that was talked about. That was planned and I hope we'll continue planning like this that things are not going to change every time there's a change of government. But the money wasn't there. The money is there now, as I announced in Brandon and Selkirk. I froze that until we found out a little bit more about it but this has been approved by Cabinet. That could start anytime. We're looking at the situation at the General Hospital in Brandon, for instance. The plans are that this be built in the way that it could be converted to a personal care home, if need be. So this is an area that we could move in, well, in Brandon and Selkirk - there's quite a few million dollars there.

As I said this afternoon, we've asked the Health Sciences Centre if they could advance the free-standing psychiatric centre out there, if that could be done without damage to the overall plan. We're waiting to hear from them also. If the possibility of that is done then that would release the present building and Dr. Bankier also would keep that.

There has been more funds given to Sarah Riel. In Linden Place we're asking for more funds. We will have a talk of other new community residences that will be started. We're spending money to try to recruit, have a program to recruit psychiatrists, also, and we're trying to get more mental health workers in the region. It's not a comparison. There was none before. I'm just saying what we're doing. I hope the former Minister doesn't believe it when I said we're weak in that - that was meant anything for the past government. Not more for his government or the government that I was in before. It was something that I think we have to admit. We're not as much advanced as we are in other areas and I think that, quite correctly, I stated that one of the responsibilities for that - there's many reasons for that. It is a difficult field in the area. It is a newer science than many of the other disciplines, and also because of the funding, the way the funding was handled before that it was cost-sharing with another field and that was always disregarded and a lot of province and people took the easy way out and spent the fifty-cents dollar as I said. So yes I certainly don't back down on that in the kind of year that we have. I think there's quite a bit.

There's also the Grace Hospital that we'll be opening. There's 20, 26 beds there. Well, there'll be 25 beds. I mentioned that the Adolescent Psychiatric and 20 extended psychiatric at Grace, Selkirk and Brandon.

Those are all not new beds at least to replace beds that are pretty well obsolete.

So I think that in the last while I know that I was just as sincere prior to 1977 as I am now and I know that the former Minister did everything we can and we might not progress. For instance, there is nothing I wanted more - nothing! - I can't think of anything that I wanted more for all the reasons in the world, for the reason that I was getting embarrassed, for one of them, that this adolescent psychiatric hospital - I know that I told staff many times and Dr. Tavener, I'll kill you if you don't start before next year, because every year we were announcing it, nothing was being done.

It was very difficult, as you know. We looked at the old Grace Hospital. We talked to, I think, the present Grace Hospital. We talked to everybody and finally it's going. So it's going to take a while. We want a blueprint. We want to know where we're going. We are going to ask the community, the volunteers, to participate. I don't really think that the kind of a wild statement and generalization saying that Manitoba is worse than all the other provinces, I don't think that is necessary or helpful or true.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I don't think it is particularly helpful either, Mr. Chairman, and I want to assure the Minister that I don't believe everything I read in the media. I was in the media, myself, for too long, 17 or 18 years. So he doesn't need to worry about that, but I do think there is some cause for concern among me and among many of us and any of us to read, for example, that "Canadian Mental Health Association figures show . . ." - and now I'm quoting again, Mr. Chairman, directly from last Saturday's front-page article in the Free Press - ". . . that Manitobans spend more days per capita in mental institutions (three times more than Saskatchewan residents and twice as many as Ontario residents); have a higher percentage of chronically-ill people who are not receiving even minimal care, and yet pay more for mental health care." That is a direct assertion by the reporter, one Barbara Huck, who wrote that particular front-page article in the Free Press.

I agree with what the Minister says, but I think he has to recognize that for those of us who have a concern for the mental health system in this province - and that includes the Minister, it includes Dr. Kovacs, and it includes Mr. Edwards, and it includes Mr. Maynard, and it includes Mr. Sherman, and it includes everybody else in this committee - that that's a rather disturbing thing to read. I would like to know where the Canadian Mental Health Association gets that kind of a position and whether the Minister has any communication with the Canadian Mental Health Association or not on subjects of this nature.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: As I said, Mr. Chairman, I read this article like everybody else when I received my paper on Saturday. I was very disturbed. The first thing I did was get in touch - my Deputy Minister was not available - with Dr. Kovacs and asked him to check this. Now, he has no idea where these figures come from. We hope that this is the - they will certainly verify it with this committee that we have going. Now, Dr. Kovacs looked at this report and he assures me that Manitoba is not singled out, rather that most people are poor.

This was commissioned by the study that they named the people on it themselves; also that was commissioned by this group to see what role they could play, I guess, and they told them that they - which Mr. Martin didn't say at all - should determine, define a role for them.

I know, in discussions that we have had at times, they weren't really sure what they wanted and I think that probably this happened in the past. I think that they are willing now and they want to do very seriously and sincerely, but they are advocates and they're going to push. That works with certain people and it works less with - I'd sooner that we can discuss things truthfully and honestly and work with people than people are going to try and pressure me with this kind of thing. I don't like that style at all. I hope that I will never be a kind of a Minister who needs to be pressured into doing things. It might work on somebody else.

The first chance I will have, if he's not privy to that already, I'll certainly let him know how I feel and ask them - it might be that we should ask them if they want to work with us on this, or if they feel that it's a waste of time, and they might as well know now. We might as well know now also. But I would hope that next year I can come back and say, yes, those figures are right or they were wrong. I hope that we will have this information and be able to make the comparisons and have recommendations and programs.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister asking his Mental Health Steering Committee to look into some of those assertions?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I just have one more question on this subject, and it has to do with the problem of schizophrenia and the chronic schizophrenics and what kind of services are available to them, and how the Minister is getting along with Dr. Sheila Kantor, and where are we going in the field of chronic schizophrenia.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I get along real well with Dr. Kantor. I worked through Dr. Prosen and it's the easiest way to work. I think they understand each other a lot better and there is no doubt that she has some good ideas. She's a dedicated person; not always the easiest person to deal with. So Dr. Prosen has been helpful on that.

I think again that this is - except that centre we are opening there - I don't think that we can determine any concrete policy at this time. I don't feel too good standing up and referring everything to this committee, but that's why we have this committee, to look at that, and we hope it will all be pieces of the puzzle. We'll be able to put the puzzle together. So, as I say, that will be very soon. In July we should have the report, so we should be able to answer these questions a lot clearer, a lot easier, come next debate on the Estimates.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Okay, Mr. Chairman, so the committee is looking at this problem too, the matter of services, capabilities, to meet the needs of schizophrenics, the chronic problem with schizophrenia, medication, in-patient treatment as against outpatient treatment, etc., etc. That's one of the issues being

addressed by this committee. The Minister has told this committee that the committee to which we are referring, the Mental Health Steering Committee, will be reporting to him in July. Presumably, its recommendations will be made public fairly shortly after that.

I would hope they would be made available to myself and other members of the Legislature within a reasonable period of time after that. I would like to hope that by September, by October, we see concrete results of that committee's work because, in my view, the three crucial areas in which this government, this province, and the government in Opposition collectively together in provinces like Manitoba must be moving in the 1980s and 1990s insofar as health care is concerned are the three fields of gerontology, the requirements to meet the changing age demographics and the needs of the aged; the field of mental health, psychiatric services and mental health and particularly community mental health; and the field of chemical — (Interjection) — well, prevention. The Minister can add his priorities after. I am giving him my three priorities.

First of all, the needs of the elderly, because of changing age demographics; secondly, the mental health field which is an area in which we obviously still have a great distance to come and a great deal to do; thirdly, the field of chemical dependency, alcohol and drug addiction and, particularly, that plague insofar as it affects our young people. Then, of course, we have to be looking at prevention, the whole field of lifestyle. I believe that dental services and good dental health are vitally important to general well-being too, and good nutrition. There are all kinds of additional fields and priorities. If I had to name my top three, they would be the three that I've cited and mental health is right there at the top of that list.

So I will be looking for some results from that committee. I hope that this isn't just an opportunity for the Minister and his staff to steer the problem over into somebody else's office, and let somebody else worry about it, and delay the process of resolving some of these challenges. I hope that the Minister's attitude to the Mental Health Steering Committee, Mr. Chairman, is one of vigorous interest and enthusiasm. I hope it's an attitude that says that that committee is going to be meaningful and is going to be doing something, and I'm going to keep at them and make sure they do something. They're there to do a job, not to bury the problems, not to spend months and months studying problems and avoiding decisions. We need some decisions and some forward movement in this area. So I will be after the Minister to produce that and I hope the Minister can assure me that that's equally his ambition.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well there's certain priorities. I look at the priorities in the department, maybe in kind of a different way. I look at priority of things that have been, for some reason or other, that we are in difficulty. Not necessarily that one is more important than the other. I certainly don't think that. I think it's very difficult to say, well, which one is the most important one. I think the most important one is if we're really weak, or something has to be done now, it doesn't mean that it should be at the expense of others. That's why it's so difficult to advance.

For instance, of course, the question of drugs and that could be the No. 1 right now, as far as that goes, but it's going quite well. It's fairly well organized. That's why I didn't include it in the priority. I'm not saying that that service is not wanted. They could be all kinds of acute care too in all of these things, but the priority I'm talking about, looking at the department the way I see it, is an area where I feel that we could improve, the others we keep on improving and that, for a certain time, to bring it up to par and so on, that we should move.

Gerontology was one that I had mentioned and that a number of years ago, and although we are catching up, I feel very proud of Manitoba. I think we're probably one of the leaders in the world in most of these programs, maybe not all of them. As I say, at the Conference on Aging that I attended in Vienna, we heard from all kinds of countries and Canada was right at the top. I'm sure, and I feel that Manitoba is probably very close to the top in most of these programs in Canada. But that, as the Member for Fort Garry said, because of the turn of the century especially there'll be a lot more people in the senior citizens bracket. The people are living longer now. They're healthier - prevention and so on, and they're becoming an important force too, a political force, which before they weren't. Now they're getting organized and we'll certainly hear from them.

So that is one of the reasons I put prevention, because I think probably also we could make a point of having that the first priority because prevention, if it prevents some of the things that we're concerned about, if we can do by certain things - immunization or certain care or education, keep people that won't need these services in mental health or any of these things. So you know it's very difficult to start prioritizing and I think that we were looking, when we talk about priority, we're not talking exactly the same thing. I'm talking about the things that I feel has to be done now.

Yes, I'm expecting an awful lot from that committee. For instance, that report - and they are not missing a bed. That report was found after that story on Saturday. I already have copies of the report. They're going to study that. The honourable member was talking about Dr. Kantor - well, we've asked the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Manitoba - this is what I meant - to comment on the validity of Dr. Kantor's program and we've just recently received some of their comments. Also these comments have been referred to the Mental Health Steering Committee for recommendation and that's not just civil servants and people. There's all the experts that we can muster around Manitoba. I should say that, so people do not expect that much, it should be stated that their programs are not universally accepted by all the people in that field also. So it might be pioneering, so it's not an automatic thing.

Now I learned too much in the years that I spent here that I'm not going to make a wild statement of what is going to be made public and how soon. But I can say - certainly, because anything can happen, there's so many unforeseen things and I want to make that quite clear. But I think that right now I see nothing, no reason in the world why it couldn't be made public and could be made public fairly soon. I think it is customary that we want to have the edge, if anything,

we don't want - there's people writing those kind of stories. We want to know the contents of it and have some time to digest it. I probably wouldn't be very adverse to have given it to my honourable friend representing the opposition party, give him a chance to look at it too, with a condition that it not be discussed, be kept for a time. I don't know, but all indication is now that as soon as I can, I would like to share it with other members of this committee.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank very much, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to thank the Minister for that assurance and for that information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: I think, Mr. Minister, that possible that reporter got his information from this same statistics - the Canada Statistics on Mental Health that I was referring to earlier. Table No. 3 shows you the number of separations from mental health and psychiatric hospitals and it says, "It has decreased by 27 percent," and so on, and if you do a comparison between Manitoba and Saskatchewan, then we are running double, or in some instances, more than double. For instance, in 1970 we had 2,797, whereas Saskatchewan had 1,052; in 1972 there was 2,610, whereas Saskatchewan only had 960; and in 1974 Manitoba had 978 - there was a large drop over there - and Saskatchewan had 742; in 1976 there was 1,002 compared to Saskatchewan 613, and so on. The final figure is that Manitoba in 1979-80 there was 859 as compared to 431 for Saskatchewan.

Manitoba's overall percentage of decrease is very favourable. It's a 70 percent decrease, whereas compared to Saskatchewan, there's a 59 percent decrease. So the percentage of decrease is encouraging, but the fact still remains, that we have double the number of people in the mental institutions according to this report. But the thing that is disturbing, Mr. Minister, is this, that this is a report in summary data only. In other words, there're guessing at Manitoba's figures, they're not sure. In all the other charts over here there's only two provinces that don't have any statistics at all and that is Newfoundland and Manitoba. There are no statistics and this is I think, Mr. Minister, the kind of thing that possibly gives us bad publicity. It's lack of communication, lack of forwarding data that they can compile. So I hope that the Minister is going to take this into consideration and forward the kind of data which is required by the Canada Mental Health statistics so that they can update their records and so that we know that when they're reporting, they're reporting accurately.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I think that point was made. I think I answered it the last answer, the member is talking about '78. Since then we are putting out these documents that probably are more complete than most other provinces. So that's all I can say. I'm pointing out there, I should see that Hansard won't know what I'm pointing at. I'm referring to the statistical bulletins that are coming out. I'm sure that the member receives them. Don't they get that?

MR. A. BROWN: Maybe we did, I don't know. If we did then I haven't seen it.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Bud, do you get those? Do you get this?

MR. L. SHERMAN: Yes, I think so.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: They're public documents. If you don't get them make sure — (Interjection) — well I'm sure you can, they're public documents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(d)(1)—pass; 5.(d)(2)—pass; 5.(d)(3) - The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Would the Minister just refresh my memory and the committee's with respect to the external agencies that are covered under this item.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Sarah Riel, a 15 bed residence for mentally ill. We know about that because that's - do you want the amount also compare and broken down?

MR. L. SHERMAN: Just for this year please.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Okay, this year was 268. Alternate day programs for post-mentally ill. Hope Centre terminated their day program and that was relocated to north YMCA. There's 38.6, it was 29 last year. Linden Place, 137.6 from 126. Community residences for mentally ill, that's 128.2 and that's the new proposal for Friends of Schizophrenia. Mental Health Association, 55. YMHA Community Mental Health Rehabilitation Program 11.9.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(d)(3)—pass.

Resolution No. 92 - Resolve that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,054,800 for Health, Chief Provincial Psychiatrist, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass.

Item 6. The Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba.
The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could advise what changes there have been in the size and makeup of the Board of the AFM in the past year if any. And what changes there have been in the size and makeup of the senior administration of the AFM, essentially that involving the Executive Director's office. I know there has been some reorganization, or realignment of divisions within the AFM and perhaps he can recap that for the committee too, but I'm concerned for the moment just at the outset what the changes are that have taken place on the board or in the senior administration, if any.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, there's been some replacement on the board. Some of their terms were finished. Some were reappointed and some are new ones. I'll give you the name of the members: Gary Miles is the Chairman; George Rajotte, the Vice Chairman, he's a new appointee; Thomas McNeil, Treasurer; Helen Harmon; Sharron Kilbrai; Msgr. Charles Empson, new; Deputy Chief Ed Ogelski; the former member wanted to be replaced, so as was the custom,

we're in touch with the Winnipeg Police and we asked for a senior member, either the Chief himself or one of his senior persons and the name they suggested, Deputy Chief Ed Ogelski; Ken Caldwell, new; Dr. Harry Prosen, well that's a reappointment; Judge Charles Rubin, reappointment; James Toal, Jalmar Erickson, new; Jim Saunders; yes, Jim Scott, new. There's one vacant. There's a member that was named from Northern Manitoba. He hasn't been attending and he's sent his letter of resignation. I think we'll have two more fairly soon, so we're going to look at that at the same time. There's been no different direction. They certainly have been running their own affairs. We've been taking their recommendations; in other words this government has not directed them in any other terms.

That's not for all the members, but at least I'll send the Member for Fort Garry - if there's somebody that can carry it over there - that would give him the amount.

The total staff years are exactly the same as they were. We know that unfortunately the Executive Director is recuperating at home. He's coming along quite well, but unfortunately, he hasn't been able to give us as much time. I appreciate the many hours beyond the call of duty that the Chairman has provided. He's always ready to meet with us provide any information. I think he was away, and he came back especially to be here this evening. I'd like to publicly tell him how much we appreciate it.

There was one person that left for Alberta. Ross Ramsey was enticed to a greener pasture, I guess. He's one of the three vacant positions that we have now. There's no change other than that, that I can think of.

MR. L. SHERMAN: So the senior administration, Mr. Chairman, consists of the Chairman, Mr. Gary Miles; of the Executive Director, Mr. David Cruickshank; of Mr. Puchlik, the Director of Administration and Finance; and the position of Assistant Executive Director, which was the position held by Mr. Ross Ramsey, is currently vacant, is that correct?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Right.

MR. L. SHERMAN: What about the three regional administrators for the Winnipeg northern region and western region; are there any changes there, or are there any changes in the administrative organization of the Foundation?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The staff vacancies that we have, as I say, they are the same as last year except there are some vacancies. Provincial Executive, there are three staff year positions that are vacant; namely, a secretary, a clerk and an evaluation officer. The secretary and evaluation officer position are currently offset by contract employees. Support Services, two staff year positions are vacant; namely, a secretary and a personnel manager. The personnel manager position will be filled on April 11th - I guess that was yesterday - I guess that position has been filled. And Regional, we have patient services; four staff year positions are vacant; namely, one supervisor, one counsellor and two field workers. These positions are temporarily vacant as part of a normal staff turnover.

MR. L. SHERMAN: The vacant personnel manager's position has now been filled, is that correct?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, it was filled just a few days ago.

MR. L. SHERMAN: The regional administrators as currently listed on my list remain the same: Mr. DeCoursey, Winnipeg Region; Mr. Thompson, Northern Region; Mr. Ludwig, Western Region. Is that correct?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the financial appropriation being requested by the Minister is approximately 16 percent or 17 percent higher than last year; the 1983-84 requested vote being 8.7 million as against the 1982-83 adjusted vote, or printed vote anyway, of 7.4 million or just fractionally under 7.4 million. So that's an increase roughly of 16 or 17 percent.

I do not object on principle to increased budgets for the Alcoholism Foundation for the work that it does in the field of chemical dependency and the vital campaign that it's waging to get at the problems of drug and alcohol abuse; but last year the Foundation's budget represented a considerable increase over the previous year. I think it was something like 20 percent. I haven't got that figure directly in front of me. It might have been slightly higher than that; it might have been closer to 25 percent. This year we're looking at 16 or 17 percent, and in the circumstances of restraint and constraint and cutbacks and budgetary difficulties and fiscal and financial pressures, it seems remarkable that the Minister is able to achieve that kind of increase. It reflects highly on the persuasive powers of the Chairman, Mr. Miles, and the persuasive powers of his Deputy, Mr. Edwards, and that no doubt is all to the good; but what is the money being spent on? Where is that increase going in terms of alcoholism programming, chemical dependency programming, or indeed is it going into new programming? Can the Minister explain the rationale for the fairly impressive increase in his budget?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, there is quite an increase. The guidelines were pretty well the same as in the others, except that here we have the full-year cost for activities that were started in 82-83, and then there were the Winnipeg building operations, remember, that's in the process of taking over the CNIB building and the Winnipeg Youth Program, the Winnipeg reception unit, Thompson's new building; that was a building that we obtained from Inco for \$1.00 and that becomes the centre of our activities in Thompson. All that is \$181.4 thousand. The Halfway House Program in Thompson, that cost was recoverable, that's 31.2; Nassau House Day Program, 23; the AFM Operating work load increase, 15.5; the external agencies we have increased by 9 percent - that's where I stayed in the same guidelines - so that was 154.9. Main Street Project operation from the new building - that'll be a new building, if you remember; I think that we announced that. We were turfed out of the old building, which was probably a good thing and the Cabinet agreed, and the new building and new programs will cost about 135,000; another 12.8. So that'll be another 302 and the Operating Budget then would be 8,969,000. I just

mentioned 8,969,000; you have 8,751,000, but there was some revenue that was generated internally and I think there was a bit left over from last year.

MR. L. SHERMAN: What is the condition of the new centre at what was formerly the CNIB building on Portage Avenue, Mr. Chairman? Is the Foundation fully established? Are the premises fully renovated? Are the programs that were to be operated initiated in and operated from the new AFM Headquarters on Portage Avenue now in fact in place and operating, or is the conversion from CNIB to AFM still continuing?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: During the past year and a half, the AFM has been in the process of transferring many of its Winnipeg services into the recently acquired building at 1031-1041 Portage, as mentioned, formerly the CNIB building. By the way, I understand the CNIB opened their new building today. This brings together many existing services of treatment and rehabilitation, education, professional development, library and administration, which had previously been scattered throughout the city. These new buildings will do much to increase the community's awareness of the range of services offered by the AFM. As well, the facilities lend themselves well to treatment services for the physically handicapped; something which was previously difficult to obtain in Manitoba. Reallocation services presently available at 1041 Portage Avenue include the reception unit, an assessment and initial reallocation area in which individuals may begin physical and psychological recovery from the abuse of alcohol and other chemicals; a 14-day mandatory residential treatment program; Winnipeg's Youth Treatment Services including a high-risk program; a 21-day intensive non-residential program; individual outpatient program and a parent intervention program.

The final move into the renovated floor at 1031 of library training EAP now at Dublin Avenue will be transferred on June 1, 1983. There was a bit of delay on that to stay within the budget, not to go too high. There was a change a bit in the planning, but that will be moved in June.

MR. L. SHERMAN: That's the William Potoroka Library, is that correct? That's coming over from Dublin Avenue to the new building on Portage Avenue too.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It will be the storefront location right on Portage where they used to have a display there of the CNIB. That will be available for the chemistry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Are the AFM and the Alcohol and Drug Education Services people continuing to work together in their amalgamated format which was achieved a couple of years ago and which really was the impetus behind the new William Potoroka library?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The AFM staff deliver the in-school program directly to elementary and junior high students in their own classrooms. In Winnipeg, this Alcohol and Drug Education Program covers an average of five to six classroom sections for each grade. Due to reduced staff availability, these sessions tend to be

somewhat less structured and shorter in duration in schools outside of Winnipeg. The total student participants in classroom education in this past year was 5,191.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Is the long-desired and long-awaited Detox operation in high gear at the new building on Portage Avenue, or is it still being phased in?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, it's in operation.

MR. L. SHERMAN: It's in operation, and did the Minister say that the youth program that was contemplated for the same new headquarters is also in full operation?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, that was one of the first ones that moved into the new building. The youth treated in 1982-83 fiscal year were 359; parents treated in 1982-83 fiscal year, 157; and the average open youth caseload of 103 a month.

MR. L. SHERMAN: At the time, Mr. Chairman, that the arrangement was made to purchase the CNIB Building and to move the AFM into the new operational headquarters that was so desirable and that we all trust will be so successful, there was discussion and consideration given to what we would be doing through Mr. Miles's offices with respect to two or three halfway houses and residences that we had in the Fort Rouge area of Winnipeg, on Stradbrook and Nassau, in that area. What has been the resolution of those discussions? What has happened with those treatment centres and halfway houses which served both male and female clientele in that particular neighbourhood? Does the AFM still own them, or was the decision made to sell them? Are they being utilized in any way now that is different from their use in the past?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The Stradbrook house was closed and subsequently sold.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Subsequently sold?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes. River is still open; that's for females, and Nassau is the youth program, that is still open. That's the day program in Nassau. We're asking for, as I mentioned earlier, \$23,000 for that. Of course, there is that facility in Thompson now that the AFM owns and purchased for \$1.00.

MR. L. SHERMAN: So the house on Stradbrook has been sold and it was a halfway house and treatment centre, was it? - that accommodated how many residents, 6 or 10 or 12? Could the Minister refresh my memory on that?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It was a men's residence and accommodated 15 and that program now has been transferred to the main place in the old CNIB

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, one could spend a long time exploring statistics with the Minister and his officials, and pursuing statistical information, pinning down every dollar that's being spent and every dollar

that is being requested and trying to pin down every individual person, male, female, adult juvenile appearing on the various caseloads of the Alcoholism Foundation, and appearing in the various residential facilities and treatment facilities throughout the province that exist in the chemical dependency service spectrum. It is not my intention to do that, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps in subsequent examination of Estimates of the Alcoholism Foundation next year, the Minister and I might find ourselves doing that.

I know we've done it in the past when we have been both in the positions in the House that we occupy at the present time and in reverse positions, he on this side and me on his side. We have pursued statistical information to a considerable length, but I think this year there are other things of more import, certainly things that concern me more than the mere statistics. Rather than consuming the time of the committee to pursue those statistics this year, it is my intention to use the few minutes available to us tonight which we are devoting to this very important area of health care programming to look at two or three major themes and major concerns.

What I would like to get at in the time available to us is a progress report in pursuing the problems of alcohol and drug addiction and meeting the challenge of chemical dependency, both at the adult level and the juvenile level. I suppose my first question in that vein, Mr. Chairman, would be a question bearing upon the economic and social conditions of the day in our province. In the current economic circumstances, in the current high unemployment difficulties, in the current situation in which many young people find themselves without career opportunities, a situation in which social pressures build up at the family level for many, many people because of financial problems and employment problems, is there a significant increase in strain and workload on the Alcoholism Foundation, on its regional directors, and on its community alcoholism treatment workers, that is being recognized or identified anywhere? Are we faced today with a greater challenge in terms of alcohol and drug addiction in Manitoba, as a consequence of the economic conditions of the time? Would the Minister have some briefing and some information available from his officials on that question that he could offer the committee at this stage?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I am informed that there is no statistics to prove that is the case. That is always a concern. It is too soon now, but this is one of the reasons that we're asking for this money, to make sure, in case there is an overflow or so at the Nassau house. But, right now, things are approximately the same as they have been the last few years.

MR. L. SHERMAN: What's the capacity of the new headquarters on Portage Avenue? What are the components of that headquarters in terms of the categories of personnel that it deals with? How many beds are there in each of those component categories? How many people can it accommodate in the Youth Program, in the Detox Program, in rehabilitation work, counselling work, at any given point in time? Would there be 50, 100 or 150 people, adult and juvenile, moving through that headquarters building, or would

the number be something substantially different from that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. W. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, while the Minister and his staff are searching, I wonder if he could get me the names of the Advisory Board in the western region as well?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The names of the Advisory Board, we do not have it here, but I will give it to the member, either this week, or as soon as possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the questions that I want to ask the Minister are essentially of a general nature because what I am trying to arrive at is some sense of what kind of success the AFM is having with its new programs and through its new operational facilities such as the Willard Monson Centre in Ste. Rose and the new headquarters building on Portage Avenue here, and the new arrangement with the Main Street project. So, I don't know that it's going to be terribly easy for the Minister to answer any of my questions other than offering an overview and an assessment of the general situation, Mr. Chairman. He may, in fact, prefer to discuss some aspects of AFM programming in fuller detail under this Salary Item on his Estimates later in the examination of his Estimates.

I would like to know what kind of headway is being made in terms of the attack on alcohol and drug addiction among the young. I know the Foundation has a number of preventative programs operating at the high school level and among youth in both addictions fields, alcohol and drugs. I would like to know what kind of headway we are making through the Foundation in getting that problem under control.

But, I don't know whether the Minister feels he can answer questions of this nature in this context tonight, or whether he would prefer to develop with his officials perhaps an overview, an assessment of the programming thrust of the AFM at the present time and the kind of feedback it's getting in terms of success and new innovations or directions in programming in which it intends to go in 1983-84.

I really, I suppose, would need some indication from the Minister as to how he would like to handle this whole subject area, because, as I say, I am not as concerned with statistical information on numbers of people and numbers of dollars. What we're looking at is a 16, 17 percent increase in the budget, the Minister has explained the reasons for that and I would like to know conceptually how the Alcoholism Foundation is proceeding in terms of meeting the chemical dependency challenge.

I would like to know how well it's doing in the North. I would like to know whether there is any extension or expansion of the network of alcoholism treatment workers in rural communities, in northern and remote communities. I would like to know how were doing in Thompson, where there have been considerable difficulties in the past with respect to alcohol and drug addiction among young people, among high school

students. There have been serious problems in terms of meeting the needs of the Native community, particularly in the North, Thompson being a case in point.

I think essentially, Mr. Chairman, that what I want is an assessment from the Minister on the position of the AFM as it heads into 1983-84 with a budget of \$8.5 million, where is it going to be focusing its priority attentions? What does it see as the primary challenges at the present time? Where is it going to be expending most of its money and most of its energy? What new programs does it contemplate? How many new alcohol treatment workers does it intend to put into the field? What new facilities do we need to go along with Willard Monson and the new Portage Avenue headquarters and the new arrangements with the Main Street Project are we going to require in order to meet the traffic volume engendered by this problem?

I'd also like to know where we stand with respect to the Impaired Drivers Program and how much success is being achieved there. So it's really in this area of philosophy and challenge and program thrust that I'd like some answers from the Minister, Mr. Chairman; and he may find, as I say, that it's more practical for him to deal with my general concern by developing a general report on what the AFM has achieved in the past year in terms of meeting the program generally and what it intends to emphasize in 1983-84.

Whether the Minister can address that sort of conceptual approach to this appropriation, I don't know, but I put it to him for his consideration at this point.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the last thing I want to do is to be left here standing alone during the Minister's Salary to answer some of these questions; I can assure you of that.

I understand what the member has said. First of all, one bit of information that we have is the capacity of the new building on Portage. There are 55 beds and there could be 75 outpatients - that's the Youth Program - per month and 150 adult outpatients. There could be close to 300 people.

It is very difficult. I am told that if we're going to measure what success we're doing, I'm told that the problem is about the same, is the same deal, with about the same percentage, about 8 percent of the population. The last figures that we have, it is fairly constant at that. I can give you an idea that the programs we're looking at are mostly with the young people. Of course, we have to treat these people who are afflicted, but in prevention with the young people, and we feel that it is a success because we're dealing with more people. We're giving the service to more people. That's about the only way. It's very hard to say, are we progressing. The percentage seems to be about the same. I guess you win some and you lose some.

The community has changed, the lifestyle has changed, and it makes it very very difficult and some of the problems that we have now may be a little less alcohol and more of the drugs, although it hasn't been that bad yet, but we're quite concerned. I've talked about the rehabilitation in the Youth Program. Also, some of the other programs that we have that we'll see is mostly with the young people in education. There's the "Tuning In to Health" and that is the

elementary school curriculum which has been designed as an integral part of the Manitoba Health curriculum schedule to be introduced in Manitoba schools in 1983-84.

These curriculum materials have been completed very successfully, field tested in a representative sample of Manitoba elementary schools; following some minor revisions consequent to feedback from teachers involved in the field testing of these materials. It is intended to have materials produced in quantity and available to schools by September, 1983. So we can't go wrong in that kind of education and that will, we hope, serve in prevention also.

Then there is the teacher training. The purpose of this training is to facilitate teachers in developing effective alcohol and drug prevention programming in their own classrooms. The total teacher training participants for 1982 was 353, so it's a bit like mental health, I guess. We're talking about some of these things that are coming out of the closet. People are now taking advantage of the programs, can talk about it a little more openly, so in that way we are successful and we have a chance at final success.

The Native staff working with the AFM offer the following courses: Native Training and Intervention and Prevention; Training Course for Counsellors; Working with Native Clients; and Native Trainers Program. All these training programs take into consideration Native culture and specific aspects of alcohol and drug problems as they affect the Native people. The participants in Native Training Programs for 1982 were 159 and the total participants in the Native Education Session for 1982 was 265. So there we have Native people on the board and we have, I think, on staff also; so that is another area where we're working with these people to try to create a better rapport.

I also talked about the teacher training. Then there is the school guidance counsellor training. The intent of this training program is to enable school guidance counsellors to be effective in identifying students with problems due to alcohol and drug use and with parental co-operation to ensure that they are effectively referred to the AFM Youth Rehabilitation Program for help. The total participants in the school guidance counsellor training - I must emphasize we're training counsellors there - is 31.

The In-School program - I think I've mentioned that - the total student participation in the classroom education was 5,191. Kids on Drug Program, this training program for parents is the time to help them to become more effective in preventing alcohol and drug problems among their own children. In addition, we also offer a leader's training program for kids in drugs in order that the volunteer presenters may deliver this program to parents as well. Apart from these training programs, one to two hours awareness of information sessions are provided for parents at schools, churches and community centres. Total parent-training program participants for 1982 was 537 and the total participants in parent education was 407.

So it is very difficult to be able to say with any amount of certainty that we are progressing. As I say, we are aiming at trying to help educate the people, trying to get them to help themselves in the schools, with the youngsters and the little older people, with the teachers, with the parents, with the Native people. So we feel

that seems to be the thrust to help the people to be able to work with their peers or with the people that they have a responsibility for, and there are more and more of the people who are availing themselves of the services that we provide. So in that way we are successful; that's about the only thing we can say, because we are told, the best information that we have, that the percentage of people who need treatment are about the same and we are communicating, talking to more people; so in that way we're successful and that's about the only measurement that we can have at this time.

I know that this won't completely satisfy the member but that, quite honestly, is about the best we can do. If you want this, I can give you, for instance, a nine-month comparison from April to December '81, and April to December '82. The programs admission to the youth, because we're not only in these things, but the people that are treating also seem to be increasing in many areas. The program admission to the youth was 113, and now there is 235. The men's residential was 417 and there's 207 this year, but we must remember that was at Stradbrook House that was closed on February 15th, so it's not a good comparison. River House was 192, and it is now 141. Non-residential short term was 501, and it's 484. After care 103 to 129. Psychologist 229 to 250. I know that's statistics, that's not the whole story, but that gives us some idea.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, that's very helpful, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Minister providing me with that information. I appreciate his response to my initial proposal and to the concept of my approach in my original questions. That's helpful information indeed.

Mr. Chairman, certainly a great deal of emphasis has been placed on the youth problem, where chemical dependency is concerned, both alcohol and drug, and the Minister has made reference to the Kids and Drugs Program and prevention education for parents. I wonder if he could advise the committee as to whether there are active programs being taken into the schools by the Alcoholism Foundation, and whether the emphasis is on high school or junior high school or even earlier age groups than junior high school?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I think I will only give the figures for the total students participating in classroom with the In-School Program, the AFM staff deliver this program directly to elementary and junior high students in their own classroom. In Winnipeg, this Alcohol and Drug Education Program covers an average of five to six classroom sessions for each grade. In fact, I had read that earlier, when we were talking about In-School Programs. So, that is taken right in the school, this program.

MR. L. SHERMAN: That's going into junior high schools and elementary schools, did the Minister say? That's delivered by the AFM through kits that are supplied to the teachers, or is it delivered by AFM counsellors themselves?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: By the counsellors themselves, the AFM staff.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Would the Minister and his officials say that there is a crisis in terms of alcoholism among

youth; that there is a serious problem; or that there is a crisis; or how would they define it in terms of alcohol addiction among young people? If there is a crisis, is there a crisis at the junior high school level, or is it just at the high school level? If there is a danger of a crisis at the elementary school level, do we have a fix on that, and are we moving to protect the children themselves and society against that kind of very serious condition?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: What we are doing in the elementary school, I think that I've mentioned the tuning in to health. This will be part of their curriculum, that is new. We hope that it will be available for school in September '83.

Now, the crisis, is it serious? I think it's a continued - I guess you don't call it a crisis, but a continued serious problem. It's about half-and-half between liquor and soft drugs, so it's a thing that we certainly have to be concerned, but it's not a crisis that all of a sudden it reaches a peak or its getting higher, it's just a constant struggle.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister advise the committee, what happened to the concept of the program known as Building the Pieces Together. There was an Education Advisory Committee struck by the commission to review the contents of Building the Pieces Together, and to look at other material to be incorporated into an Education Program and Counselling Program to be delivered into those schools and those school divisions who wanted it, in the alcohol and drug addiction field. Has any new manual or textbook or instructional kit resulted from that process? Is some of the material from Building the Pieces Together still being used in some school divisions.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, as we remember, that was recalled. This is the program that I mentioned earlier Tuning Into Health. This has been tried much more carefully this time and lay people in the schools have had to be approved by the school board, finally all approvals are in and it is in the process of being printed now, and the Chairman promised that as soon as they have them they'll send me a few copies and I will make sure that the the members receive them. I think that we should have one for all the Members of the House.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, there were some key program priority areas in which the Alcoholism Foundation felt it should be moving, and the province should be moving, which it discussed with the Department of Health when I was Minister, and I would like to know where we stand, in terms of pursuit of those objectives, or achievement of those objectives, at the present time? There were some six specific goals that the Foundation was looking at, in concert with the previous government. They consisted of the necessity to develop detox facilities for No. 1; an Education Program that was going to be geared to junior high schools for No. 2; a Youth Program for No. 3; a drinking and driving program called Counter Attack for No. 4; some additional components to the Education Program for No. 5; and then a Metis and Off-Reserve Native Treatment and Prevention Program for No. 6. I am not

listing these in order of numerical importance. But there were those six thrusts that were seen as very important, and were the subject of considerable discussion by the Foundation and the previous government, Mr. Chairman. I know that we have moved in the area of detox facilities, and certainly the new headquarters on Portage Avenue is one of the answers to that. Obviously, we've moved some distance in the area of the Youth Program and the Education Program. The Minister has just discussed those with us, but what about the other three, Counter Attack, other components of the Education Program and the Metis and Off-Reserve Native Treatment and Prevention Program? Has there been any movement in any of those directions or are there any other key priorities or thrusts of this kind that have been defined by the Foundation in the past year and presented to the government and to the Minister as objectives to be pursued in a high-priority way in the year immediately ahead or in the next two or three years immediately ahead?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, it's obvious that the board, and especially the chairman and the executive director, ought to have been able to convince us that they were going in the right direction, because pretty well all the programs and the priorities that the former Minister had, we carried on. I think we've talked about those. In the North, we were quite fortunate in getting that building in Thompson and there is an Impaired Drivers Program and Outreach Services in Leaf Rapids, Lynn Lake, South Indian Lake, Nelson House and Wabowden. The Detox Unit were moving in the - every area except one that I have to report that we're not - in fact, that program was abandoned because of the costs and that's the Driver Education Program, and not necessarily because it wasn't a - the name, I guess the program was Counter Attack? Does that ring a bell? Anyway, that is the program. I'm less familiar with that one because we have been advised by the board that the final situation, although they did receive quite an increase, all the other things they wanted to do were more of a priority, and because of the cost we did abandon that program for the time being. All the others were progressing quite well, so it was obvious, as I said, that they were doing a good job of convincing us that they were on the right track.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, did the Minister mention the Impaired Drivers Program for second offenders? Is it in place in as many parts of the province as the Foundation believes it should be?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I understand that for second offenders that program is still continuing and there are also meetings. Apparently, we will be getting a report soon that the AFM have been meeting with the A.G. and other departments, but it is the first of this education that B.C. has - the one that they call Counter Attack. That is the one for first offenders, that's the one that we've discontinued for the time being because of cost.

MR. L. SHERMAN: So Counter Attack is not being pursued at the present time, but the Impaired Drivers Program for second offenders is in place. Is it being

expanded into new areas, new communities, throughout the province?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: My information is that it is province-wide now in all the important centres.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Is the treatment program at Headingley Jail still in place, Mr. Chairman?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, the program at Headingley is still in place.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Is the caseload or volume of personnel taking treatment through the program at Headingley Jail remaining fairly constant or is it going up or down, is there any significant change?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I could get more specific information, but I am told that, yes, it is going ahead and it's improving. I don't have any more specific information at this time.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could just recap for the committee the situation with respect to some activities started last year or in some cases they might have been started in 1981-82 but they got, I think, into a full year phase in 1982-83. There were some changes to the rehabilitation program; there was a program called Northern Region Employee Assistance; there was an Alcohol Treatment Worker and Training Program; and then there was the project known as Community Mobilization. Are those all in place and in gear and operating on a full-year scale now for 1983-84 and thus included in this budgetary appropriation that we're looking at?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, all those programs that were mentioned are in full swing now and, of course, the full year - I guess the one that we had - the Employee Assistance Program Consultant Services also, that was the Employee Assistance Program to consult and assist employers in establishing programs which will help an employee whose work performance has deteriorated due to dependence on alcohol or other drugs and other living problems. In establishing and maintaining such employee assistance programs, our consultants provide training for union representatives and managers as well as general information sessions for employees.

Yes, all the programs that were mentioned are in full swing and, of course, I've talked about the full-year cost for the Youth Program, the reception unit, and the Thompson building also. They are pretty well all operating. I think the last thing is the final move in the new building of June of this year.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the vote of \$8.7 million for the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba is money that's being requested for all components of the Alcoholism Foundation, and I would ask the Minister if he could recap for the committee the categorical breakdown of the components within the Foundation and the amount of budget that each gets. I believe there are four pieces or parts or components to the Foundation and each will get a portion of that requested budget. Could he give us those figures for the four

sections of the Foundation or any additional sections that have resulted from any reorganization and provide the 1983-84 figures in comparison to the figures for 1982-83?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'd like to remind the member that he has a copy; I sent that earlier. He has the comparison but I'll read it into the record. The provincial executive, 1982-83 - \$257.7 thousand; 1983-84 - 308.1.

MR. L. SHERMAN: That's Provincial Administration?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Provincial Executive, yes.

Support Services '82-83, 1,018.9 million; '83-84, 1,279.7 million; Regional Reallocation Services in '82-83, 4,298.2 million; '83-84, 5,357.3 million; the external agencies in '82-83, 1,721.2 million; '83-84, 2,023.9 million and the staff is exactly the same staff here, 173.5.

MR. L. SHERMAN: In that, I think the Minister referred to it as Support Services, I have a category that is identified as Prevention and Extension Services. That's an old classification then. I see. Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, the Minister sent a statement over earlier this evening with the staff vacancies listed in it. As he pointed out a moment ago - he's quite correct - there he has provided the breakdown of the components and the figures that he has just read into the record. The components are now entitled Provincial Executive Support Services, Regional and Rehabilitation Services and External Agencies.

I was looking off earlier records of mine which in some cases provided different names. That's why I was seeking the clarification. The Minister has provided me with that statement and that breakdown and I overlooked that. I acknowledge it now, Sir. I appreciate having it.

Where does community mobilization, for example, come in? Would that come into the category of Support Services, or Regional and Rehabilitation Services?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I think it's quite simple. The Provincial Executive, that's the Board and the Executive Director, and the Chairman and so on. The Support Services of the old administration, I guess that is. And all programs are Regional and Reallocation Services. Of course, External Agencies, that's quite clear.

So Support Services administration and the programs are Regional and Reallocation Services. So, the two categories that the member had before would be part of Regional and Reallocation Services.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Could the Minister just describe the range of activity that the community mobilization project covers? What in general does community mobilization mean in these terms, Mr. Chairman? Are we talking about mobilizing teachers to teach alcohol prevention and address the problem in the classrooms, or are we talking about all the programs in the community, both at the school level and at the workplace level, etc., etc.?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, it's exactly that, Mr. Chairman. It's meant to mobilize everybody that's

available in the community; the youngsters, their parents, the teachers, the counsellors, the leaders, the health professionals, the Natives. That doesn't leave too many people left. — (Interjection) — He says that I missed the mayor. The Mayor of Chicago or what?

No, it's everybody that can be mobilized that I mentioned; the students, the parents, the teachers, the counsellors, the Natives. — (Interjection) — That's who I was thinking of, but I think that we're working also with the unions and so on in the labour field also.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Are there specific services going into the elderly community, Mr. Chairman?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There's the Drug Use and the Aging Process. This program is designed to prevent alcohol and drug problems amongst the elderly. It provides both training for senior citizen volunteers who act as educators with their own peer group and training for community professionals who provide services to the elderly. In addition to these training programs many awareness or education sessions are presented to senior citizens groups.

The total participants in the Drug Use and the Aging Process Training for '82 was 109; and total participants in general education sessions for senior citizens was 488.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Were there any changes in the regional delivery, Mr. Chairman? Have we got more alcohol treatment workers being established in rural communities, and particularly in Northern and remote communities, or are there plans for extension and expansion of that area of programming in '83-84 that the Minister could describe at this point?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There's no new staff, but I can give you some of the areas where we're covering. In the Northern region, for instance, there's Leaf Rapids, Lynn Lake, South Indian Lake, Nelson House, Wabowden, Flin Flon, servicing areas, as well as Snow Lake, The Pas, Swan River, Gillam.

Then in the western region, there's Rossburn, Russell, Binscarth, Foxwarren, Strathclair, Elphinstone, Erickson, Newdale - where's McKenzie? - Brandon, Minnedosa, Neepawa, Gladstone, Deloraine, Killarney, Boissevain, Virden, Melita, Shilo and Carberry.

Then the community office located in Dauphin will serve Gilbert Plains, Roblin, Ochre River, Ste. Rose, McCreary, Alonsa, Winnipegosis.

The Impaired Drivers Program, the central region, community . . . are located in Gimli and they're servicing Arborg, Riverton, Teulon, Selkirk, Portage la Prairie; Portage la Prairie is servicing Gladstone, Austin and Carman.

I can give the committee the staff by region. The directorate service, there's two; northern region 20; western region 45; central region 34; and Winnipeg region 47. There has been, as I say, no change at all, so 148 altogether.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Are there any plans, Mr. Chairman, to establish alcohol treatment workers in communities that are currently not served by such?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The only place we did transfer is to Flin Flon. Now, on request or as need develops,

we'll try to meet all the needs as possible but that's all that we are looking at at the present.

MR. L. SHERMAN: There was a network of alcohol treatment workers, of a full-time category, in certain rural and northern communities and another network of part-time workers in various small, remote communities. Do those networks remain the same, are those part-time and full-time alcohol treatment workers still in place in those communities, such as - well in the case of the full-time workers - Gillam, Rossburn, Swan River, points of that nature? In the case of the part-time workers, Cranberry Portage, Nelson House, Snow Lake and communities of that nature?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Actually they're all full-time people. When we talk about part-time it's because they are part-time in that area, they are covering more than one area, but they're all full-time people.

MR. L. SHERMAN: We haven't lost any though?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No. Of course, with the programs there might be volunteers, or people that will work, like educators and people in the union, and so on, but our own staff is the same.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Does the Foundation do as much work, Mr. Chairman, in the field of drug addiction and drug dependency as in the field of alcohol addiction and alcohol dependency, or how would that break down? Is it moving more into the drug addiction field, as against alcohol, or is there any change in that relationship, or in those emphases?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, there is certainly more done in the province with alcohol, except in the educational, so it's educational for both pretty well equally, but in the detox centres and actual treatment there's more alcohol than soft drugs.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, there has been some controversy and difficulty in the past with respect to The Intoxicated Persons' Detention Act and where the Alcoholism Foundation, the Attorney-General's Department and the Police Department, particularly in the City of Winnipeg, for example, stood in respect to that Act in the treatment of intoxicated persons; can the Minister apprise me and the committee of what the current situation is with respect to the IPDA? Has there been any change, is there any work or research being undertaken in respect to the manner in which intoxicated persons are handled and counselled and treated? Is the new AFM Centre on Portage Avenue going to have a capability to deal with intoxicated persons and resolve that problem, or just what is the situation where this subject is concerned?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm told that there has been for awhile; probably because of the original makeup of the Board that we maintain, of having a senior person from the chief and the judge also, I think that has been quite helpful and, as I said, the Deputy Chief Ogelski and Judge Rubin, also; and I'm told that the co-operation is still very good, things are working the way they were.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, what's the situation with respect to the Main Street Project? Is the funding that's being provided going into the new Crisis Centre, the new detox centre, or what component of the Main Street Project is being altered or improved or expanded under the AFM's program planning in 1983-84?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, there was in 1982-83 an amount of \$425,000 that was provided to purchase and renovate a building at 75 Martha Street. The acquisition will now allow Main Street Project to consolidate most of their operations in one building and operate additional services to the Core area, that is, The Intoxicated Persons' Detention Act. Holding area, continuing care program and short-term hostel added to the existing Detox Crisis Centre and Drop-in Centre services. Funding is provided by the City of Winnipeg and the United Way, as well as the Foundation, although we don't know if we'll be able to maintain the same funding from the City of Winnipeg.

MR. L. SHERMAN: What's the projected financial support for the Main Street Project from the AFM in 1983-84, what's the amount of funding that the AFM is going to be pouring into the Main Street Project in fiscal 1983-84? Is it a half a million dollars?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: A little more than that, it'll be - by the way that'll open in about two months, that won't be a full year - we're asking for \$757,000.00.

MR. L. SHERMAN: \$757,000, and that's one of the grants to the external agencies?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Can the Minister provide us, Mr. Chairman, with a list of the external agencies and the amounts that they will be receiving in 1983-84?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The external agencies at 154.9; The Pas Health Complex 10,000 . . .

MR. L. SHERMAN: Excuse me who's the 154.9 for?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Churchill Health Centre 65.9 from 56.8; Fort Alexander - I'll put it on the record but I'm sending another page to the member - Fort Alexander 39.7 in 1982-83, now 43.3; Kia Zan 153.2, now 174; Main Street Project 570.6, that is not for the construction and purchasing that was just for the program. As I said, there was 425, but for the project 570.6 last year, now 757. Native Alcoholism Council 144.9, now 157.9; Salvation Army from 162.4 to 168.8; The Pas Health Complex 445.6, now 495.7; X-Kalay 148, now 161.3.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Okay, thanks very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 6—pass.

Resolution No. 93 - Resolve that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$8,751,000 for Health, the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1984—pass. Committee rise.