

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 11 August, 1986.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - EMPLOYMENT SERVICES AND ECONOMIC SECURITY

MR. CHAIRMAN, M. Dolin: We are dealing with Resolution No. 55, on Page 59, Item 2.(b)(2) Social Allowances Program - the Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, actually I think this has more to do with 2.(b)(1).

MR. CHAIRMAN: We passed it, but go ahead.

MR. J. McCRAE: Thank you for that.

Would the department have a policy on single parents whose spouses have deserted or departed under one circumstance or another in respect to filing claims for maintenance?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Economic Security.

HON. L. EVANS: We have a definite policy of trying to do whatever we can to find the spouse and require that spouse to provide the maintenance that may - I guess you're assuming the court had ordered maintenance payments. If that's the case, we certainly do make an effort. I think there have been changes in the legislation in the last couple of years so that Manitoba is in the forefront in this respect, so we definitely make this effort.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister somehow qualifies that by saying they try, or is there a laid-down guideline that in every single case that these things are pursued or if there's no hope of any success - I assume nothing is done - but is there anybody who falls through the cracks and gets away with it?

HON. L. EVANS: No system is perfect but the law allows us to take steps to ensure that the enforcement comes about.

I'm advised that under the Attorney-General, there is a monitoring procedure under the Family Maintenance Act and there is an enforcement process, so there is a laid-down legal process that is followed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: I think that's all I had on that area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b)(2)—pass; 2.(b)(3) Municipal Assistance—pass.

2.(c) Manitoba Supplement for Pensioners - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Mr. Chairman, now in this, did this department add staff, because there is an addition to the Salaries this department?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we did add three staff because of expansion of programs.

MRS. C. OLESON: Then what caused the additional expenses in that department? Is it still with the addition to the program, or was there another reason?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, as I indicated in my opening statement, there is a huge increase in the number of eligible people. No longer do you have to show that you are getting some other pension income in order to be eligible between 55 and 64. That used to be a requirement. That's been wiped out.

Also, because we've changed the eligibility levels, generally we've got an expansion of - the 65-and-over component, we've expanded by 5,600, estimated expansion of 5,600 people. Between 55 and 64, we expect another 3,700. So that's a huge increase.

MRS. C. OLESON: Does the Minister estimate that most of these will be women?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, it's difficult to say, but I expect that there will be a great number, particularly in the 55 to 64, who will be women. I think they're probably going to benefit to a larger extent than the men.

MRS. C. OLESON: Just for clarification, people will qualify for this who have, within of course the guidelines in income, but who have no pension at all, as opposed to before when it was only for people who had a small pension of some type or some of their income from pension.

HON. L. EVANS: That's right. They had to fall within the income guidelines and have some other pension income. Fifty percent or more had to be from some pension sources. So that's being wiped out.

To give you it in a better perspective, in 1985-86, we had roughly 18,400 people in the program. In 1986-87, we'll have approximately 27,200. So that's about a 50 percent increase in the size of the program. So this is why we have to add a few staff.

MRS. C. OLESON: Well then, for someone who has no income at all and would be on social assistance, would they be eligible for this or would it be deducted from their social assistance?

HON. L. EVANS: They could apply, but it would be deducted from their social assistance.

MRS. C. OLESON: Yes, so it would be of no benefit to them to apply?

HON. L. EVANS: No. You could understand why, because others could criticize special benefits being paid.

MRS. C. OLESON: According to the chart, and I believe it was in the annual report - and I think the Minister's

had this asked of him before - the discrepancy in the amounts, \$187.68 for single pensioners and \$202 each per annum for married. Is something going to be done about this discrepancy?

HON. L. EVANS: We're very cognizant of that discrepancy. We were cognizant right from the beginning. The fact is that, however, we've more than doubled the spending in the area. There is a limit to how much additional you can spend. We made a decision; we would double the benefits; we would eliminate the pension requirement, to bring more in; and we would automatically index it from now on. Every year it will be automatically indexed in accordance with the Consumer Price Index change.

That cost a lot of money. It got us to more than doubling, from \$3.2 million to \$7 million - not to speak of the administration costs. It was felt by the government that's as far as we could go at this point. To go beyond that would require another several hundreds of thousands of dollars - another half-million dollars. If I can find another half-million dollars, then we can eliminate that anomaly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(c)(1)—pass; (c)(2)—pass; (c)(3)—pass; (d) Child Related Income Support Program - the Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I'll just put in a word here for the Honourable Member for Springfield, who, I believe, had questions on the Manitoba Supplement for Pensioners item. I wonder if we could come back to that, if the honourable member should come back in this evening?

MRS. C. OLESON: If he comes back, we could talk about it under the Minister's Salary, perhaps?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it's agreeable with the Minister, certainly.

Meanwhile, we'll move on to (d). The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: I believe I asked the Minister about this before, of course, but the Estimates do not reflect the increase in the funding for this program. The Minister had told me in the House that it was something they thought of - or words to that effect - that they thought of it just before the Budget.

Where is the Minister going to get the funds for this additional payment to families?

HON. L. EVANS: This was the decision that was taken prior to the Budget; it was announced in the Budget. I guess the Minister of Finance indicated this, but if he didn't, it has to be provided in Supplementary Supply because that took place after these Estimates were prepared and printed, as a matter of fact.

MRS. C. OLESON: How many farm families does the Minister predict will be benefited by this addition?

HON. L. EVANS: We estimate 1,500.

MRS. C. OLESON: If a family is on social assistance, then these payments are deducted from their social assistance payments, are they?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. C. OLESON: There's a one-time only payment referred to in the publications about this. On what basis do you pay the one-time only payment?

HON. L. EVANS: What we did was indicate to people that they could apply if they were eligible for this benefit year, then the farmers would also be eligible for the one-time payment. Of course it was made because of the farm crisis. So it was a special payment to farm families who qualified for this benefit year. The basis of the calculation was simply 12 months times the \$30, that would be up to that amount, that would be the maximum; 12 times \$30 is \$360 per child, maximum.

MRS. C. OLESON: That goes from last year's income, like their income from 1985.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, it's always based on the previous year.

MRS. C. OLESON: Yes, on the previous year's income. The reason I ask is that I had a call from people who were concerned because the one-time only payment, I guess as you've just said, is tied in with the eligibility for the monthly payments and they had had their monthly payments decreased this year, and the one-time only payment was decreased also and they were rather upset about it.

But their income must have, would you suggest just from that brief resume of it, that their income must have increased last year, probably not enough to be that noticeable but just got them into the different bracket for their one-time only payment.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the answer is yes.

MRS. C. OLESON: I think we could pass that item then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (d)(1)—pass; (d)(2)—pass; (d)(3)—pass. Page 60, Item (e) Economic Security Field Operations—the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: The increase reflected in Salaries in this, it does reflect the increase in social assistance, and what else, any other reason?

HON. L. EVANS: This is field staff, Mr. Chairman, and it does reflect an increase of 9.09 staff year equivalent, not 909 but 9.09.

MRS. C. OLESON: Does the Minister feel that under a one-tier system that he'd need a lot more staff than this to handle it?

HON. L. EVANS: If we got into a one-tier system, depending on how far we went, there are suggestions of just involving ourselves in the rural municipalities to begin with, then the larger towns and then the cities, and so on. But regardless, there will have to be additional staff, I couldn't tell you how many.

We would try to use as much of the existing field operation staff that we have of course, but we would

certainly have to add to the staff. I don't know whether we have any estimates, I think that's rather premature because we're a long way from that position.

MRS. C. OLESON: Pass that item.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 2.(e)(1)—pass; 2.(e)(2)—pass.

Resolution 55: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$191,245,600 for Employment Services and Economic Security, Economic Security for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

Now move to Employment Services, Resolution 56; 3.(a)—the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Could the Minister tell me how close he is to having those Orders for Return ready for me; the one from last year and the one from this year? The one from last year first, we'll start with that.

HON. L. EVANS: My understanding is that — (Interjection) — Is the honourable member talking about the Manitoba Community Assets Program?

MRS. C. OLESON: And the Careerstart Program - both of them. I submitted them in May 1985, I think it was, and then again after the Session started.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, on the Manitoba Community Assets Program, I'm advised - and I checked on this twice with people - that we cannot table it until we have the French translation and that is imminent.

MRS. C. OLESON: You must be kidding.

HON. L. EVANS: That's what I'm told and, therefore, technically we cannot table it till it's translated into French.

Having said that, I should point out that every one of the MCAP grants was put out in a news release showing the location and the amount and the purpose of the grant, so those are all out at any rate. You'd have to look at half a dozen news releases, but they usually group them by allegiance and so on.

MRS. C. OLESON: I know, that's the problem.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes.

MRS. C. OLESON: That's all the information there is.

HON. L. EVANS: But if you had some specific inquiries, we could try to get that, but that is the technical reason. I've checked again recently with the House Leader and this is what I'm advised.

MRS. C. OLESON: Is the Minister telling me all Orders for Return submitted to the House cannot be tabled until they're in both languages?

HON. L. EVANS: I would have to check that again, but I only asked about this because I knew my Estimates were coming up and I asked about this and this was

the answer I got for MCAP. I don't know - I can check again with either the Attorney-General, or the Clerk of the House may be the better person to check with, regarding all Orders for Return.

Mr. Chairman, I'm advised it's the same thing for Careerstart, although for Careerstart there was a very large amount of work involved. The last one still isn't finished because there's a lot of work to produce it the way the member asked for it, but certainly as soon as we get it, Mr. Chairman - I wished that it was and we would have given it to the Minister - but if she has some specific questions, we could try to answer those.

MRS. C. OLESON: Well there may be some flow when we get to those programs.

The Canadian Job Strategy, could the Minister point out to us which programs are funded by this in this department, just so we won't be asking each one separately, or would you rather as we come into each one mention how much of those funds flow to it?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, we do have somewhere a list of Canadian Job Strategy Programs and we could review those. That's the Federal Government's program of course. Some of them relate to our department and indeed not all of them. Usually the ones we were talking about are those that are jointly funded.

Mr. Chairman, maybe the best way is to touch on this when we get to the specific ones. The four programs that are funded by the Canadian Job Strategy in our department are: New Careers; the Selkirk Training Plant; the Job Access for Young Adults; and fourthly, the Single-Parent Job Access Program.

MRS. C. OLESON: With regard to the Limestone Training Agency, how many entered that training course?

HON. L. EVANS: I should say, Mr. Chairman, the Limestone Training Agency as such comes under the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro. That Minister is responsible for the training agency, although our staff do help in finding candidates for potential trainees and so on. Now, I don't know whether the staff have any data on that or not. We could try to get that information. We don't have any at the moment.

MRS. C. OLESON: Then this department does not administer that program?

HON. L. EVANS: The Limestone Training Agency comes under the Minister responsible for Manitoba Hydro, although our northern field staff are involved in assisting in various ways and coordinating and counselling and so on. So we are involved but the direct responsibility for the agency is under the Minister of Hydro.

MRS. C. OLESON: And no direct funds from this department flow into it?

HON. L. EVANS: Just to back up a bit, we negotiated the training agreement with the Federal Government. There is a joint - with the Federal and Provincial Governments, but that money having been assigned to that agency, any involvement on our staff - we provide

Monday, 11 August, 1986

them with any assistance or whatever - they pay our staff as I understand it. There is a payment from the agency to the department. There's a transfer of funds from the department for any services that we may engage in a supportive nature to that agency.

MRS. C. OLESON: We can go then to the Employment Development and Youth Services of that. Oh, just a moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass (a)?

MR. J. McCRAE: No, one little question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Under Administration for Employment Services, what would the Other Expenditures be?

HON. L. EVANS: I'm advised that this one large item there is a grant to the Winnipeg Unemployed Help Centre as well as the newly established Brandon Unemployed Help Centre. Both of these are engaged in assisting UIC clients or potential clients with their claims. So that's the biggest reason for that increase.

MR. J. McCRAE: Well, it's really, Mr. Chairman, only an increase of about \$40,000.00. — (Interjection) — How could that account for the Winnipeg and Brandon operations?

HON. L. EVANS: The 86-87 represents a transfer from the Department of Labour's Budget. They had \$62,000 previously for the centre and there is \$45,000 for the Brandon Unemployed Help Centre.

MR. J. McCRAE: So that, Mr. Chairman . . .

HON. L. EVANS: So therefore, Mr. Chairman, just to finish off, this only reflects the Brandon — (Interjection) — the 85 figure has been adjusted. So this only reflects the Brandon increase.

MR. J. McCRAE: Do I take it then the Brandon Unemployed Help Centre has a budget of about \$40,000 for this . . . ?

HON. L. EVANS: I believe it's around \$45,000.00.

MR. J. McCRAE: That \$45,000 is to cover what expenses at the Brandon Unemployed Help Centre?

HON. L. EVANS: It's given to that centre which has its own board and they will use it to hire staff and pay whatever other expenses are required, rent, utilities, any travel if necessary. It is hoped that centre will obtain other funds from the community. That is the thought, from the United Way or other organizations that you'd want to contribute towards it. In fact, it may be getting some now. I'm not sure.

MR. J. McCRAE: I'm surprised, Mr. Chairman, that this centre would be set up and that arrangements for funding would not have been put in place. I say that, as I know, I think it was last year, last fall, the centre

was set up and had a budget of about \$20,000 then and I understood that there was to be another \$40,000 coming from the government. But that was since last fall. What efforts have been made to raise funds in the community to help finance the expenses of this centre?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I understand that, although they get a grant of 45,000 from us, their total budget is 49,000; so they must have raised some money in the community, about 4,000, I suppose. But I'm not aware of their specific fund-raising activities. I think they wanted to get established to show what service they could be to the community, the amount of UIC monies they could increase in Brandon and so on; and, having done that, they would be in a position to seek out funds in support from other agencies. I know they've made a presentation to the Brandon City Council which supported them and I know they're making presentations to other organizations. So I hope they will be finding additional funds in the future.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the City Council when one Mr. Pimlott came before us. Is that the approach the Minister is talking about?

HON. L. EVANS: I believe that may be. I'm not sure when they went. I was advised that they did make a presentation, so that may very well . . .

MR. J. McCRAE: I can say, Mr. Chairman, that the support given by the council of the City of Brandon can be measured in some ways, but certainly not by way of any money. I don't think that any money was passed between the city and the Unemployed Help Centre. Would it be the board of the centre that chooses the director of it?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, the board selected the . . .

MR. J. McCRAE: Would this be the time to ask the Minister about the Winnipeg Unemployed Help Centre?

HON. L. EVANS: Sure.

MR. J. McCRAE: I would like to ask him about its budget and how much the government funds the centre in Winnipeg?

HON. L. EVANS: This amount for the Winnipeg Community Unemployed Help Centre is \$62,000, and I understand they received \$63,000 in 1986 - has been allocated from the United Way of Winnipeg.

MR. J. McCRAE: Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister can tell me whether there are other agencies doing this same kind of activity in Winnipeg, because it's unlike me, of course, to speak for Winnipeg. I usually speak for Brandon, but Winnipeg must surely have a few more unemployed people than there are in Brandon. It appears they are getting about \$22,000 more from the government in Winnipeg and I wonder how that can be rationalized in the department, that that small amount really can be spent in Winnipeg on the same type of program that we have in Brandon.

HON. L. EVANS: I could only say what the facts are and that is they've got a budget of \$125,000 in Winnipeg

and they have several staff. I'm not sure whether they are getting additional funding from other agencies such as the Core Area Initiative. I do know there are a lot of union organizations and union offices in Winnipeg, I think, who help their members with UIC as well. So, I suspect there is more general assistance being provided for potential U.I. claims, Unemployment claimants in Winnipeg compared to Brandon. But there are many union offices in the city that I suppose help their people. But, while there is general employment counselling and so on, which is quite important, the key function is to assist with unemployment insurance claims and one task there is for the staff to become conversant with all the regulations. You know, there are reams and reams of regulations and documents to be familiar with and so on and to work on behalf of the client or would-be claimant of the unemployment insurance system.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, we have union offices in Brandon too and in other centres which could provide this service. The question has certainly been raised in Brandon and perhaps elsewhere that this is very little more than a straight duplication of the services provided by the Canadian Employment and Immigration Commission. The point has been made over and over again that these help centres do nothing more than provide that same service. I wonder what response the Minister has to that?

HON. L. EVANS: I don't know whether the staff has a figure, but I believe the centre did provide an estimate of the dollar amount of unemployment insurance claims that they secured for their clients. There is a figure around - a fairly large figure I think - of monies that they were able to secure on behalf of the unemployment insurance claimants that might not have come otherwise, because of their efforts.

MR. J. McCRAE: Has the Minister considered approaching the Federal Government to ask them for a federal grant to help with the centre, since they're taking so much work away from the federal offices?

HON. L. EVANS: No, I haven't considered that, Mr. Chairman. I don't think we're taking work away. What we're doing is providing with the cooperation of the Brandon Labour Council, and other organizations who are on the board I guess in Brandon, we're supporting a service which advocates on behalf of an unemployment insurance claimant, just as we have a service which the Manitoba Government funds with regard to the Workers Compensation Board.

We have Workers Compensation advocates; there's one in Brandon and there are several elsewhere in the province, where we assist people who are trying to get their file straightened out with the Workers Compensation Board, who are maybe not very happy with some of the answers they're getting from the board itself. So the Workers Compensation advocacy offices work on behalf of those people, and in a similar way, these unemployment help centres work on behalf of would-be unemployment insurance claimants.

Also I'm reminded, we fund a welfare advocate organization as well, the anti-poverty organization.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I'm just curious I guess. Who approached whom on this? Was it the - first I should back up and ask - which centre opened first? Where did the idea for these centres originate?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, it originated in Winnipeg. In regard to the Brandon one, we were approached by the Brandon and District Labour Council.

MR. J. McCRAE: I recall at the time, Mr. Chairman, as Mr. Pimlott made his presentation to City Council, sitting and listening to him and thinking that it won't be very long before we have an election coming and we've already been hearing the Member for Brandon East telling us about how unemployment was coming down and was about second lowest in this whole country; and now we have this type of thing set up. It just seems ironic to me that we would be setting up employment help centres at a time of decreasing unemployment.

HON. L. EVANS: Well it may be ironic, but regrettably, there are many people out there who are potential unemployment insurance claimants, and if we can help them, I think we should.

MRS. C. OLESON: Mr. Chairman, just to the Minister. I suppose this was, from what I hear, set up because of some demonstrated need, but it seems to me that unemployment insurance is a federal jurisdiction. Perhaps this department could have gone to the Federal Government, if there were demonstrated problems collecting unemployment insurance and said, look, this is your program, do something about it so that these people get some help; instead of asking the provincial taxpayers to pay money to help with a federal program.

I get calls quite often from people having problems with unemployment insurance. I'm sure every MP gets dozens of them, but I refer them to the MP. Their offices, to my knowledge, have straightened out a great many of these. I think that's where the problems should go, is to the federal people. It's their program. If there's something wrong with it, tell them about it, instead of setting up special programs to help these people and taking Manitoba taxpayers' money to do so.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, hopefully, through the efforts of these two centres, we will obtain in Manitoba more unemployment insurance payments than we would otherwise. As a matter of fact, my understanding is Manitobans collectively pay more into unemployment insurance funds than we get back in payments from UIC, which is rather interesting . . .

MR. J. McCRAE: We've got a low unemployment rate.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes. So I'm not complaining about that, but I think we have an obligation to get as many dollars as we can. I would say, if you would sit down and look at some of the technical questions they get into, some that an MP and his staff may not even have time or the expertise for it because they're flooded, as we all know, with all kinds of queries and problems - but there is a matter of getting technical expertise of

all these regulations and I've seen the binders. I was in the Winnipeg office recently and there are stacks of binders filled with regulations and it becomes a very detailed matter. It's almost sort of a sub-category of labour law.

MRS. C. OLESON: Well I don't doubt that they are of assistance to the people who are contacting them. I'm not taking away from their usefulness, but it did cross my mind that perhaps if there are problems with the Federal Government program, then the Federal Government should step in and get something done about it.

Who appoints the members of the board to these unemployment help centres?

HON. L. EVANS: They are independent agencies. They exist on their own, we don't appoint any board members.

MRS. C. OLESON: Why does this not appear in the annual report? At least if it did, I didn't see it.

HON. L. EVANS: I'd be very surprised if there wasn't some reference. There should be, if there isn't.

MRS. C. OLESON: There may be. I haven't fine-tooth combed it. I think we can pass that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)(1)-pass; 3.(a)(2)-pass.
3.(b) Employment Development and Youth Services - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: I note, with some interest, that under Employment Programs, No. 3, there's a reduction in funding. I was surprised since the Minister - that's one of his main topics of conversation, what we're doing for unemployment and the programs, particularly for youths. So I want some explanation of why there is \$184,900 reduction?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, like many departments, we've had to trim our sails in certain places and try to get by with a bit less sometimes. In this area, we made a decision to eliminate the Northern Student Summer Employment Service - sorry, Northern Summer Education Program - all I've got are initials here. That's about the amount, that pretty well takes care of the difference between these two years. It was a saving of 190.9 thousand which is a little more than the difference shown here, so that's one program which was eliminated.

MRS. C. OLESON: Well then does the Northern Affairs Department, does it have a program for Northern Youth that might take the place of this?

HON. L. EVANS: This was a special camping-type of experience operated out of Frontier Collegiate in Cranberry Portage. There were 200 children who came there for the summer and had arts and crafts, camping, canoeing, swimming and so forth. Last year, it involved hiring eight Northern youth to be counsellors and training and so on. So it was decided that this was one that could go.

There are other programs that we have in Northern Manitoba. We have many programs, but we made a decision to save some money by eliminating this particular program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, employment programs proposed expenditures are down here, yet Salaries seem to have increased under this line by about \$58,000.00. Could the Minister tell us, is there a difference in staff years here under Employment Development and Youth Services?

HON. L. EVANS: That increase in Salaries, this \$58,600, that is strictly merit increases and that type of thing, miscellaneous salary adjustments, increments, general salary increases. I don't believe there are any additional staff years in that category, no.

MR. J. McCRAE: Well, I just make the point, Mr. Chairman, that here we have the same number of people getting their salary increases and benefits increased and so on and yet, for the programs themselves, there is this cut in the amount. So we have the same number of people delivering less program, it appears, and it seems that the emphasis the government's been making on youth unemployment is not being backed up by concrete proposals here in the Estimates.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the staff are involved in running some other major programs, and that is carried on. As I was explaining to the Member for Gladstone, the only reduction, the only cut was the specific Northern Summer Education Program, which didn't really require any staffing necessarily on our part. I think the monies that we saved for summer counsellors that we hired.

That's equivalent to 7.18 SY's. That covered the staffing required to run this program. These were temporary staff required to run this Northern Education Summer Education Program, not only counsellors, but maintenance staff, kitchen help and so on. I think we're looking at about 33 people, but it translates into 7.18 staff.

But all the other programs were kept, so really there wasn't much reduction in terms of direct work for this section as such. It still has, among other things, the entire government STEP Program, the Student Temporary Employment Program. It runs the Manitoba Youth Job Centres, and we have volunteers in the public service. So those are all large programs that are being administered.

MRS. C. OLESON: In the Youth Year Project, has that wound down completely or do these Estimates reflect anything to do with Youth Year?

HON. L. EVANS: That year was a one-time effort. It is not reflected in here. We are considering some of the recommendations from IYY. You'll recall that it finished with a large congress at the University of Manitoba, and there were a number of recommendations. One that we're looking at is establishing a Youth Secretariat, but that would not be reflected in here.

Monday, 11 August, 1986

MRS. C. OLESON: The Youth Business Start Program, I noticed in an Order-in-Council in November of '85 some funding going toward that. Is that going to be an ongoing program, or was that just continued for one year?

HON. L. EVANS: That program was funded under the Manitoba Jobs Fund. We are winding it down in our department, and transferring it as such to the Department of Business Development.

MRS. C. OLESON: How many businesses were started under the program?

HON. L. EVANS: I understand about 70, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. C. OLESON: 70?

Are they all still in business, or have there been any problems that caused some of them to have to go out of business?

HON. L. EVANS: I understand there are 64 active still.

MRS. C. OLESON: When a business that was started in this way with, I believe, it was a \$4,000 grant, did that grant have to be refunded if they didn't stay in business any length of time?

HON. L. EVANS: No, there wasn't that requirement, Mr. Chairman, but I would advise that, with the assistance of an advisory committee, including some businesspeople, I believe did a fairly thorough job of screening the young people before they were accepted. When they were accepted, of course, they had to take a bit of a training course, had to accept a business adviser and so on. So this accounts for the relatively high success ratio. At any rate, the monies were paid out once we were satisfied that they knew what they were doing and had some ability and passed all these tests. The monies were paid out.

MRS. C. OLESON: Your figures that you gave me though indicated that six were not in business anymore. Did those six then repay their \$4,000 startup, or was that asked of them?

HON. L. EVANS: It's my understanding it was a grant. Mr. Chairman, we haven't experienced any payback, but to get this assistance they had to agree to stay in business at least six months.

MRS. C. OLESON: The Counselling Assistance for Small Enterprises, is this group in this department? They were the ones apparently who did the advising and coordinating of the Youth Business Start. Are they in this department?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, that program is a federal program.

MRS. C. OLESON: But they assisted this startup of the Youth Business Start Program.

The Member for Springfield is here and had some questions, if you could entertain them now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, I was just going to get to that when you finished the line of questioning on this section. Are you finished?

MRS. C. OLESON: I think I'm finished with that, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, 2.(b)(1) . . .

MRS. C. OLESON: Just a moment. There are still lots of programs under this, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, do you want to hold on 2.(b) then, and deal with it. The Member for Springfield had questions under 2.(d), was it?

MR. G. ROCH: Yes, I just had a couple of brief questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the Child Income Program?

MRS. C. OLESON: No, the 55-Plus.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh okay, 2.(c).

MR. G. ROCH: 2.(c), I guess it would go under 2.(c)(3).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.
The Member for Springfield.

MR. G. ROCH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I was just wondering, are recipients of social allowance other than provincial eligible for the 55-Plus Program?

HON. L. EVANS: Sorry, I didn't hear the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are people receiving social allowance eligible for a supplement under the 55-Plus Program?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, they're eligible, but the monies are deducted, so there's really no point in them applying.

MR. G. ROCH: But under Section (d), it says that if you're receiving social allowance payments, check the box "yes" and indicate the source - provincial, city, municipal or federal. However, it says that only provincial social allowance recipients receiving the 55-Plus supplement will have their social allowance benefits reduced by an equal amount. Why does it only specify provincial? Does that mean if it's from another source, it will not be deducted?

HON. L. EVANS: That's because we run the provincial program; social allowances is our program.

MR. G. ROCH: Are you saying then that the others are not necessarily being deducted?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, it's up to the municipalities to decide whether they want to deduct it or not. We don't have any information as to whether any of those municipalities are deducting it.

MR. G. ROCH: What is the rationale behind these deductions, seeing as the whole purpose of the program is to supplement the income of those 55 and over who are earning under \$8,000-odd a year?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, actually who we're trying to get at in this particular program happen to be people who are, let's say, among the working poor, in some cases. They do have a bit of income, but they're really darn poor, so we're trying to supplement them and regrettably, a great percentage of them are women; so we're helping a lot of older women who can't get full-time work or can't make much money and yet they're not on welfare; so we're giving the working poor a bit of a boost.

If we simply said, look, if you're on welfare you can get it and top it up, we would have screams of complaints from all the other welfare recipients. At least, that's our opinion. I may be wrong, but it's our opinion that the other welfare recipients in the province would criticize us for being discriminatory in that respect.

MR. G. ROCH: But aren't the working poor under 55 making the same complaints, that maybe they're being discriminated against?

HON. L. EVANS: I guess you have to cut off some place.

MR. G. ROCH: I realize that, because I know of some cases where there are people 55 and over who, because of circumstances, are on social assistance and they seem to feel that - like a particular lady who's only making less than \$3,000 a year including all the benefits - she just can't understand why, being in dire straits, that she cannot qualify, where someone else who can be making up to \$8,000 a year will qualify.

HON. L. EVANS: This program is indeed an income supplement program. We're attempting to supplement a pretty small income, usually; so that is the intent of that, just as CRISP. It's the same idea with the Child Related Income Support Program; it's meant to supplement a fairly low income situation.

The welfare program, the social allowance program has a different thrust. We're talking about people who have nothing, virtually, and what we are doing for them is providing, hopefully, sufficient monies for their basic needs, their basic food, clothing, shelter, personal needs and so on. It's a basic support of people who are really destitute, so that's another category, virtually, altogether.

What we're trying to aim at here is this group that we've been told are in some need. They do have sources of income, relatively low, particularly women; and it was felt that it was justifiable to increase the amount as we have done, doubling it, and of course putting it on an index now, as of July 1, for the 55-Plus.

MR. G. ROCH: It just seems that there are some, like you said, on social assistance who have nothing. It seems kind of unfair that because they have less, they are destitute, that they are not entitled to an income supplement. Would you care to comment on that?

HON. L. EVANS: I just mention, Mr. Chairman, that we've got in these Estimates about \$150 million going to these people over here who have nothing, and we're trying to provide for their basic food, shelter, clothing, housing, etc. There it is, \$150 million.

What we've got here is a relatively small amount, about \$7.4 million supplementing an income of the

working poor, another group, and if you could think of it in that way.

MR. G. ROCH: I understand what you're trying to say, but if you're a person in dire straits, you have trouble understanding that. If that person is making \$5,000 to \$6,000, the working poor to get an income supplement, but another person is making \$2,000 or \$3,000, the same age, because of circumstances, they used to be working, is not entitled, they just don't understand that.

HON. L. EVANS: I am sure the individuals find it difficult to accept and understand, but this is not a new decision; this is a decision that's been in place for 10 years or more. Under the Manitoba Supplement for Pensioners it was the same approach, a smaller amount, but it was the same approach.

MR. G. ROCH: But the CRISP program - correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe, for example, single mothers on social assistance are eligible for the CRISP Program.

HON. L. EVANS: It's the same thing for the 55-Plus. They're eligible, but it will be deducted from their social allowances, so they're not any further ahead.

There is a particular group, I might add, Mr. Chairman, who are on supplementary welfare. They get a little bit, and by applying for 55-Plus, they don't need any more welfare. In fact, they may be better off, so that these are people who just get a very small amount of marginal welfare to bring them up to the basic need level and the same thing is true of CRISP.

So there are some people then who have left or will be leaving welfare now and just getting by on their income plus the 55-Plus or with some CRISP money.

MR. G. ROCH: Okay, because the situation that I'm familiar with or situations, they are working, receiving assistance, but I know they are eligible for CRISP. But you're saying in the case of 55-Plus, it could work under the same principle?

HON. L. EVANS: The same principles apply to CRISP and to 55-Plus.

MR. G. ROCH: That clarifies some. It's not clarified in the booklet though.

That's all the questions I have, except for maybe is the department constantly reviewing these programs to try and resolve any inequities such as these which come up, because there's an awful lot of money being spent and it's just that I know we'll never achieve the ideal system, but there are some no doubt who abuse the system; but on the other hand there are some who are in bona fide dire straits who just seem to feel insecure?

HON. L. EVANS: I agree with the member. We'll never get to the perfect situation, I guess, but this is a big step. We've more than doubled the money in terms of total spending, from \$3.3 million to \$7.4 million. For most people, it's a doubling of the amount of money under the 55-Plus and now it's going to be indexed.

We also, as I indicated earlier, removed the pension requirement. No longer will you have to - you see

previously under the supplement before, you had to obtain 50 percent or more of your income from pension sources. We've eliminated that. That's caused thousands more people to be eligible. So I think we've taken a big step forward.

I'm not going to say for one second that it's perfect, that it's adequate. It could be better. It could be more. It could be more generous but given the financial situation we're in, this is quite an improvement.

MR. G. ROCH: I'd just like to make a comment that it's unfortunate, in the case of people who, maybe not necessarily the working poor but by no means rich, a lady becomes a widow and then because of reasons of health ends up on social assistance and then cannot qualify for an income supplement. Yet all things being normal, that is her husband living, her keeping on living a normal life, she would have been eligible, but because of health reasons, she's not eligible. She's actually worse off now than she would have been had she been able to work. She can't comprehend it and neither can I. I just hope that somehow, somewhere along the line, the twain shall meet.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, if the member could give me some of the specifics of this case, we could certainly look into it and review it to see whether everything has been done that can be done. I'll certainly undertake to do that if the member could give me the lady's or the individual's name and some of the information, and then we could certainly pursue that.

MR. G. ROCH: I could do that at a later date. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can return to item 3.(b)—the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: The Careerstart Program, is it the same level of funding this year as it was last?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. C. OLESON: How many people applied this year and how many jobs were funded?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, we estimate well over 4,000. Roughly 4,300 applications were received. This was equivalent to 8,300 positions.

MRS. C. OLESON: That was the number of jobs that were actually funded, not just the applications?

HON. L. EVANS: That's right. No, those were the applications. The approvals, in terms of positions approved, is just slightly over 6,000.

MRS. C. OLESON: What percentage of those were in the City of Winnipeg and what percentage were in agriculture?

HON. L. EVANS: The information I have is that we have 43.6 percent hired in Winnipeg; 46.7 percent in six southern regions; and 9.6 percent in five northern regions. Winnipeg has about 60 percent of the

population. It obtained about 44 percent of the application approvals.

In terms of agriculture, we approved this year 657 positions for the agricultural sector. Just as a matter of interest, of those agricultural employers who applied, 77 percent of the positions were approved.

MRS. C. OLESON: Is that an increase then that went to Agriculture, over last year?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes. Last year, I understand, there were 574 compared to 657 this year.

MRS. C. OLESON: How long does the funding last for each job applied for? What's the minimum, or maximum?

HON. L. EVANS: The average employment is 12 weeks. The maximum is 16 weeks and the average is 12 and that's a full working week.

MRS. C. OLESON: Last year we had some discussion over abuse of the system, that people somehow got around the rules and had people in fictitious jobs. The Minister said at that time he had a safety net in place. Is that working or is there any indication of problems with it?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, our technique is to sample a percentage of them; you can't go to all of them. So we take a 10 percent random sample and we monitor those. That process is still under way and there's very little abuse, generally I think.

If we know of something, of course we investigate it right away. We could get the odd phone call or a letter of complaint.

One thing that we have done this year is to disallow employers from hiring direct members of their own family.

MRS. C. OLESON: During the election, the Premier, I believe it was, promised a Manitoba Katimivak Program. Do we find it anywhere in the line in these Estimates?

HON. L. EVANS: Again, Mr. Chairman, I believe the funding would come out of the Jobs Fund. But we are in the process of developing a Manitoba version of Katimivak, a Manitoba Youth Corps Program, and hopefully it will be under way early next year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Is it the Minister's department that is developing this program?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. J. McCRAE: The Minister will recall there were allegations about sex, drugs, and rock 'n roll in the Katimivak movement. Is the department keeping those allegations in mind when it's designing this mini-Katimivak program?

HON. L. EVANS: I want to keep all the criticisms in mind and build on the successes.

MR. J. McCRAE: Did the Minister say we'll see the beginning of that program next summer?

HON. L. EVANS: Hopefully it will be under way early next year. I'm not suggesting it will follow the Katimavik model as you know it. There are many options we can pursue and we are considering. It may be that we would want to come up with a program of two, three or four components giving people options so it wouldn't necessarily be pure Katimavik styled or modelled program.

Part of it could involve young people moving around the province for work experience and part of it could be individuals being transferred to different job opportunities or career opportunities or just work experiences of a different kind on a one-to-one basis - housing the individuals with families for instance - or it could be groups of young people who might work in their own community or within say a 20-mile radius so they'd never leave home. So there are different combinations we are looking at.

MR. J. McCRAE: Was the Minister consulted by the First Minister about this program at the time of the announcement? I hint a slight bit of embarrassment on the part of the Minister here because the program's demise met with a fair amount of, I would say approval, across the country and of course there were small pockets of dissent that we heard about from those people most directly involved, but it struck me at the time the promise was made that it was very much like the oil price promise that we got from the Premier; one of those foolish promises that are made in haste during an election campaign. Is that one of the options the Minister is considering as well; just giving up on the idea and forgetting about it?

HON. L. EVANS: No, we are actively working on it and we intend to consult with a lot of youth organizations before we finally put it into shape.

I would say, just as a matter of interest for the member, the Katimavik still exists as a non-profit organization. It's been scaled down quite a bit but it still exists as a non-profit organization. I believe the Federal Government turned over all the assets to that organization; to that non-profit group. But we are actively pursuing this and hopefully early next year we will have a Manitoba version of a youth corps in place.

MR. J. McCRAE: If the government is going to insist on going forward with this, I would just offer a suggestion that Manitoba is very much an agricultural province and I wonder if the Katimavik or Manitobavik Program, or whatever it's going to be called, will have an emphasis on farm living because one editorial I find in the Country Guide from March of 1986 suggests that people involved in a program that would put young people on a farm which would give them - what does it say here - long hours, low pay, uncomfortable conditions, heavy responsibility. Contact with a businessman struggling to keep his head above water will teach them far more about life than Katimavik ever could or did. I suggest to the Minister he keep the agricultural aspect in mind when he's designing this program.

HON. L. EVANS: I assure the honourable members we'll have an open mind and we welcome all suggestions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)(1) - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: One criticism that I heard about Katimavik was that it had the potential of - as these youths travelled from community to community - it took away some of the jobs the local young people in the community would have had otherwise and that's something I think the Minister should bear in mind in designing this program, because there is little enough in the rural communities, few enough jobs as it is without creating a youth corps say that would come in and take the jobs that were already there. So that's something the Minister should keep in mind.

HON. L. EVANS: I'll most certainly keep that in mind, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)(1) - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Several more programs, Mr. Chairman. The STEP Program, how many applications were for the STEP Program this year and how many were hired?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, D. Scott: Mr. Minister.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the 1986-87 STEP Program received 700 project submissions. We ended up funding 415 of them involving 810 positions and that employed 900 students - that includes replacements, that's why it's a little bigger - so it's 900. That's more or less the same as last year; last year was 898. So the program is more or less the same dimension as last year. If the member wants I could give her some of the figures on average earnings and so on if she would like.

MRS. C. OLESON: That might be helpful but what's the overall level of funding also and how many weeks work?

HON. L. EVANS: The overall level of funding, Mr. Chairman, is 2.249 million and the average job duration was 12 weeks. So it's 900 students employed on average of 12 weeks each.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone further questions?

MRS. C. OLESON: Does that reflect any difference from last year's level of funding and job numbers to any degree?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, it's the same as last year.

MRS. C. OLESON: The Manitoba Jobs and Training Program, what is the funding for this program?

HON. L. EVANS: That program is funded out of the Jobs Fund and it is approximately the same as last

year as well. Even though the youth unemployment rate was reduced, it's approximately the same as last year.

MRS. C. OLESON: Does this program go on all during the year? Can an employer apply at any time to have a person to hire or is it just announced and given a window once in awhile?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, this was an ongoing program with no specific deadline; however, I should point out that we have now concluded this cycle and a new cycle will begin in the fall. But this particular cycle is now concluded but when the cycle was on there was no deadline as the member was asking.

MRS. C. OLESON: He could apply at any time.

HON. L. EVANS: You could apply at any time.

MRS. C. OLESON: Does the Minister have any information about the jobs created? For instance, do most of the jobs continue well after the program part of it has ended? In other words, are you creating permanent jobs of this?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, that was the intent of the program, particularly with the private employers. They were asked to declare that they were going to make their best efforts to. We did follow it up and we found there was a fairly good retention rate. The business positions, we found there was a retention rate of 71.5 percent. So on checking some weeks, eight weeks after the program was over, we found over 70 percent were still retained by the business. It was smaller for the non-profit organizations because they are not in the same position but even they retained a fair number after the program ended.

MRS. C. OLESON: Manitoba Graduates in Business, what's the funding level of that program?

HON. L. EVANS: The Manitoba Graduates in Business this year is \$700,000.00. This is a reduction from last year. This program is now in the process of being phased out.

MRS. C. OLESON: What number has applied for this and what are the number of graduates now working under the program?

HON. L. EVANS: There were 158 positions approved in 1985-86 and they break down into a variety of areas. I can give you some indication. Of the 158, 134 are now active and that 134 breaks down as follows: 51 in engineering; 20 in science; 26 in product development and design; 2 in international trade; 1 in production operations and management; 12 in marketing; 14 in finance; 6 in business administration; and 2 other.

MRS. C. OLESON: When this program was first initiated, it was only in one field. I can't at this precise moment remember what field, but it's open to all different fields now is it for the different graduates?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, it was science and engineering. It was broadened because there was a

demand. We consulted with the business community and they felt there was a demand in these other categories, so they expanded it and changed the name of the program.

MRS. C. OLESON: Is this proving to have a good job retention? Are people staying with the companies they initially start with or is it that type of a program? Am I mistaken in my impression?

HON. L. EVANS: No, it's a fairly good program in terms of retention because the employer has to put a lot of money into this as well and it's a two-year period. The retention, to answer your question specifically, 78 percent of the employees were retained in permanent positions. As a matter of fact, 91 percent of that 78 percent reported they had received promotion and/or pay increases.

MRS. C. OLESON: The Job Access for Young Adults, is this through the Job Strategy Funding? I believe you did say it was, and is it a pilot project?

HON. J. STORIE: Mr. Chairman, it's a pilot project inasmuch as this is a new experience for us. If it's successful, we'd like to carry it on, but it is a pilot project and we'll have to assess it a few months down the line.

MRS. C. OLESON: How does it differ from the Jobs In Training Program? Is it a duplication? I need some explanation on the program, obviously, by the look of the Member for Inkster who is shaking his head at me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Couldn't possibly be duplication.

HON. L. EVANS: The Manitoba Jobs in Training Program is a major program of wage subsidy funding of private and non-profit employers. The employers apply to us. If they are accepted, we provide a wage subsidy under different terms and conditions. There are thousands of people under that at any one time. The Job Access for Young Adults zeros in on one specific group, usually young adults between 16 and 24 years of age who have less than Grade 12 education. They are then brought into a classroom situation. They get accredited classroom instruction and work experience in one of three areas: industrial manufacturing, business skills or commercial food services. This pilot project is centred at the Red River Community College and/or the South Winnipeg Technical Centre. The work experience is of course at various locations with various kinds of employers. So it is a very specific program aimed at the structurally unemployed; the young people who have problems, social problems and so on, and they're having difficulty in schools and so on. We're trying to get them in the regular workforce.

Whereas the Jobs in Training Program is very all pervasive, it's applicable to any employer who can hire someone to do that particular job. It's not aimed at any particular group.

MRS. C. OLESON: So part of it is training and part of it is employment - am I correct - and this will be a

continuing program? It's just in its infancy now, but hopefully it will be a continuing program?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I can't say at the present time. We'll have to evaluate it in a number of months to see how successful we've been.

MRS. C. OLESON: What numbers are we looking at in people who are in this program at the present time?

HON. L. EVANS: We took in 30 young adults in November '85, and another 30 in January of '86. So '86-87, we expect therefore 60 young adults in the program and 20 will be in commercial food services, 20 under business skills and 20 under industrial manufacturing. We have 50 employers participating and so it's fairly widespread.

MRS. C. OLESON: What is the provincial funding in this and what's the federal funding under the Canadian Jobs Strategy?

HON. L. EVANS: My understanding is that 50 percent is recoverable from the Federal Government.

MRS. C. OLESON: What's the funding that's allocated to this program though?

HON. L. EVANS: The request is \$561,800.00. That includes salaries, training allowances, weigh subsidies, constructional costs and administration and it involves two staff years.

MRS. C. OLESON: There's a program listed in a booklet called "Taking Stock" which was done as a youth year project. Anyway, it's a Job Opportunity Service. Does this tie in with any of these programs we've been discussing?

HON. L. EVANS: This was done by one of the organizations that was funded under the IYY Program and it was as you say "Taking Stock." It was an inventory of provincial youth programs and services. So that group undertook that particular project. I don't have a copy.

MRS. C. OLESON: That wasn't my question though, but listed in it is a Job Opportunity Service.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, this is an office in Winnipeg where we register young people for jobs. It's a matter of providing information. Generally, it's the central registry and referral and placement of students in summer positions in Provincial Government departments, Crown corporations, and Commissions. Referrals are made to positions funded under various provincial employment programs, including Careerstart and Jobs in Training Program, for students and unemployed Manitobans in this area.

There is some assistance provided, too, in terms of resume writing, job search information, and self-marketing techniques.

MRS. C. OLESON: Also listed in that same book, "Taking Stock," is a Core Area Training and

Employment Agency. Is it something that's included in this department?

HON. L. EVANS: No, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. C. OLESON: Not at all. Okay. The Community Assets Program, Mr. Chairman, is this program going to be announced again this year or is it not operating this year?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I believe the Minister of Finance indicated in his Budget Speech that the program would not be operating in future. The government is looking at a replacement program that might operate under the Department of Culture, Heritage and Recreation, and funded by Lotteries. So MCAP, as such, will not be continued as we know it.

MRS. C. OLESON: The Minister, when I asked about the Order for Return, said the information was available. It is, to a certain extent, but not broken down. There are many press releases on it but they're not specific. They list it by regions and except for one or two, September in 1985, where the Minister announced specific programs for the Westman area and each project was listed with its amount and how many jobs it would create and so forth. But there wasn't anything that I could find forthcoming in press releases for the rest of the area and it's very difficult to pinpoint just exactly where this money is going. When it says Winnipeg, nine projects, well, Winnipeg is a large city. Interlake 6; Southeast 8. But where, and what they were for, of course, remains a mystery to most of us.

That's one reason I particularly wanted the Order for Return, to pinpoint just exactly where this money was going. It gave us the feeling last fall, when we heard announcements, that it certainly was being targeted very carefully and it become a rather political, to put it mildly, event. It seemed that some areas were getting funds whereas others were not. It certainly made one feel, if one had not any other indication, that an election was in the offing.

I would recommend that the Minister, if he's not having this program, recommend to the Minister of Cultural Affairs, who will possibly be having it, that perhaps there should be some way found, if you're having a program of this nature, to have it distributed evenly throughout the province. It becomes rather a political football if it's used in the way in which it appears to me it has been used in the past.

There must be some way of looking at a project - I've seen projects, have had copies sent to me of projects that I would find very difficult to turn down, where people had done an awful lot of work. People are encouraged - press releases go out saying the money is available, and people put in a great deal of time and energy and spend possibly sometimes a considerable amount of money preparing these. They do, I know, have a feeling that there is very little point in even applying, but they do go through the motions and then get turned down. Then they hear of projects with not near as much input being funded. It becomes, I know in my constituency, it's not looked at too kindly because there were not many projects funded in my constituency. Speaking from that point, from a

constituency point of view, I've seen a lot of work go for nought.

I hope the Minister, when he speaks to the Minister of Cultural Affairs, who possibly will have this, reminds her that it would be a good idea to have it evenly distributed somehow, perhaps the decision being made in the municipalities, as it used to be at one time. They know their needs better than anyone else.

HON. L. EVANS: The member will get the Order for Return and get that detailed information.

I would simply say this. The difficulty is that we had \$8 million available and we had requests totalling \$25 million. There was just no way that you're going to say yes to everybody. It's an absolute impossibility. A lot of factors were taken into account: The type of project; the amount of work that would be created; the amount of involvement; the amount of contribution by the organization. Then there was some division, for monies for municipalities as such, and sometimes some towns seemed to get a little bit more. I think Killarney got a lot of money but they had a lot of good projects, a firehall, some community stuff, and so on.

You'll find that in some suburban areas of Winnipeg, such as the member beside me, his riding, I think there was nothing because the suburban areas of Winnipeg don't have many projects and there weren't very many applications. In fact, there were some areas in Winnipeg where there were no applications; there was just no community spirit or whatever. At any rate, it's a very difficult thing.

The type of program that is being worked on now will have some changes in it. I believe, among other things, the attempt is to have longer-term projects so people can do some more planning. There won't be this rush to get all the applications in, get the approvals, and so on. The thrust won't be job creation in the winter, as much as it will be assisting community, cultural, and heritage groups. It will be a different type of focus and there will be an opportunity for more long-term planning by the organizations and the communities involved.

Personally, I would have liked to say yes to everybody. It's good to be a hero with everybody. Unfortunately, there's just not that - as I said, for every dollar we had, we were requested for \$3.00 and we just didn't have it.

MRS. C. OLESON: I think it's back to the age-old thing where you have to advertise a program and, of course, it builds up the expectation in people that all they have to do is ask and they shall receive and, of course, that isn't the case.

So the MLA gets on the firing line and is asked why can we not produce these programs when the government said they were available.

What's the average length of a job created by the Community Assets Program?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised we haven't done an averaging of that type. We did try to get the work weeks per project and that would be their best estimate. Remember many of these projects were small, you know you might have a carpenter there for two weeks, and a plumber for three days, and an electrician

for a day-and-a-half, and so on; so the contractors and the community organizations were supposed to put in these estimates. I don't know whether the average is really that much, but we did have a tally of the total work weeks funded, and then, I suppose, you could divide that by the number of projects and get something; but I don't know how meaningful that is a figure.

MRS. C. OLESON: Well I wonder too, because I'd see a project which, no doubt, is a very worthwhile project for \$2,050 to repair a roof, for a total cost of the project being over \$4,000, creating three jobs; three jobs for how long? I mean the press release sounded as if three people worked solidly for a year repairing a roof and, of course, we all know that isn't the case. But when you say it's three jobs, it's probably three jobs for one day.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, I agree with the member. You have to put the number in a time dimension, so work weeks is probably the better calculation.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)—pass? - the Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: One comment for the Minister. Recently I referred a problem to one of the Minister's offices in Brandon, and they kindly took on the case and I'm glad for that. But I'm wondering when we're designing programs in the future, if we could keep in mind those working poor that the Minister referred to earlier.

In one case and others that I know of, there are people who are very hard workers. They don't like to move from job to job; they stay in a low-paying job and then their life starts to develop and they begin to have children and they need more money than they're getting, and what they're doing is keeping themselves down by staying in low paying, not very satisfying work, but they're not qualified to really move ahead very fast.

I'm wondering if the Minister has any programs or is thinking about developing any programs to help people in such a way that they can be trained without having to give up a monthly income, so they can continue to feed their families, train for a better position without having to take time off work. Because, as you know, there's a time lag between the time that you leave work and the time you start collecting benefits, if you leave under certain circumstances.

The case I'm talking about, the person wants to better his qualifications so that he can move up the ladder in the type of work that he's doing, just to do a higher level of that work and to make more money, and to keep his family in a better standard of living.

Now obviously, the attention will be given to those who don't have jobs at all, and, of course, we all support that, but there are thousands and thousands of people in Manitoba who are employed all their lives in jobs like the ones the Minister spoke of a few minutes ago. Really this is a province of opportunity and I wonder if the Minister could direct his attention to the design of such a program, or if there's one in existence now that could be amended or changed around to help people in that kind of situation? I'd like to see something like that.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, I gather what the member is talking about, Mr. Chairman, is a program whereby we provide some income to a person so that person could still obtain income while attending a college or technical institute or something for skill upgrading.

MR. J. McCRAE: The problem with it, Mr. Chairman, is the voluntariness of leaving the job. I guess there's programs not available to a person who leaves his job voluntarily, but when he leaves to better his life, it seems to me we should try to do something for people like that.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I thought that there was some opportunity - well I guess maybe more for people who are sort of technologically displaced who can, through Unemployment Insurance, Canada Employment go to community colleges like Assiniboine College or Red River and receive some benefits while being trained. But we don't have anything specific along the lines that the member is suggesting right at the moment.

Our major program has been the Manitoba Jobs in Training Program, which has been a multi-million dollar program. The last cycle was roughly \$8 million, it's a lot of money. The thrust there is to enable people to be hired by employers and to be trained on the job. There were two categories. It was direct employment for 20 weeks, so we would cost-share up to \$4 an hour with the employer, plus fringe benefits we would pay for 20 weeks of direct employment. But if the employer had a job where there would be training, where he or she, the employer, would provide a training to that person, and, of course, had to promise to keep the person on after the wage subsidy ran out, we would subsidize them for 30 weeks, which is about seven months roughly, for training on the job, so that was our big push to help people. So if you did find somebody that you speak of, of course you have to get an employer who is ready to hire that individual, but there were many thousands of people under that program that did receive training on the job.

MR. J. McCRAE: Well I'm sure many thousands of people were helped that way, but what I'm talking about here is institutionalized training that is required in order to get a ticket of one kind or another. In this particular case, a particular kind of driver's licence is required for a higher paying job, and that's the thrust of my problem and my constituent's problem.

HON. L. EVANS: All I can say, Mr. Chairman, we'll take the member's concerns into consideration and I can appreciate somebody in that position, particularly if they have family responsibilities. At the moment we don't have anything, but we'll certainly take it under advisement.

MR. J. McCRAE: I thank the Minister for that.

MRS. C. OLESON: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this, I refer again to this Order-in-Council that I asked about. According to our discussion to do with the Receiver of Lake Winnipegosis Development Corporation the payment of \$100,000, I wonder could the Minister explain why his department is paying this?

HON. L. EVANS: As I recall it, Mr. Chairman, this was because of an unemployment situation in a particular locality; namely, the Lake Winnipegosis area, the town of Winnipegosis. There was a considerable amount of unemployment and in cooperation with the Manitoba Development Corporation, we assisted for a period of time in providing some work in that specific area. I could get more details for the member. I don't have any at my fingertips, but that was a special employment problem.

We will be undertaking others from time to time where there's specific problems created by, say an industry that's closed down in a town where it is devastating for that little community, and I think we're going to see more of that occur in the future where, for whatever reason or other, there's some unemployment.

There is a problem on Lake Winnipegosis now with fishermen who will not be able to fish for awhile because of problems with the fishery, and we're working with the Department of Natural Resources there to provide some special employment opportunities, to assist those fishermen who may be losing some income; hopefully, being employed in useful community projects. If the member had some specific questions, I could undertake to get the answers.

MRS. C. OLESON: Well I take it from this Order-in-Council that the company had gone into receivership. Did this help to keep it open for some time? Is it closed now? Did it pay wages to these people just to keep them employed for a little while longer? What happened?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I'll have to get a report on that for the member, and certainly give her that.

MRS. C. OLESON: It's Order-in-Council No. 851, which is dated July 24, 1985, if I could have some more information on it.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, we'll get a report on what happened and all the circumstances for the member.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, we can pass that section now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay, 3.(b)(1)—pass; 3.(b)(2)—pass; 3.(b)(3)—pass.
3.(c)(1) - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you.

The Immigrant Access Service, what is the funding for that and how many staff administer it?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, this year, 1986-87, the program costs involve \$172,800 in salaries, and \$74,500 for operating with seven staff years involved.

MRS. C. OLESON: And the Newcomer Service Support Program, could you give me the funding and staff of that?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the Newcomer Services Support Program is a relatively small program. It

Monday, 11 August, 1986

involves providing \$25,000 worth of grants in the year. Staff in the branch generally spend a bit of time on it, but it's not a big enough program obviously to have

MRS. C. OLESON: Specific staff, okay.

The Manitoba Work Experience for Professionally and Technically Trained Newcomers, what's the funding and staff for that program?

HON. L. EVANS: I believe the member asked about the Recognition Project, the Manitoba Work Experience for Professionally and Technically Trained Newcomers. We have, in '86-'87, one staff year, and the total program in salary costs is \$150,000.00.

MRS. C. OLESON: How many newcomers are in the program?

HON. L. EVANS: In 1986-'87, we anticipate 12 new positions will be created. Last year, there were 22 positions approved and, so far this year, we have 12 - I'm sorry, revised, 15.

MRS. C. OLESON: Could the Minister explain the necessity of this program? As I understand it, people who immigrate need to have a job before they are allowed to immigrate. So perhaps the Minister could outline why this program is necessary and who it helps.

HON. L. EVANS: While people may come and have a job in Canada, you'll find many immigrants are really employed below their level of training skills. So you might have a doctor or an engineer who may be doing some very menial job. What this does is to provide an opportunity for someone who's been professionally trained elsewhere to obtain work experience in his or her profession in Manitoba. So we provide a subsidy, as indicated, to the employer to encourage the employer to hire these persons for a maximum period of 52 weeks. It's a year-long program.

Generally, they are people who already have some working knowledge of English or French. They must be a graduate of a field of study which is compatible with our objectives. They certainly must have completed post-secondary education outside of Canada, and whose credentials are not formally recognized in Canada. So what happens is that someone who is virtually underemployed has an opportunity to get the relevant experience and to get his or her credentials recognized.

MRS. C. OLESON: Now these three programs that I have just asked about, are they correlated together or are they run separately? Are they all run out of the same area of the department?

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, they're all run out of the Immigration and Settlement Branch.

MRS. C. OLESON: But are they a correlated program that they work hand-in-hand, or are they completely separate?

HON. L. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, certainly there's coordination, but they appeal to different groups; they're

aimed at different groups. The Project Recognition is dealing with a group of professionals who need some upgrading or relevant work experience, whereas the Immigrant Access Service usually deals with people who are recent newcomers, who have great problems with the language and the institutions and the values and so on, where they need a lot of assistance in virtually tapping into the existing health and education and social service programs that we have. So we tend to deal with a different category of immigrants. So those are two major different thrusts.

MRS. C. OLESON: I think we can pass that area, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(c)(1)—pass; 3.(c)(2)—pass.

3.(d) Regional Employment Services, (1) Southern Employment Resources - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: What is the staff component for this, and what does this department administer? For instance, do they administer the Careerstart and the Jobs in Training and that sort of thing?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the Regional Employment Services, Southern section, has 18 staff. They indeed, as the field personnel, do deliver the various programs of the department, such as the member referred to, New Careers plus Jobs in Training Program and Careerstart. Also, they were involved in the assessment and contractual negotiations with the MCAP Program and they were involved in helping the Manitoba Youth Job Centres in their establishment and of course they were very much involved in International Youth Year.

MRS. C. OLESON: Under 2 the Northern Development Agreement, there is no appropriation for that department. Could the Minister tell us what funds are being expended there?

HON. L. EVANS: There is indeed money spent but the member, if she looks closely, will see that it's recovered under the Canada-Manitoba Northern Employment Agreement - sorry, the Northern Development Agreement - I stand corrected, under the Northern Development Agreement.

MRS. C. OLESON: So there's no provincial money per se?

HON. L. EVANS: There is provincial money, but Northern Affairs holds the money, transferred to this department.

MRS. C. OLESON: So have there been any new components to this program this year? Any changes?

HON. L. EVANS: No, Mr. Chairman, it's essentially the same program as we delivered last year and previous years.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you. We can pass that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.—pass; 1.(a)—pass; 1.(b)—pass; 2.(a), (b), (c) and (d)—pass. (3)—pass?

MRS. C. OLESON: (3) Human Resources Opportunity Program, is that where we are?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MRS. C. OLESON: Perhaps the Minister could just outline for us what all programs are under this apportionment.

HON. L. EVANS: The Human Resources Opportunity Program is probably one of the key programs that we have to zero in on the structurally unemployed and we have in the program as such, apart from the Human Resource Centres, we have 27 staff in the program providing assistance to people to obtain employment. They are very much zeroing in on the welfare recipients to help them obtain useful employment. I think we made some reference to them earlier today, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. C. OLESON: The Canadian Job Strategy Funds then dovetailing in with these programs, I noticed in the annual report there's a listing of programs delivered which include the Driver Education Program. Could the Minister explain why Driver Education would be in this department?

HON. L. EVANS: Just a correction, there are no Canadian Job Strategy monies into the Human Resources Opportunity Program per se; but under the Human Resource Opportunity Centres, we did apply for the Single Parent Access Program and we did get funded for that particular project. Having said that, the Human Resource Opportunity Centres are funded generally under CAP on a 50-50 basis. That is with regard to wages spent.

The member asked specifically about a Driver Training Program. It's a rather unique situation. There is no Department of Highway's personnel or anyone offering driver training education. So our Human Resources Opportunity Centre has taken it on as a project, so it does provide some useful employment - I'm sorry, in Dauphin. Did I say Brandon? In Dauphin - it's just for the clients in the centre and for corrections.

MRS. C. OLESON: I just was curious because in most areas the schools offer Driver Ed Training and perhaps maybe the Dauphin School Division doesn't, I don't know. So that may be the reason.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that the Dauphin School System does for young people but not for adults.

MRS. C. OLESON: In the booklet I referred to earlier called "Taking Stock," there's information about an emphasis on youth through the Human Resources Opportunity Centre Summer Student Program. How many participants in that and how much is the funding for that program?

HON. L. EVANS: You can't say we don't have programs. We've got so many we can't keep track of them.

There are approximately 76 people in the Summer Student Program, but only in two centres: one in Gimli and one in The Pas; and it's funded federally and provincially.

MRS. C. OLESON: The Single Parent Job Access Program, how many are participating in that program and what's the funding for that?

HON. L. EVANS: I believe there are 344 people. As I indicated, there are 344 people taking it at different times throughout the year.

MRS. C. OLESON: I asked also what was the funding, but, also, where is it available?

HON. L. EVANS: The program is available, this is another innovative program which we'd like to have - I'm saying this for the benefit of all - along this line and certainly it's up to us to apply under the Canadian Job Strategy to get some more programs and indeed we are working on this.

But the overall budget relates to the City of Winnipeg and West Brandon. The total is approximately 1.2 million and it's shared with the Federal Government. Of that 1.2 million, we get a contribution from Employment and Immigration amounting to \$795,000.00.

MRS. C. OLESON: I think we can pass that item then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)—pass; 3.(b)—pass; 3.(c)—pass; 3.(d)—pass.

I'd just like to mention for information for voting purposes, the time is after 10:00 p.m. I assume you want to continue?

MRS. C. OLESON: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item (e) Employment Training—the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: The Labour Market Programs, would the Minister please explain this to us and what all it includes?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, this branch is the one that deals with these specific problems of adjustment in specific areas, we mentioned like Winnipegosis before. This would be done here. People who are also affected by technological change, we've been discussing with the Federal Government the question of older worker adjustment. There's a problem there. All these types of problems are dealt with by this staff.

This is the area where the Workplace Salvation Centre is established. They have some input into it, not the only input into it. They participated with other departments in other adjustment situations such as Kimberley Clarke, INCO, Burns, Sherritt Gordon and so on.

MRS. C. OLESON: Is this a new Needs Program?

HON. L. EVANS: No, Mr. Chairman.

MRS. C. OLESON: The Selkirk Training Plant, how many people are trained there, and what's the cost per student?

HON. L. EVANS: The number of trainees accepted during the year 1985-86, was 99. We planned 100 for

Monday, 11 August, 1986

this year. Of those, 40 went on to employment. We expect a couple will go on to further training.

Was there another question?

MRS. C. OLESON: What's the cost per student of operating that?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, we estimate about \$40 per day per student.

MRS. C. OLESON: Now into No. (3), the Inter-Governmental Relations . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to pass (1) and (2)?

MRS. C. OLESON: We can pass them all together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, sure. Item (3).

MRS. C. OLESON: They're all of (e), I mean.

In the report of the Manitoba Women's Directorate, there's a reference to input from this department in the report on Labour Force Strategy for Women in Manitoba. Would that come under this line? If so, what dollars are spent and what is the input from this department into this report?

HON. L. EVANS: That subject wouldn't necessarily be under this Branch. These people do a lot of negotiating with the Federal Government, and there is what's called a Labour Market Needs Committee which is coded. This is a federal-provincial committee looking at the needs within the province for different categories of labour. So this is one thing.

Annually we jointly with the Department of Employment and Immigration, develop annual training plans, including the interests of other departments.

We're involved with monitoring the Canadian Jobs Strategy as it applies to Manitoba. This is the area where we negotiate for The National Training Act under the Canadian Jobs. This is the area that we're concerned about getting sufficient monies to maintain the level of training at the community colleges.

But we do the negotiations with our counterparts in the Federal Government Department of Employment and Immigration, which then allocates it under the overall umbrella of the Canadian Jobs Strategy.

MRS. C. OLESON: When I initially asked about the report to the Women's Directorate, in connection with the Women's Directorate, where did you say that would be involved?

HON. L. EVANS: That would be in our Research and Planning Branch. Did the member have a specific question?

MRS. C. OLESON: I just wondered how much money was involved and what input from this department.

HON. L. EVANS: We don't have any dollar amount that we expended in the department that we can identify, but we certainly assisted in that effort.

MRS. C. OLESON: Back to the discussion, you were mentioning negotiations with the Federal Government?

Are there ever any negotiations with other provinces to share services for employment?

HON. L. EVANS: Not that I'm aware of, Mr. Chairman. We do meet with the other provinces. Some time this fall, there will be a meeting of provincial Ministers of Employment and Immigration, hopefully, with the Federal Minister, but we exchange ideas, exchange program information. There is some correspondence. But to my knowledge, I don't believe there are any provinces, forgetting about Manitoba, that approach employment or unemployment problems on a shared basis. We share information, but not money.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, on Item (3), how is it that, in this budget of \$123,900, just 3,500 of it comes from the province? How do you figure that? How do you negotiate something like that? — (Interjection) — Inter-Governmental Relations, the budget is \$123,900, and Recoverable from Canada is \$120,400 — (Interjection) — . . .

A MEMBER: Good negotiations. The next Minister of Finance. Wouldn't you want him working on your behalf?

MR. J. McCRAE: Very shrewd.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, in administering the National Training Agreement, the Federal Government recognizes that there is a cost and they do pick up the salary costs plus 50 percent of operations, and I guess they do that for every province. So it's a good deal.

MR. J. McCRAE: It just looked very generous, Mr. Chairman, on the part of the Federal Government and I thought I'd better put a plug in there.

HON. L. EVANS: It's been going on for years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the Northern Development Agreement, again no allocation of funds but that, I take it, is because of the federal agreement?

HON. L. EVANS: That's right. There is provincial money, Mr. Chairman, but it all comes through Northern Affairs.

MRS. C. OLESON: I see. Is the Limestone Training Project included in this, any allocation of funds for the training, or is all through the Department of Mines and Energy?

HON. L. EVANS: I believe it's under the Manitoba Jobs Fund.

MRS. C. OLESON: The New Career South Program, how has this program changed? It's listed as north and south now. Is that a change in thrust?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, there's been no change the last couple of years.

MRS. C. OLESON: Who does it serve in the south?

HON. L. EVANS: More or less the same clientele. People who are disadvantaged and yet have some potential and can be trained on the job and in the classroom setting.

I just might add that in the program, in '85-86, to give the member a idea of what kind of training occurred, we trained people for these kinds of jobs: Child and Family Service workers; budget final and financial analysts; radio broadcasters; museum technician; drafting technician; medical interpreters; social welfare administrators; chemical dependency workers; retail store managers, and so on.

The trainees were involved in a large number of communities: Winnipeg, Pine Falls, Birch River, Waterhen, Selkirk, Crane River, Rosssburn, Portage la Prairie, Scanterbury, Ste. Rose du Lac.

We cooperated with many organizations, who provided the experience and on-the-job training, including organizations like the Native Plan Organization, St. Boniface Hospital, the Main Street Project, the X-Kalay Foundation, Child and Family Services of Winnipeg West, Northern Association of Community Councils, Salvation Army, Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, and so on. There's quite a variety of organizations. It's certainly a variety of occupations.

MRS. C. OLESON: This is geared toward Native people primarily, is it not?

HON. L. EVANS: 81 percent in '85-86 are estimated to be of Native ancestry. Some of them could be Metis people.

MRS. C. OLESON: How many people were trained through this?

HON. L. EVANS: The average number of trainees planned for '86-87 would be 204.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. (6) - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: No. (6) Stevenson Aviation, how many were trained through that program and are there any changes to the program this year?

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe there are any substantial changes in the program. Under Technical Training, we have 24 under apprenticeship training, and 44 under technical training. That's in '85-86. In terms of training days, the '85-86 training days were 1,636. In '86-87, we estimate it to rise to 2,104. Some are apprentices and some are in technical training.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: I have one question on the training at Stevenson Aviation and Technical Training Centre. It appears that there's a good jump in the salary level and no new staff years. Is there some special arrangement there or some reclassifications, or what happened?

HON. L. EVANS: The increase in salaries was \$22,900, and represents additional costs of sundry adjustments and primarily the annual merit increases, so there was no change in the staff years.

MR. J. McCRAE: No change in staff years but, just very quickly, it looks like, if you took the five people and gave them their fair share, you're talking about an increase of \$4,000 in one year, over \$4,000.00.

HON. L. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I'm also advised that we didn't pay full-year costs in all cases last year, so that explains that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(e)1(a) to (e)6(b) inclusive—pass.

Resolution 56: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$13,269,100 for Employment Services and Economic Security, Employment Services for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

Item 4. Manitoba Bureau of Statistics - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Have there been any changes in this department, changes in operations, at all?

HON. L. EVANS: As you can see, there's a slight decrease in spending but essentially there has been no major change. There's some repriorization and there's always new reports to work on and so on, but essentially it's the same as last year.

MRS. C. OLESON: I just would mention that with regard to statistics, when we hear the statistics of employment given, it's interesting to note - I believe there was an article in the "Brandon Sun" last summer or fall sometime, about a study done by some people, and it turned out that there was 25 percent unemployment in the City of Brandon.

It immediately begged some questions and, of course, they were using a different set of criteria for doing their study than what the Statistics Department does. If you're unemployed, according to Statistics Canada, you must tell an official that you're unemployed. This study was done, and I understand it's being done in other communities. I was at a meeting the other night where it was reported that a certain community had 25 percent to 27 percent unemployment.

So it shows, of course, that it depends how you use and apply and find your statistics. They were using a base that if you didn't have a job, then you were unemployed, so we can't always go by exactly what Statistics Canada tells us when we're talking about unemployed; and when we're talking about unemployment programs and unemployment, it doesn't do the people who are unemployed any good to hear some of these grandiose statistics, because they are still just as unemployed as they were before the announcement was made.

So I just remind the Minister that it isn't always as rosy as we think it is when we look at a list of statistics. There are many people in the rural communities and others that are still looking for work and maybe have a job but are under-employed, and there's always that

to take into consideration too. I don't think I have anymore questions on the Statistics Department; my colleague may have some.

HON. L. EVANS: Just a quick comment on that particular survey, without being critical of the survey, the point is that the only way you can compare the results of that survey is to use the same definitions for the rest of the country or some other areas that you want to compare, otherwise you're comparing apples and oranges.

The figures we've used and most provinces use are the official figures from Statistics Canada, the labour force survey; and indeed, there must have been some differences in definitions of unemployed, as the member alluded to. But that makes that survey not very helpful because unless you do the same survey across the province or across the country, how are you going to make adequate comparisons?

MRS. C. OLESON: I agree that you need the same definitions, but I think the purpose of that study and the purpose of the study that I'm thinking of that's ongoing now is to use it for the potential of a community to generate more jobs, or the needs for people, let's say, are thinking of putting an industry or trying to get some employment programs into a community and they do a survey and you phone them or ask them to send in questionnaire on what they are expecting in the line of jobs. So that's the purpose of it; it's for an entirely different purpose, of course, than the Statistics Canada job statistics, so it does serve a purpose in that a community is aware of what the potential is for employment in their community.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, what kinds of statistics does the Manitoba Bureau provide to the departments? Is it a matter of providing statistics on a custom-job basis or just how does that work? I know the Manitoba Bureau looks after registrations of births and deaths and marriages — (Interjection) — That's Vital Statistics? Okay, what kinds of service does this bureau provide?

HON. L. EVANS: I can give the members an overview. For the current year, these are some of the major projects: to continue and finally develop a set of economic accounts for the province. This is the provincial product. You've heard of GNP for Canada, and so on. We are now fairly well to the point where we have a set of provincial accounts, income and expenditure, and also included under that, we'll be developing a leading indicator for the province, quarterly personal income estimates, and related macro-economic statistics. That is being developed and eventually these will be released once we're confident that the numbers are fairly reliable. This is based on Statistics Canada information but it's adjusted so that we do have tables for Manitoba.

We do population projections for the eight economic regions of the province. The bureau has completed a sourcing directory for the Limestone project, where it provided a computerized directory identifying the supply capabilities of Manitoba businesses, so that we can encourage people who purchase for the Limestone project to purchase from Manitoba businesses. This is

a large computerized sourcing directory that's provided, which is available for businesses to use.

We develop and are developing small area data development. Statistics Canada does not provide a lot of information on small areas of this province, and we are using a technique whereby we can break down this information for small areas. It'll be useful for some of these communities that the Member for Gladstone was speaking about. We're using the postal code to break down the province. We're trying to relate the information that we've got using postal codes to provide that detail.

We are developing a computerized register of all active Manitoba businesses and this will be used as a source for Manitoba Government surveys, regional profiles, profiles of businesses by industry sector and potential clients for government programs.

We have and are cooperating with the 1986 census. They do various analytical reports requested by specific departments. For instance, Northern Manitoba businesses, a statistical profile was conducted. They engaged in a price monitoring survey in December of 1985 and they provided a report called, "Manitoba Economic Multiplier," it's 1985.

Then they put out generally, through their information system, various kinds of data on the province. The idea is not to duplicate what Statistics Canada is doing. We don't want to duplicate, but we want to use that information and provide it in a form that makes it more useful for Manitobans.

MR. J. McCRAE: The (c) identifies some \$79,800 Recoverable From Other Appropriations. Where is that recoverable from?

HON. L. EVANS: This will be from other departments where we'll be selling our products. They call it information products, otherwise called statistical reports.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. C. MANNES: It's nice to be with you this evening, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I'm glad that I came into the Committee Room just a few minutes ago to find this particular Minister was discussing some of the statistical information. Mr. Chairman, I have before me a report, I believe tabled to all members of the Legislature, dated May 22, 1986. I'll show it to the Minister. It's called, "Manitoba Economic Statistics," 1978 to 1985 (Provincial Comparisons.)

Mr. Chairman, what struck me as rather odd, when I went through this particular compendium of statistics covering some half dozen items, that the government has taken it upon themselves to arbitrarily group these statistics into two four-year terms. — (Interjection) — That's right, Mr. Chairman, and they were grouped arbitrarily, for some reason, into PC years, 1970 to 1981, and NDP statistics covering the term 1982 to 1985.

My question, Mr. Chairman, is with respect to the propriety of government funds being spent on the development of these types of statistics, being grouped into these types of arbitrary groupings. I don't question that the figures themselves can't be released, shouldn't

be released in a chronological series, but then I question the propriety of government themselves presenting it as a government document. Mr. Chairman, indeed, we can all do our own analysis; political parties can do their analysis, and group it in any fashion they wish to present to the public. The government felt obliged for some reason to take data of this nature and to break it out, and I question the propriety of it and ask the Minister to so explain.

HON. L. EVANS: I'm not sure, if I could see it. I'm not sure which one that is.

MR. C. MANNES: I have a number of questions written on it.

HON. L. EVANS: I'll not look at the questions.

MR. C. MANNES: Go ahead.

HON. L. EVANS: Yes, these categories and all that were developed by yours truly when we were in Opposition and I produced similar reports to this. I don't know if the member was here at that time, but I produced these kinds of statistics using Stats Canada figures basically along these lines. I believe this was published by - certainly the data originated in Stats Canada. My understanding is, if I recall properly, that it was reproduced by our caucus.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, why was this then tabled in the House as a government document?

HON. L. EVANS: I'm not sure what the occasion was. Was it the discussion of the Budget or the Throne Speech?

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I keep getting these little comments to my left here and I guess I'd have no criticism of it. If it had come forward during the election campaign, indeed, it's a fair way, I suppose, to try and depict certain arguments during election time and it's a political document and I have no difficulty with that. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister again, the propriety of tabling a document like this within the House as if it were, and as if government time and employees of government were directing their energies toward breaking out these types of statistics purely for political purposes. Now the Minister may claim that he does it as his own exercise and I accept that, Mr. Chairman. What I can't accept is the fact that it was laid before the House by he being a Minister of the government. I ask the Minister of the propriety of that action.

HON. L. EVANS: I think we're maybe in a grey area, Mr. Chairman. I believe it was during the debate, we had this information. As one who participated in the debate, I tabled it as information. The information is reliable. It's free from Stats Canada, anybody can obtain it, it's public information.

MR. C. MANNES: Well, I'd ask the Minister again whether he compiled this or did staff of the government compile this under his instruction?

HON. L. EVANS: My recollection is - I'll have to check - but my recollection is that - I didn't compile it personally, although I originated that type of series and those kinds of key economic indicators - my recollection is that, and the data is available through the Bureau of Statistics, but originates in Stats Canada, but my understanding, as I recall, it was reproduced in the caucus room. But it was a document for debate and there are many documents that are tabled for debate.

MR. C. MANNES: Mr. Chairman, I'm not arguing the right of a member to table documents for debate. I guess I'm questioning, when raw statistics are provided, which have been gleaned from a number of sources, including obviously StatsCan and maybe some provincial sources, although I don't see that in reviewing the tables here. Manitoba Economic Statistics, in themselves being important and of some interest to probably a large cross section of Manitobans, yet somebody within government spending the time to purposely take these statistics and compile them in groupings reflecting very real political times. I guess I just question the Minister whether or not he has any concern about the propriety of it and he indicates to me that he doesn't. So, Mr. Chairman, that was my sole reason for bringing it up.

HON. L. EVANS: As I said, there is a grey area and I can point to other documents that had been produced over the years and had been issued to all and sundry. For many years, back in the 70's, in the Lyon years, where there were reports tabled and indicated a certain slant on Manitoba's economy. You might say the Government of the Day was trying to produce a favourable light on what was happening to the retail sector or the manufacturing sector. It's been done for years and I dare say if I had the time I could find them in my files some place. On the same basis, the staff prepared them. At that time, I believe they were produced by either the Department of Industry and Commerce or Finance or maybe the Bureau, I don't know, but they were statistics prepared by the government and they were just released. We didn't criticize. We accepted the information. We might have questioned some of the conclusions, but it was data.

MR. C. MANNES: A final point, Mr. Chairman, I guess I question when I see the various headings throughout, it's called Employment Growth, Rate of Increase, Manitoba under the NDP, Manitoba under the Conservatives '78-81. I just question how it is that material that supposedly could be taken right to a franking piece, a purely political franking piece, could be so detailed and developed within the department. I question how it is that taxpayers' money can be used by way of department staff, directing their energies and time toward the development of these types of statistics.

HON. L. EVANS: As I recall, the thing was reproduced and distributed by the caucus staff.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 4.(a)—pass; 4.(b)—pass; 4.(c)—pass.

Resolution 57: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$326,000 for

Employment Services and Economic Security, Manitoba Bureau of Statistics, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

We now return to Item 1.(a) Minister's Salary.
The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd just like to thank the Minister for his answers and remarks to our questioning. I think we've had quite a good debate on his Estimates and covered, I hope, all the programs, the many programs, that are covered by his department. Sometimes it's difficult to see a clear picture when so much of the funding, for instance, of this department is through the Jobs Fund. It's hard to get at quite just what is going on with regard to the programs. It's hard to get a clear picture of exactly what appropriations the funds are actually spent by this department when some of it is Jobs Fund money and some of it is done in other ways. But I think we've had adequate discussion and I don't think I really have any more points to raise with the Minister. I'll probably think of some good questions tomorrow and, if they're really good, I'll write him a note and ask him about them or use question period.

Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Item 1.(a)—pass.

Resolution No. 54: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,204,200 for Employment Services and Economic Security, Administration and Finance, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

That concludes the Estimates of the Department of Employment Services and Economic Security.
Committee rise.

HON. L. EVANS: You didn't give me a chance to thank you for your questions and your debate.

MRS. C. OLESON: No, he didn't. It's all the Chairman's fault.

SUPPLY — URBAN AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee please come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Urban Affairs. We are now on Item No. 3.(a).

The Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The question of Plan Winnipeg, we've been through, I guess, almost 10 years of process to get Plan Winnipeg to where it is at the present time. It's been a long and arduous road both in terms of the original tripartite representation and then the refusal by the Federal Government and latterly by the province to continue on with that tripartite agreement. Subsequently, it left the city on its own to continue on to finalization of that plan. Once finalized, then it was a question of holding public hearings.

I happened to, as a member of the Executive Policy Committee, participate in all of the public hearings that were held with the exception of the most recent public

hearing on Plan Winnipeg. We heard the representations of people from all across the city as to their interests and so on.

When the matter was first referred to the Provincial Government as part of the process after Second Reading, the Minister at that time came forward with a whole series of changes that the NDP Government of the Day wanted to have incorporated into Plan Winnipeg. Those were subject to negotiation over a period of time, some three or four years and I think three different Ministers of Urban Affairs; initially Mr. Kostyra; secondly, the late Mary Beth Dolin; and latterly, the Honourable Monsieur Desjardins — (Interjection) — He knows, Kostyra, Dolin and Desjardins.

We finally after a great deal of harangue and a great deal of arm-twisting, I suppose, and I think a great deal of common sense as well prevailed with the latter Minister, Mr. Desjardins, to the point where I think people saw the light and we came to a realistic conclusion save one little area that kind of got off-track. In any event, with certain amendments, Plan Winnipeg was given absolute, if you will, by the Minister to have Third Reading, following which certain amendments were introduced to deal with the question of the urban limit line and a couple of other areas.

That public hearing, I believe, was held a month or so ago with the city and, I believe, in probably 75 percent of the cases the amendments were rejected.

I'm not sure whether that's been yet before the City Council; I don't believe so. I think it's coming up perhaps this next week in that regard, but in any event, in the event the City of Winnipeg Council, Mr. Chairman, decides to agree with its executive policy committee and decides to not pass on the proposed amendments that were advanced for public hearing, what does the Minister intend to do in that area with regard to the urban limit line?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, as the honourable member opposite mentioned, my predecessor and the committee from City Council took a three-year problem and brought it to - to use his words - "a realistic conclusion," a realistic conclusion the members opposite called very pragmatic. I agree with that, unfortunately, and it was subject to public hearings which I respect and the members opposite respect and the Honourable Minister of Health respects, but the key is when two parties come to an agreement and unless there's absolute evidence to the contrary, then it's the responsibility of both parties if they have a "realistic conclusion," to use the Member for Charleswood's terms, it's up to both parties to deliver on those conclusions unless there's evidence, public or otherwise, to show there was lack of wisdom in the original preclusion.

As the members opposite are aware, this went to EPC. There were some presentations on the proposals; in some other areas, there were no presentations. EPC, in their wisdom, and again they're the elected representatives, saw fit to recommend to City Council something contrary to the arrangements the member opposite made with the previous Minister to City Council.

Now City Council has tabled those recommendations and hasn't dealt with them. I'm not sure what form they will come back; the present form, another form or whatever. I can say that if there was absolute public outcry - and I mean strong public, sustained public input on the "realistic conclusion," then we're not insensitive to that.

In fact, arising from the hearings, there was some feedback from the department on the Leila North arrangement that unfortunately the land had been stripped or whatever else. There seemed to be a large public outcry on that agreement, and we were certainly willing to take a look at that or listen to what the city had to say to that based on the public hearings.

Unfortunately, EPC recommended changes to the "realistic conclusion" that were quite a bit contrary to what the arrangement was the year before. I have suggested to some councillors and the mayor that we are concerned about having a joint-planning process. I don't want to go back to the days in which we're all - I agree with my predecessor, I don't want to go back to the days where we're just trading letters and not getting anything done. I think the approach both parties took last summer was a sensible one, but the province is responsible for paying for capital costs for schools and operating of schools and there's other issues the city has to pay for in terms of operating. It means that we have to have a balance, and I don't mean an ideological balance, but an intelligent balance of how we develop the city versus the costs and services we have to present.

I have asked that this item be placed on the next joint agenda. I haven't had a chance to discuss it formally with some city councillors. I've discussed it informally with a few, and the Mayor. I think it would be somewhat presumptuous to say what specifically we're going to do before a city council acts, and before we discuss it with the joint committee.

I also think, in the long term, that where a body of government has responsibility, both constitutional, I might add, responsibility, but also responsibility for providing ongoing services such as capital costs of schools and operating costs of schools, it should have some joint authority on where those costs are going to be and how they're going to be implemented.

As I say, I thought the former Minister of Urban Affairs, the Minister of Health and the committee that was delegated - I understand the Member for Charleswood was on that committee; the Member for Riel was on that committee; the Mayor was on that committee; I think Guy Savoie was on that committee, as well - I thought they came up with an intelligent, pragmatic solution to it. I hope we deal with this issue on a pragmatic basis in the future because I don't think it helps the citizens of Winnipeg very much to have two solitudes dealing with this issue.

We believe we have some responsibility in the longer term issues and we should have some hopeful joint authority in this area.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, part of the fundamental problem in this whole area of urban and municipal government, is the fact that the Provincial Government, as the Minister has just said, wants to have a joint planning approach with the City of Winnipeg, for

instance; that he wants to have joint control, as it were, over the planning of the City of Winnipeg.

This Minister doesn't recognize; the Minister of Municipal Affairs doesn't recognize the fact that municipalities have matured in terms of their ability to operate their own plant, or their ability to carry out their own mandate, and that successive provincial governments have failed to recognize that municipalities have matured, matured to a point where they can handle 99.9 percent of the matters thrust upon them in terms of their own legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I've had 13 years of experience in city government. I've had some considerable experience with respect to government outside the City of Winnipeg through my association with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, through my association with the Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities, and through my acquaintanceship with a number of people involved in municipal governments throughout the province.

Let me say this. I have every confidence in the world that those people can carry out an effective job in their municipality because they know what the problems are, Mr. Chairman, they know full well what the problems are, better, quite frankly, than most of the civil servants associated with that area, both in Urban and in Municipal Affairs. They have a very keen understanding, those municipal officials, of the kind of things that need to be done in their municipality in order to keep it functioning and operating properly. My fellow caucus member from La Verendrye, being the Mayor of Steinbach, certainly would know far better than anyone else in this room about the kind of problems that the Town of Steinbach would face and how to deal with them and so on.

The question now is not a matter of control, Mr. Chairman. The question is not a matter of superimposing additional administration over and above the existing administrations in the municipalities. It is simply a question of funding, and that's the key.

Now, the Minister has indicated that the province funds the question of capital costs for schooling, and that's fine. But let him argue with the school districts with respect to whether they bus children, whether they build a new school or whatever, but don't let him impose upon municipalities the question of planning. In particular, the City of Winnipeg Planning Branch alone is probably - well, it's certainly considerably larger than the Department of Urban Affairs, and that is a lean department in terms of overall city planning compared to other Western Canadian cities. You have some very excellent people, Mr. Chairman, in that department as well that have a great expertise and a great understanding of the kind of thing that's necessary to properly plan for orderly contiguous development.

The question of urban sprawl has been brought up from time to time. It's non-existent virtually in the City of Winnipeg, except in areas where it's been allowed through opting out in some cases of the additional zone municipalities. You have opting out take place, Mr. Chairman, in a couple of areas, and that's where you're going to get into the urban sprawl problems in my view. Orderly contiguous development and/or a firm statement, not necessarily the opting out of municipalities, but a firm statement to those municipalities that they're in and they can't opt out.

Monday, 11 August, 1986

That's been another problem that the city had been faced with over a long period of time.

We have situations where East St. Paul and West St. Paul have come to the City of Winnipeg with subdivision applications for development, and they have said, if you don't grant our subdivision application, by implication they have said, we'll apply to opt out and form our own planning district and we'll do what the hell we want. So, Mr. Chairman, when you have that kind of a club levied over your head, it's very, very difficult, particularly when successive Provincial Governments have allowed people to opt out of the additional zones. We've had opting out under this government. We've had opting out under the previous government.

So, Mr. Chairman, the question is, there has been no firm statement to deal with the periphery of the city, to deal with the additional zone and to deal with a firm and proper planning statement. That's something that, Mr. Chairman, has to be dealt with.

But I'm concerned, first of all, that the province wants to continually impose its will, impose its interests on top of the City of Winnipeg, appreciating the fact that municipalities and the city are creatures of provincial legislation. That is historically and constitutionally how they come about. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, they have matured significantly since that early legislation came forward, since The Municipal Acts of the Thirties and Twenties and so on. Municipalities today right across the length and breadth of this province have a maturity to deal with their own individual problems far beyond what was ever anticipated when that legislation was put into place.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that, with respect to the Plan Winnipeg amendments, the Minister would take a pragmatic approach, take a realistic approach and say, look, it's been 10 years since the Plan Winnipeg first started, 10 years of continuous evolution. Over that ten-year period times have changed, events have changed, we've gone through two or three different cycles of development and decline.

The time has come to get down to have at least some kind of a plan, a firm plan, a plan that the people in the development industry, a plan that the people in the City of Winnipeg have an understanding of, that they can say at least, good or bad, whether it accomplishes every objective or it doesn't, at least it's there, at least it's in place and at least people know what kind of direction the city is going in terms of their overall plan. And 99 percent of the plan that's in place at the present time nobody's arguing about.

Mr. Chairman, we're really not arguing about that 99 percent at all. What we are arguing about is a few lines on a map, I think lines that all of the planners collectively, both I'm sure in the Department of Urban Affairs and, Mr. Chairman, in the City of Winnipeg Planning Department wish they never ever heard of, that I'm sure they'd all love to see the urban limit line go away and not bother anybody anymore, that it's caused far more havoc than it was ever intended to cause, and has caused more friction, shall we say, between the city and the province than it was ever anticipated.

So I would hope the Minister in his approach to this whole matter of those amendments would just say: Look, what's done is done, it's a new ball game, let's get on with the job, let's not get into a confrontation

position again over those amendments but if they don't meet everybody's criteria, at least we have a plan in place that we 99 percent agree with, let's get on with the job. It's almost, Mr. Chairman, I think time now to start reviewing the plan again under this legislation that hasn't yet been passed. So that that's the kind of delay and the kind of concern that's been expressed over a long, long period of time.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

HON. G. DOER: I thought last year we did take a pragmatic approach. My predecessor and members opposite took a very pragmatic approach to the problem of the - and I've read the missives that have gone back and forth, believe me, ad nauseam probably in terms of the public, I'd say continue to have a pragmatic approach, yes. But that's the issue. I believe that we did have a pragmatic approach to the city to a problem and an impasse we had called albeit on 1 percent of the total Plan Winnipeg.

Our Minister, our former Minister of Urban Affairs, goes back to Cabinet with a compromise to what the Cabinet had already taken and recommends it and delivers it back in Cabinet, and comes back with agreement to sanction the amendments that the Minister had formerly refused to sign.

City Council with the same agreement, and subject to public hearing takes the whole agreement EPC, we don't know what City Council is going to do, takes the whole pragmatic agreement and somewhat disregards it. I would prefer to go the way that you went last year and our Minister went last year because I don't think we should get hung up on this fuzzy planning versus unfettered planning. I think we should come up with a pragmatic approach to this problem, I really do. But if we come up with a "realistic conclusion" and those are your words and I think they were a good conclusion, and our Minister goes back and gets a compromise where the Cabinet wasn't a year before, goes back with his own credibility and his own reputation and delivers back on some of the positions the government had taken in good faith, then I think there's a reciprocal good faith in the whole area of what astounds me, because there's one area, I think, Assiniboia-Fort Garry in the industrial area, that has a surplus of land already. There wasn't one public presentation and yet the recommendation that's tabled by EPC is to proceed with the original plan not the plan that you and the Minister of Health had taken.

So I hope, I really hope that we can take pragmatic decisions and if there's a huge outcry of people that we've made the mistake, God knows we're both sensitive to public opinion - but if it's just the lawyer and a couple of other people with a potential - I don't even want to say it, but there are people that gain with urban limit lines changing and there are people that are somewhat restricted in their potential gain depending on where that line is, we know that. But I think that the pragmatic approach that was taken last year would be my preference. Certainly I would like to take that approach in the future, I give you that guarantee.

But there's a quid pro quo, there's a quid pro quo when a deal's made unless there's absolutely overwhelming public opinion against it and that's the

reason for the public hearings, then I think it's incumbent on sides, two parties of government to deliver.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister's statements of just now in substance at least, I appreciate and I'm sure the city will look forward to. But I think it demonstrates a lack of understanding of how the two different government processes work.

Mr. Chairman, on the one hand the Minister can go to Cabinet in secret, not that there's anything the matter with that, that's the process. But he can go to Cabinet and he can advance the position and have Cabinet adopt it and Cabinet in fact can and will deliver on that particular agreement once adopted by Cabinet. But, however, when you deal with Municipal Government, those who negotiate, negotiate from the strength of one vote, Mr. Chairman, because that's how Municipal Government works, everybody has a vote; there isn't a government and an opposition, everybody's on the same side, so to speak, in terms of how Municipal Government works, so that when I or the Member for Riel or anybody else sits down and in our former capacities to negotiate "a deal" in fact, we're not negotiating from a position of strength; we're negotiating from a position of one vote and also the job that you happen to carry at that particular time, be it Chairman of Executive Committee or Deputy Mayor or whatever. It's an unfortunate situation that many, many people in Provincial Government affairs do not understand that that's how Municipal Government works.

So that in fact if somebody says, this is what we'd like to see and are delegated "by position if nothing else" to go and discuss matters with another level of government, that's all that can be; it cannot be a hard and fast agreement because those people representing Municipal Government don't have that authority. They don't have the right to go and say, yes, I'm going to bind all of my colleagues as can the Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. C. BIRT: . . . public hearings . . .

MR. J. ERNST: In addition to that, the Member for Fort Garry has reminded me that the whole question of public hearings, this government has claimed time and time and time again over the last five years, how they are in favour of public hearings, of public input, of getting the mood of the people before, Mr. Chairman, they make a decision, not after but before. In this situation, the Minister of Urban Affairs has just indicated that a deal was a deal and you have the public hearings as sort of a window dressing affair because the deal's already been struck. Therefore, the city should live up to that agreement, realistic or not.

The process is what's at stake here, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister's indicated that the city should, having made an agreement now with the Minister through myself and the Member for Riel and the Mayor and so on, we should go back down to the city and hold the hearings but only as a sham, only as a window dressing, only as an opportunity for people to come and vent their spleen if they want. But we still have to pass what they wanted.

A deal is a deal, I think the Minister has indicated quite clearly. I understand his concerns. I understand his frustrations perhaps, but the fact of the matter is the process does not allow for that. If you're going to have a public hearing, the public hearing is to determine what you should do, not as some kind of a window-dressing arrangement, not as an opportunity for people to come and jump up and down. Mr. Chairman, it's there to get public input. Once public input is taken, then the members of the committee, having heard that public input, make the decision after the fact, Mr. Chairman, not before.

Now the concern that those "agreements" that were made prior to the public hearing, Mr. Chairman, are not possible. Under that process, they are not possible. The agreement that was made, in principle if you will, that would be subject to the public hearing process, subject to what people would have to say, and subject to reconsideration of the whole matter again after the public hearing process, that's fine, that was what was done with the Minister of Urban Affairs at the time, but there was no commitment, Mr. Chairman.

The only commitment given - and it was made very clear - as a matter of fact, we went through two and three and four different meetings, along with legal opinions to the effect that in fact we could not do what the Minister wanted. That was agreed beforehand, before a public hearing, and to have the public hearing for whatever purpose. But we could not agree beforehand. The legal opinions told us we could not do that. Eventually, the Minister realized. He got his own legal opinion, I think. We got our legal opinions, and they coincided. They said, look, you can't have a public hearing and you can't jeopardize or prejudice that public hearing in advance.

What had to happen was the Minister had to give permission for Third Reading of the by-law, which he did. The city undertook to advance for public hearing certain amendments that the Minister thought were in the best interests of the Provincial Government, which it did. So the agreement was reached, and the agreement was lived up to as far as that's concerned.

Now what happened subsequent to that with those particular amendments and whether the Executive Policy Committee of the day chose to alter or reject or adopt certain of those amendments, Mr. Chairman, are as a result of a public hearing, fair, reasonable and open. That's the position that the Provincial Government has taken all along, to have fair, reasonable and open public hearings and to judge the results after that public hearing has taken place, not before. So I think the Minister has to perhaps understand the process a little bit more before he starts to allege that certain agreements were broken.

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, I think I mentioned the agreement six times in the context, subject to public hearings. Not once did I mention it just recently, if you check Hansard, outside of the public hearings to deal with the public sensitivities.

I also stated that, if there was an overwhelming public reaction or sensitivity to what had been, in your words, a realistic conclusion to this problem, then we were certainly sensitive to it. I know in Leila North - I think that's the area - even though the land was stripped

without permits prematurely - and God knows how it could be an agricultural land when it had no topsoil left - there was some feedback from staff, and I read the transcripts, of a number of briefs from the public who had come forward. We were certainly sensitive to that.

There are other areas of the, and I'm using your terms, "realistic conclusion" that didn't have one public presentation, not one brief to EPC. Now, Mr. Chairman, the statement has also been made that we're just one voice in 29 or whatever, one vote. Well, when people are delegated to discuss issues of mutual impasse with the Provincial Government, hopefully at minimum they can deliver it back to the group that delegated them, the EPC Committee.

I have been involved in situations not in Cabinet before when I had to deliver it with 20,000 people. That's called leadership. When you make a deal, it's your responsibility to deliver on it.

A MEMBER: You just don't understand.

HON. G. DOER: No, I do understand. I understand that, in Tuxedo Industrial, there wasn't one brief, not one public presentation. I also understand the words of the member opposite. We had a "realistic conclusion" to the problem. So without one brief from the public — (Interjection) — no, each one is an individual package. Each one was dealt with individually.

On the Tuxedo Industrial, there wasn't one brief, and still the EPC went against what the Member for Charleswood has called a realistic conclusion. So if the argument was, it's totally subject to public hearing and, as one part of that area the council recommended these positions, EPC has recommended to council these issues on an individual basis so there's one individual piece that didn't have any presentation from any member of the public, and still the "realistic conclusion" the member opposite and the former Minister of Urban Affairs came to was by recommendation to City Council, which has now been tabled, has been rejected.

Now I buy totally the theory of public hearings. I totally buy public sensitivity. There's a difference between that and overwhelming disagreement on the basis of a "realistic conclusion" between the two parties, and just going through an exercise where there's no public presentation. The two parties have made a "tentative and tentative to public hearing" agreement to resolve a three-year impasse, and it's basically ignored.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Riel.

MR. G. DUCHARME: Just in consideration, when you're having public hearings and you've got this farm land that's - say, we'll use the original hearings out in St. Vital. You've got farm lands way out there, and you've got houses being built up to there. Maybe, they're within a half-a-mile, the same thing as it would be in the north. Could the Minister tell me what he would consider an overwhelming response or sensitivity? Who would come forward to that public hearing, say, in the North where it's not affecting anybody immediately right now? Who's going to come forward and give you that sensitivity that you're talking about?

That's the problem that we do have when the planning is going on, and we do accept the planner's report as part of the program. But a lot of times, when you do have these public hearings, you don't have these people come forward. Maybe the Minister can tell me who he expects to come forward, the overwhelming people come forward at these particular public hearings?

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, the city, in reaching their realistic conclusion, we agreed to some positions of the city, a majority actually of positions of the city. There were a few amendments proposed subject to public hearing that was agreed to again, to use the terminology, a realistic conclusion between some members opposite and the Minister of Urban Affairs. Now surely to God, there was rationale for the two parties agreeing to that position to begin with.

There was not one public presentation in one of the examples I used. Some others were just developers. I think they have a right to be at the public hearings, but in one area there was not one developer, not one person. Yet, the realistic conclusion that the Member for Charleswood has talked about has not been recommended. There was no change in public opinion, and it has not been recommended to City Council. Now there are other laws across Canada that are harsher than Plan Winnipeg in terms of - not harsher, but more unilateral - in terms of provincial rights, in terms of this issue, some that are more permissive.

I prefer the kind of solution that was arrived at last year, but I think implicit in that, not withstanding public sensitivity, is delivering on those joint arrangements.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, I suppose we can debate the question of whether or not the city did what it did and so on, whether it had the right to do it or whether it should have lived up to an agreement or not, but the one thing I don't think the Minister has yet understood is the question of an agreement in advance of the public hearing. Mr. Chairman, you can't have an agreement in advance of a public hearing or the public hearing is a sham, the public hearing has been prejudiced, and the public hearing ought not to have taken place if your mind is made up before the public hearing takes place.

Under that public hearing process, whether there's a great hue and cry from a number of people, whether it is representation by one or two people with a vested interest, i.e., ownership of the land and a substantial investment made therein or, in fact, by no representation but by a passage of time. Mr. Chairman, things change, times change, agreements change, the needs change and, if an agreement in principle, at least, is reached in September or October of one year, and in July of the next there's a public hearing which indicates that perhaps things have changed; perhaps development has taken place sooner; perhaps demand is greater; who knows? And I wasn't part of the decision-making process then so I can't answer that.

But I think, Mr. Chairman, we have to understand all of those factors in advance before we can understand how the process works. At any rate, perhaps the Minister can comment, that notwithstanding any of the matter that's gone on before us tonight, the fact of the matter is he has the ultimate responsibility; he has a

responsibility to either accept whatever the City Council recommends to him or to reject that and impose his own will. If what the city recommends is not acceptable to the Minister, is he about to impose his will?

HON. G. DOER: I beg your pardon?

MR. J. ERNST: If what the city ultimately recommends to you, under Plan Winnipeg, is unacceptable, are you prepared to impose your will, as permitted under the legislation, and enforce or implement or - I'm looking for the proper terminology - but in effect you have the right, as I understand it under the legislation, to in fact pass it yourself with those amendments attached, and I'm wondering whether you're prepared to impose your will in that sense.

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, there's two points here. One is - and I've always said in all my answers that it's always been subject to public sensitivity and public hearings - if something goes before a public hearing and there's absolutely no presentation to the contrary, one could argue that if we went against tremendous public outcry on an agreement that was taking place, that made a sham of public hearings and I would agree with you.

But also one could argue that if an agreement - and as you stated, to a realistic conclusion of this joint problem - has taken place and there's no public opinion to the contrary, that makes a sham of the "realistic conclusion." I think it's a double-sided issue, and I've never once, nor have any of us once stated they were opposed to the public hearings nor were we insensitive to it.

In fact, we were advised immediately of the issue at Leila north when 15-20 people came forward with what I understand to be fairly impassioned briefs against what the province had initially suggested. People were sensitive to that.

The second question becomes, do you want to impose your will? I have no personal will, it's a decision ultimately that must be made by colleagues in Cabinet. It's not a personal issue, but I have asked for this issue to be on the next agenda of the official delegation meeting scheduled - we asked for a meeting to be in July, because we had cancelled some during the election, in all fairness, we couldn't get it in July. We have asked that it be on the agenda at the next meeting to discuss both sides of this issue.

At the hearing that the member opposite attended, the public hearing, there was some indication from the superintendent of one of the school divisions, I believe, that three new schools would be necessary in that area of the city alone, notwithstanding St. Vital South, notwithstanding some of the other areas of the city. We've got schools closing down in some areas of the city; we've got other schools opening up. It might be nice to say we can deal with that policy after, the busing policy, etc. after, but we believe we should have a longer-term situation. We're not perfect with the school division either on these things, as members opposite know, in terms of where we're going. I'm not pretending for one minute we are.

The other issue that's been raised is the whole additional zones. There is some development, primarily

two, maybe additional zones in the last couple of years, and there's also some development outside of the additional zones in the area abutting the City of Winnipeg. I've asked for figures of what those are, because many of them have been agriculturally defined as two acres, the majority of them, outside of the additional zone, agriculturally defined, but that's only as two acres.

We can't have one set of rules for the City of Winnipeg and another set of rules that the City Council has for the additional zones before they're left, and another set of rules in areas like St. Clements and La Salle and everything else and I'm trying to get a handle on that. Hopefully, that will be part of the discussion at the official delegation meeting, because when you ask about what our intentions are in this area, I think we have to work, in fact, we have a working group with the Minister of Municipal Affairs to make sure that we're not saying one thing to City Council and doing another thing ourselves in areas beyond the additional zones. I guess the answer to the question is, I'm not going to panic on the thing, I've read all the correspondence back and forth, I've talked to a lot of people.

There are some recommendations in this City of Winnipeg Review, quite frankly, that I don't think deal with it totally. They say, do the one hand on the other hand kind of recommendation and say we should study it further; we are studying it further, the additional zones, but the whole area within the City of Winnipeg, within the additional zones, which is approved by City Council, the Committee of Environment of City Council. I've heard before that if you don't do this, we'll just opt out, it's been of the reality of that decision making there and then of course the whole area, the megalopolis or whatever term we want to use, up the Red River, up to Selkirk and East Selkirk and over to La Salle and whatever else. I think we've got to get a handle on all that before I would want to come back with a definitive position to the answer to your question.

MR. J. ERNST: I thank the Minister for his response and hopefully we've been able to enlighten him somewhat through this discussion.

Mr. Chairman, from time to time there have been recommendations made and presentations made with regard to a variety of split jurisdictional issues that continually create problems for the city, not the least of which, for instance, is the Health Department.

In the inner city, the old City of Winnipeg, we have the inner city Health Department, operated by the City of Winnipeg. In the suburban areas we have the provincial health units dealing with health and environmental issues in that area. The problem is, on one side of the street you can have one set of guidelines, one set of rules, one set of enforcement procedures, and on the other side of the street, Mr. Chairman, you have something different. You have a situation where a provincial health officer is dealing with, for instance, let's take restaurants for example, on one side of the street; and on the other side of the street, you have the inner city health department dealing with restaurants again, both directly competing now, because they're on opposite sides of the streets, but operating under two different issues, two different sets of guidelines, regulations and legislation, etc. That's becoming with

every passing day, Mr. Chairman, an intolerable situation.

In addition to that you have a variety of other health-related - under that particular situation - issues; one directed by the Provincial Government and the Minister of Health, the other directed by the Commissioner of Environment and the City of Winnipeg. It does not make sense, quite frankly, to take 600,000 people, Mr. Chairman, and say of those 600,000 people, 250,000 of those contained in the Inner City will operate under one set of guidelines and be subject to one set of criteria; whereas on the other side, the other 350,000 people will be dealt with in a different manner. It will be dealt with by provincial regulation under the Minister of Health.

Now, there was an attempt at one point to try and put these things together; to say to the Provincial Government look, health constitutionally is a responsibility of the Provincial Government and the Federal Government, certainly not a responsibility of a Municipal Government. Health, by and large, is not a service to property as were municipal governments created for, but health is a constitutional responsibility under federal and delegated to provincial legislation.

So Mr. Chairman, there was an attempt made but that attempt, I think, all of a sudden got caught up in the maelstrom of health-related issues and health funding at that particular time, to a point where I think the government simply said, we can't afford it.

I can remember the Minister telling us the kind of great involved health care problems in financing and it was going to happen in the next 10 or 15 years and he simply said no, I won't deal with it; he simply said we can't afford it; this is the kind of thing we're facing in the future; so sorry, we can't deal with it; and it wasn't dealt with. We've had the Deputy Minister, Mr. Edwards go through a long study with the Commissioner of Environment of the city. We had, I think, a series of discussion issues that led primarily toward a provincial takeover of the Inner City Health Department, I think as well to deal with other health care issues like ambulance service for one.

Ambulance service is not a municipal service department; ambulance service is a health issue. It is an arm of the health care system that is the primary sales department, if you will, of the health care system. It delivers those emergency cases to the health care facilities for treatment and that is not a municipal issue. It is not a constitutional situation relating to municipalities. It's not a service to property; it's a health care issue. Those kinds of things, Mr. Chairman, have been around for a long, long time.

You can carry it further to the question of social assistance. Social assistance again is not a municipal constitutional responsibility; it comes under Health and Welfare. Health and Welfare is a provincial or federal responsibility. But they have been in part abdicated by those relative two governments and left to municipalities to deliver.

For instance, can anybody in their right mind tell me why the first 90 days of social assistance, by and large, under municipalities should be dealt with rather under municipalities, following which it's taken over by the Provincial Government? That makes no sense whatsoever. There is no constitutional responsibility for that, there's no practical reason for that and quite

frankly it's an abdication by senior government or other orders of government, Federal and Provincial, over a long period of time and it says simply, let the municipalities take care of it; something else we can shift on to them. And it's not correct. It's not right and those matters should be addressed, Mr. Chairman. I would wonder if the Minister has been able to wrestle with any of these problems, if he's given consideration to any of these problems, or if he has not had the opportunity or the time, will he in the next short time be able to deal with some of these problems to get them back on track?

HON. G. DOER: Although I don't have the authority on many of the items the member opposite has raised, I would like to comment.

Mr. Chairman, we have probably the best health care system. In fact I was at a meeting the other day with the Council of Women who said unequivocally that Manitoba has the best health care system in North America. We have one of the finest ratios and supports for social assistance anywhere in this country.

We don't have a perfect health care delivery system nor a perfect social assistance system. The health care system originally was started and privately funded and raised by volunteers in the early years. Some of our administrative systems today I'm sure the Minister of Health will agree, administratively predate modern medicare acts and modern Canadian health acts that we are now presently operating under and there are adjustments to make.

We have a social assistance issue that quite frankly on the one hand the Cherniack Report recommended going one way, i.e., the city taking it all over; and on the other hand the Ryant Report recommended the province taking it all over — (Interjection) — what's that? Well on this area I totally disagree with the City of Winnipeg review, personally, notwithstanding the fact that the decisions have not been made yet by government to suggest again that the province would fund 100 percent welfare and health care costs which I might add are running at about 20 percent administrative costs to the City of Winnipeg, it's about 15 percent in the province. I would think that it would be very, very costly because if one doesn't have again, any authority to say how those issues are spent and only the responsibility is to send over the money, I think we would be in a strong administrative nightmare.

I know many of these issues are being discussed now by the Minister of Health, the Minister of Community Services, the Minister of Employment Services. There is some joint planning now going on in terms of delivery, I believe that Social Resources Committee of Cabinet, to look at these dual jurisdictions and doesn't make sense for the citizens. I know first-hand we've had some discussions with the City of Winnipeg dealing with environmental inspectors that deal as you say with different things. You can get one area of St. James that deals with one set of inspections and another area of St. James that deals with another. Again the province has half as many staff as well but of course there are more restaurants in downtown Winnipeg.

The whole area of The Environment Act and do groups opt out and enforce their own is another issue.

I think we have to get some coordination of these groups in the longer run. I would never suggest that some of this duplicity and duplication of delivery is perfect; it's not. But we have to decide which way we're going to go; totally the city or totally the province; or just go the way it is. There are rationales for all of them. One of the major rationales of course is now with money and money being tight it's difficult to move in a perfect way which is what we would all like to do.

The whole area of ambulance system, that's a matter that the Urban Affairs is not directly involved with. I am aware of the situation and I know the Minister of Health and his officials are meeting I believe now with the City of Winnipeg on some of those matters. I'm sure that's an issue that can be raised with the Minister of Health. But I don't have the authority for all those issues but I am concerned about them and I am participating with the Minister of Health, with the Minister of Community Services and with the Minister of Employment Services on a Social Resources Committee on some of these areas.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, lest there be any error, I don't think anybody, certainly not myself, questioned the type of system we have at the present time. Nobody is questioning the social assistance system and nobody's questioning the health care system. What we're questioning about is a jurisdictional problem, a jurisdictional problem and a funding problem, a problem, one where matters were shifted over through a process of evolution more than anything else, shifted to municipal government when it ought not to be shifted to municipal government.

I appreciate that the Minister of Urban Affairs doesn't have jurisdiction, but I would hope he would take some leadership. I hope that he, as the Minister of Urban Affairs, he who is the direct liaison with the City of Winnipeg, he who is the Cabinet voice, if you will, for the City of Winnipeg, would take some leadership and say to the Minister of Health, accept your responsibilities, Mr. Minister of Health, and take care of those problems and take some of these things away from the City of Winnipeg that are not jurisdictional or constitutional responsibilities of that city, to say Mr. Desjardins, look, the Health Department should be paying for these costs; these are Health Department costs; assume them. Get them off the back of the City of Winnipeg property taxpayer and get them into the health care system where they belong. In that, I would hope that the Minister of Urban Affairs would show some initiative, show the kind of leadership that should be shown in this matter and to carry that torch on behalf of the City of Winnipeg to the Cabinet table to make sure that these things get straightened out.

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, the issues are not that simple. I don't disagree that there is not, from a perspective of the citizen, and there is some confusion about who delivers what and why, it's been developed on an ad hoc system. I mentioned before that we had an unsolicited comment the other day in the committee meeting that both the Minister of Health and I were at where the people said it's the finest health care system in North America; but the delivery system has a duplication in the City of Winnipeg and the solution is both philosophical policy and somewhat financial.

We don't have it in this year's Estimates; let's be perfectly honest about that, but it's not something that we disagree with in terms of duplication, environmentally with the Environment group, with Health, with social assistance, etc.

MR. J. ERNST: I just want to reiterate once again that I appreciate it's not in this year's Estimates, but I would hope that the Minister would take the initiative and advance those positions forward in the hopes that, at least by next year, being in a position where at least some of that burden can be removed from the property taxpayer and put back into the health care system or the social assistance system where it belongs.

Mr. Chairman, another issue that's been long outstanding and appears to have little or no resolution - and again I would wonder whether the urban policy coordinating people have done anything in this regard - I'm not giving up you guys - but that's the question of Shoal Lake and Indian Bay and the City of Winnipeg's water supply.

That's been ongoing now, I guess, six, seven or eight years since the original advance by the Indian Band at Indian Bay. It came forward and wanted to make application to develop 350 or 400 cottage lots and about 100 condominiums and a marina and a variety of other commercial activities. That matter has been through, I guess, or overlapped the Lyon Government in the late Seventies, the first Pawley administration and now this latter one. I gather it's also overlapped a couple of federal administrations as well.

Mr. Chairman, it would appear still that there's no resolution to this matter, there doesn't appear to be any action even in this regard. Perhaps the Minister can advise the committee if in fact there is action in this regard, if there is something taking place, if there is progress being made and, if there is, what the present position of the government is toward that very, very serious issue that faces the City of Winnipeg.

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, not only is this issue going between various political parties that have been in office and various people in council and two different federal administrations, it may even go between a person who may be a future Prime Minister of this country who's involved in negotiations at this point. Mr. Chretien, as I understand it, has been retained by the bands. There has been a renewed effort on the band's behalf to explore a negotiated settlement.

The province is not a landholder, of course, in terms of Shoal Lake. It is not directly responsible for the water, but certainly we believe the water quality is an important issue for Winnipeggers and have always stated that we want to, I guess, be an honest broker in the process between the other two levels of government in the whole area of Shoal Lake.

There have been some discussions that have taken place. I think it's been slightly on the back burner with the recent set of negotiations. I don't believe the Chief Commissioner's been involved. Certainly some officials in the Department of the Environment, in the Department of Urban Affairs have had exploratory meetings with the Federal Government through the Department of Indian Affairs and the officials of the City of Winnipeg.

I don't think it was Mr. Diakiw. I'm not sure whether Mr. Diakiw's been involved; I think he was preoccupied by the other issue. I'm not sure what the position of the city is; I'm not sure what the position of the Federal Government is. I don't know where the bottom line is and whether it's financially feasible to negotiate, whether it will take care of all the other environmental aspects, whether it will take care of Band 39 on the other side, or whether it has to be dealt with separately; but water quality remains a priority I'm sure, of City Council, the residents of Winnipeg and the province, and even though we're not directly owning the land and have direct jurisdiction of the band council, or do we administer the City of Winnipeg Waterworks, we believe the environmental issues and the water quality issues are important enough for us to be participating in the discussions. I'm hopeful we can resolve something with the band and not have the development on the shores of Shoal Lake that will jeopardize the excellent quality of the water in Winnipeg.

Secondly, I'm hoping that the Band, I.R. 30 or 40 that's in negotiations now - there's another band, I.R. 39, isn't it? Are those the right terms? I can't remember them all - but those are the bands that I think are involved and certainly the Minister of the Environment and his staff are involved in it and I think there's a window there, potentially for something to be settled; but if it's not I think that the federal negotiator's on rather a quick track and he may recommend there's no way of offsetting this development to proceed with the development, which I don't think is in the best interests of any Winnipegger.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, I find the comments of the Minister incredible.

Here we have a situation where half-an-hour ago the Minister wants to have serious control, Mr. Chairman, of the city's planning process, of this process and that process, but when it comes to the water for two-thirds of the population of the Province of Manitoba, the Minister says, well, we really don't have any jurisdiction, but we should have a little discussion and we should be involved in it just for the sake of, sort of on a haphazard basis, Mr. Chairman, I find that incredible.

This is the water of two-thirds of the Province of Manitoba. That is the most important issue that has ever faced the City of Winnipeg and, certainly, this provincial government, when you have water quality for 600,000 people. If that water quality were shut off, if that water supply was denied the City of Winnipeg, there would be chaos, Mr. Chairman, chaos in this province.

You don't pluck water for 600,000 people out of a well that you can drill at Portage and Main. This is a very, very serious issue and I'm very surprised at the kind of lackadaisical kind of response I got out of the Minister, that he really didn't know too much about it and this was happening or he thought we might be involved and so on.

I would think, Mr. Chairman, that the province, by virtue of its natural resources mandate, by virtue of its environmental protection mandate, by virtue of the Crown land that surrounds this whole area, by virtue of that mandate, by virtue of the fact that they have a constitutional responsibility for urban government,

one that they want to exercise, on one hand, quite often, they wanted to exercise on one hand, quite often they wanted to exercise control over the City Council, yet at the same time they're ignoring virtually this kind of situation. Mr. Chairman, I find that intolerable that this issue should be taken in the forefront of the Minister's portfolio of things to do. He should be leading the charge, as it were, Mr. Chairman, to protect the water supply of those 600,000 people out there — (Interjection) —

A MEMBER: He's the Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. J. ERNST: He's the Minister of Urban Affairs, that's correct. It's his job, his duty, his responsibility to lead the charge on these issues, not to take a back seat type of role or passive role or a role just as a watching brief. He should be carrying the flag, Mr. Chairman. He should be leaping into the breach in this situation; he should be taking the leadership initiative, coming forward and demanding a resolution to this take place; a resolution that protects the City of Winnipeg and protects the water supply with 600,000 people.

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, let the record show that we are not taking a "lackadaisical" approach. Now the member opposite may not be able to interpret wording, but I said there's a window now and serious discussions going on with the Federal, Provincial and Civic Government. I also mentioned that Mr. Diakiw, the Chief Commissioner who has normally been involved in these types of negotiations was not present due to the situation. I also said the situation, I thought, was fairly critical in terms of getting a resolution to this. I think it would be absolutely remiss in a negotiating environment to throw all our cards on the table here in spending Estimates and throw all the cards of the taxpayers that we represent on the table, so that Mr. Cretien can pick up Hansard tomorrow and see what we're prepared to do.

So this is a serious situation but we in resolving this issue want to, and I've made it very clear, the quality of water in the City of Winnipeg is very important; the quality of water is extremely important and we hope the Federal Government which has jurisdiction of that band area and has a new Federal Minister of Native Affairs involved. We're not sure where the senior Federal Minister is at in terms of those negotiations, whether he's supporting the Federal Minister. — (Interjection) — We have asked him, we haven't got an answer - whether he is supporting the federal position of Native Affairs.

We don't know where the city is at on the whole thing, in terms of stopping that development, but I can assure the member opposite that we believe the water quality issue for the City of Winnipeg and I stated it in my initial answer, is extremely important. We consider that right now a very critical window as I've mentioned.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, nobody is suggesting that we lay all of the negotiating cards on the table and that's silly quite frankly. But what I'm asking is, will the Minister assume a leadership role, will the Minister start now to advance in cooperation with the

city? Mr. Dakiw(?) obviously is not a provincial employee, he's a city employee. So the Minister need not wait for him particularly, I think. What the Minister needs to do, Mr. Chairman, is to assume that leadership role, to go in concert with the city to the Federal Government to say look, we'll not tolerate this situation, we want to come to a resolution; it will be a resolution that will not affect the water supply of the City of Winnipeg and quite frankly, will put an end to the concerns. I think, of the Indian Band who are sitting in limbo, who really don't know where they are in terms of their ability to function. They made an application for a bunch of cottage lots seven or eight years ago. They really haven't got a definitive answer either. The Federal Government should say no, you can't do it period and end of story. That's one option. They say no, you can't do it but we'll compensate you for it and then there's a whole new set of guidelines and concerns come to pass in terms of who's going to pay, how much compensation, etc., or thirdly, they're going to say yes, you go ahead and do it. That's not an option in my view, Mr. Chairman. The option of going ahead and doing it, in developing that property, in creating cottage lots and commercial development on the water supply of the citizens of the City of Winnipeg is not an option in my view and ought to be rejected outright and the Indians should know that, the City of Winnipeg residents should know that and the Federal Government should know that.

Once that's been established, Mr. Chairman, then they can get on with looking at either of the other two options. But certainly no decision has been taken, no statement has been made, no indication has been given to anyone as to where the matter is. The matter is virtually in limbo at the present time. Now admittedly if it's in limbo then it's not affecting the water supply of the City of Winnipeg and I suppose that's one little blessing in disguise. But at the same time, I don't think we can continue to ignore it, we can't continue to stick our heads in the sand and hope that it will just simply go away at some point. You have now a very high-powered former federal politician becoming involved with the Indian band for whatever purposes. We have a situation where the Federal Government needs to act and where we need a strong united voice from the Province of Manitoba. We haven't had that strong united voice, Mr. Chairman. It's time that we have had. It time that the Minister of Urban Affairs, it's time that the Premier came out and said no, that there's no development going to take place on Indian Bay, no development will take place to affect the water supply of the citizens of the City of Winnipeg, as a definitive, firm statement. Given that, then they can get on with the other two options. I would hope that the Minister of Urban Affairs in his capacity there with his responsibility will go forward now to see that that kind of statement is put on the record, to see that that kind of statement is transmitted to the Federal Government so that the citizens and the Indian band know where they are at.

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, I find the suggestion of the member opposite quite interesting. He excluded one option of 'no' which is self-evident for all of us in this Chamber. I have stated the water quality is a very important issue; the other two options you've stated

is compensation and the question of how much, and two is the Federal Government absolutely banning that kind of development on Indian Bay.

Now the member opposite knows that the Federal Government's not going to do that. It's never said that, it never will do it and we have no commitment that it will. So we're left with one option, we're left with one option and I can assure the members opposite that there's all kinds of circumstances; I mentioned Band 39, the Environmental Impact Study, the issue of the bridge; there's a number of issues. But I can assure you that the provincial position in terms of those options are much more advanced than the federal position and the city position.

The Minister of Environment and the Minister of Urban Affairs have developed a number of options that have some sanction from our colleagues in this area, to resolve the issue of the water quality. In terms of advancing options and positions in terms of the discussions, we are much further advanced than the other two parties in this area.

But I'm not going to say what specifically our advance is because that will prejudice the discussions of the other party. We are trying to get a resolution to this issue, water quality is an absolute key issue for Winnipeg, and we don't have the right to say no or yes. The Federal Government does, it's not our land. We also believe that there's not an option to have that cottage development there. So we get into the third option. We have discussed the third option; we have a range of issues that we have identified and discussed with the Minister of Environment to hopefully resolve this issue. But we are quite frankly much further advanced in terms of the options and positions we would take back than the other two parties. But I think all of us agree that the water quality is the issue. I mentioned the city was rather preoccupied last month when some of the more specific proposals were being advanced on an informal basis, without prejudice basis. There were statements made by city people that we don't have the mandate. There wasn't statements made by the provincial people in that regard and we don't know where the Federal Government's going to go because there's the issue of the Department of Native Affairs or Indian Affairs in the Federal Government, and there's the issue of the senior Minister. When it gets a little bit firmer from the other two parties, certainly it will be our intent, the Environment and Urban Affairs, to try to nail down some tangible solution instead of, as you said, just talking about this festering issue for the last seven years.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, I think if the Minister checks Hansard, he'll see that other option was presented by myself. It was a question of do nothing

HON. G. DOER: Do you favour competition?

MR. J. ERNST: Well, I may be.

HON. G. DOER: To me, it's not the word that you use in negotiations.

MR. J. ERNST: Well I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman, but the fact of the matter is, if the province is well

advanced in positions, if the province has a number of options, have they presented them to the city? Are they jointly now going with the city to the Federal Government and saying, these are the options that we're prepared to consider, and we're not prepared to consider any others?

Now, a firm position needs to be taken. Everybody's sort of dancing. The city is dancing and the province is dancing and the Federal Government is dancing, but nobody has touched anybody yet in that situation. I think it needs to happen before any resolution of this matter's going to take place.

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, we have a number of firm options. The Minister of Environment has discussed them with his colleagues. I've discussed them with our colleagues. What I'm saying is that we're trying to get a three-level solution - well, I guess it's four-level, when you count the three levels of government and the Native Band I.R. 40 on the solution. We want it to be, not a two-year deal, or a ten-year deal, or whatever else, we want it to be a long-term deal to protect the long-term water source.

We also want to be able to say that it's realistic in terms of what that land was actually worth if it was developed, if that is the option recommended. We are trying to ascertain the specific position of the City of Winnipeg right now in terms of some of the options that are there. As I say, we are further advanced and more firm on where we could head in terms of the alternatives you represented than the other two parties. We're trying to get the other two parties along, although we recognize the City of Winnipeg was involved. They were preoccupied, I think it's safe to say, in the last five or six weeks. The Chief Commissioner, who was negotiating on behalf of the City, was preoccupied with his other set of negotiations and that's why I'm not being critical of the city on it, but we have to fish or cut bait on this issue. Either we rely totally on the Federal Government on this issue, or we try to come up with a three-level government proposal that's acceptable to the taxpayers and acceptable to the Indian Band and acceptable in the long run.

When I mentioned, in this committee earlier, that this is a critical point in the negotiations, I think it's the assessment of both the Minister of the Environment and myself that if we don't get this thing nailed down soon, it may not be in the best interests of the quality of water for the City of Winnipeg.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, the Minister also indicated earlier, I didn't get a chance to finish, that they had no jurisdiction, the Federal Government has jurisdiction. And I agree. The Federal Government over the Indian Band lands has jurisdiction. The province does, however, have jurisdiction on the Crown lands adjacent and, Mr. Chairman, without a road built over those Crown lands into that Indian Reserve and into the lands reserved out of the reserve for cottage lot development, that development will never take place. That's the key, Mr. Chairman, and that's totally in the control of the Provincial Government. Totally in control, Mr. Chairman, and without that road being constructed, I don't think that development will ever take place; certainly there's no access. And the other way, unless

they build a causeway from Indian Band 39A on the north side of the peninsula, that's the only other way in down the Shoal Lake Road in Ontario over a causeway into that development and I think that probably is prohibitive. Possible, but probably prohibitive.

In any event, certainly we have some jurisdiction over that. I'm not sure of all of the natural resource situation down there but I'm sure there must be some jurisdiction relating to water there. I know the City of Winnipeg, for instance, on half of the bay, I think, which is under their ownership, they own the land underneath the water, that could prohibit, for instance, Mr. Chairman, any docks being built in the water. So that there is some additional control there. Although it doesn't specifically relate to the Indian Band land itself.

So I'm pleased to hear that the Province has developed some positions; I'm pleased to hear that the Minister of the Environment has been involved, and that there are things happening. I would only hope that, rather than trying to be the great arbiter in this situation between the city and the Federal Government, that the Provincial Government assume a role of leadership and go to the city and say, look, let us resolve our issue, it is our concern, our problem, ours being a Manitoba problem. Let us resolve our differences and come with a common position there, from thence we will go to the Federal Government as a united front, as opposed to a fractionalized situation at the present time.

HON. G. DOER: As I understand it, my discussions on this issue, like most citizens, I've tried to follow some of the debate before getting into it specifically as an MLA.

The option of building a road over the provincial Crown lands is not the option that we're pursuing as part of our negotiations. The option that is being pursued by other parties at the table is that the causeway is a legitimate way of developing the cottage land without access through the provincial Crown land. So we want to make sure - I'm sure the member opposite can appreciate this - that everybody, and we've talked about deals before, but we want to make sure that we're not playing with an option to deal with - I think everybody agrees on the water quality, everybody agrees on the importance - we want to make sure that one party isn't continuing negotiations on the basis of the option of the Federal Government coming up at the last minute and saying, no development.

There are people who believe we should take it down that road, and then when push comes to shove, the Feds will come in and save that issue. We want to make sure that everybody who is negotiating or discussing this issue are coming up to solutions on this issue on the same option. Because certainly we believe there is not going to be anybody coming in at the last minute to deal with this issue if we demonstrate that we haven't tried to deal with it ourselves.

We are trying to move the discussions with both levels of government and the I.R. 40 and the representative, Mr. Chretien, in a way that's, as I say, reasonable to them and reasonable to the taxpayers, not outrageous just because of its critical strategic location adjacent to our water supply.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, advanced some time ago, before the Provincial Government, for

consideration as to participatory funding, was the question of energy from waste plant facility. Certainly the environmental effects over the long term of landfill and continuing landfill is becoming somewhat critical, although not necessarily absolutely critical at this point. The fact of the matter is that the kind of costs now that are going to be associated with landfill, I can give an example, the Kilcona Park is a classic example of the kind of environmental conditions attached to a landfill site where the cost has become astronomical in terms of the end result. Those kinds of concerns have prompted this proposal of an energy from waste plant.

In addition to that, one of the areas that's going to make or break it in terms of economics, Mr. Chairman, is the question of whether some large-scale institutions within the downtown area of the City of Winnipeg participate as customers for that energy that would be produced from burning garbage. Areas like the Health Sciences Centre, while not necessarily directly controlled by the Provincial Government, certainly is funded by the Provincial Government virtually 100 percent, so that Mr. Chairman, I think the province can show some leadership in that area as well, looking at funding of an energy from waste plant.

But some decision is going to have to be taken, I think, fairly soon. The city, I know, is running out of landfill. The District 2 landfill, for instance, in St. James-Assiniboia, is reaching its capacity and will likely close in the next couple of years. The Kilcona Park landfill in the northeast sector of the city will be full in the next couple of years and will have to be closed.

Additional capacity at the Brady site in Fort Garry has been expanded with an additional land acquisition program in recent times, but at the same time, the costs then of trucking refuse, for instance, from North End Winnipeg out to the Brady landfill site will become extremely expensive.

In addition to that, of course, with only one landfill operating, it will fill up that much quicker to a point where the city has to, Mr. Chairman, make some plans for the future.

At the same time, you just don't bring on a landfill site overnight. I can remember back in the middle Seventies when I first came on to City Council, the question of the Kilcona Park landfill site was then before the Clean Environment Commission and the city. It took virtually about three years to get the matter from the time it was first proposed until it went through the public hearings with respect to the Clean Environment Commission, and dealt with all the concerns of the residents who happened to be nearby, and it dealt with the final planning process and everything else that was going to take place on the site to final approval and commencement of use.

If it takes two or three or four years for that kind of a situation to occur, Mr. Chairman - and I'm sure it's not going to be any quicker at the present time and likely will take longer - then some decisions have to be taken fairly soon. If we are going to continue with landfill, then that's the option that will have to take place, or if we're going to proceed with an energy waste recovery plant, then we're going to have to deal with that issue but that issue, of course, at the present time appears to be more capital intensive.

Mr. Chairman, some resolution of these issues has to take place. Can the Minister advise if the Provincial

Government is yet in a position to advise where they are in terms of the energy recovery from waste point and when some action in this regard or some announcement in this regard might take place?

HON. G. DOER: This issue was raised again at our last official delegation meeting and I assured the councillor responsible for the Works and Operations, Mr. Eadie, that the province, rather than just keeping this thing in abeyance, would give them a specific answer, yes or no, as soon as I could get it out of the Department of Energy who had discussed the proposal a year ago but had really not given a specific answer back to the city.

The Department of Energy reported to Mr. Eadie, and I think all of us agree that waste - who was the first original pioneer of this program, Jeremy Bethune, a few years ago, if I can recall my English history - all of us agree if we could have waste turned into energy, it's an ideal solution to two problems; one is the waste disposal and the other is energy.

However, Mr. Chairman, unfortunately the province has advised the city they are not prepared to proceed at this time with the project. Apparently, and even studying it beforehand the economics were questionable before the energy downturn. I for one, don't believe the OPEC prices would be the long-term issue, long-term prices. The gas prices have gone down. There's also the issue of how this will cost against electrical costs.

The Minister advised Mr. Eadie that it had a high front-end investment and Canada had advised us - some of these projects were proposed by three parties or funded by three parties - Canada, the Federal Government has advised us their funding under the FIRE Program is all committed and this program will be phased out in '86.

The issue of the Health Sciences Centre, as we understand it, it would only have 26 percent of output rather than 44 percent anticipated.

At this point in time, the province, in recognition of the fact that the city asked for basically a yes-or-no answer at this time, had to put the cards on the table and let them know what the status was. We did say to the city in a letter Mr. Schroeder wrote to the city, that Manitoba would be prepared to reconsider their position on this plant at a later date if there was a change in economic conditions and if Canada agreed to become a major participant in the financing of this project.

I have asked that this matter be dealt with somewhat later on in the agenda if Mr. Eadie wants to raise it. The Minister responsible for Energy was not able to be at the committee meeting because the Hydro Estimates were being presented that day. I would have preferred, quite frankly, for Mr. Schroeder to be discussing that directly, or the Member for Rossmere I'm sorry, to be discussing it with Mr. Eadie.

We've also indicated we'd be prepared to facilitate a meeting in the future on the issue. I don't think a letter does anything except put some of the speculation into the city planning about where we're going to be. In the long run, I don't know what the numbers will be, but certainly in the immediate future, we didn't have the financial resources or the economics to support

it, although in theory it sounds like it's a tremendous idea.

MR. J. ERNST: I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that when we're facing deficits, and we've been critical of the deficits as well, but I think we have to maybe take a little bit longer term outlook in the situation. This is not something that really can be, I guess, classified as a black-and-white-today issue. It's an issue for a generation or more. The fact some expenditures may have to take place in the next four or five years if one of these facilities is going to be constructed, Mr. Chairman, not necessarily just from the capital point of view but perhaps from an operating subsidy point of view for a period of time.

It is something we have to look at in a longer term. It is something that, I think, as our water supply was looked at in the area say between 1911 and 1920, with a vision to the future, Mr. Chairman, I think the same kind of vision has to take place now with respect to this kind of a facility. We can no longer continue to eat up valuable agriculture land, notwithstanding the surplus, cost-price squeeze situation that agriculture is faced with today. The fact of the matter is the world does require the productive capability of that land.

At the same time, there are a multitude of environmental problems associated with landfilling which we don't know about, that we haven't had an experience of 100 to 200 years of landfill in our soil conditions to really address that situation.

We've seen some problems just in the short term, in 25 or 30 years, Mr. Chairman, in terms of methane gas; in terms of the kind of problems experienced in the St. Boniface landfill site where a lot of animal by-products were being dumped from the packing houses, the kind of methane generation that took place there; the kind of migration of methane, the leaching of a variety of toxic wastes that are located in those landfill sites, and where and how they will affect groundwater supplies and how they will affect, Mr. Chairman, the environment miles from the landfill site. We don't know that because we haven't had the experience and we don't have the information yet to make those kind of judgments. We can guess. We have some information.

We have concerns, Mr. Chairman, but here's a situation where, dealt with properly, the technology is there. Certainly they're doing it in areas where land is not readily available to them. They're doing it in Japan, in Germany, and in Sweden, and in a variety of other countries around the world, Mr. Chairman, so the technology has been tried; the technology has been perfected, to some extent. I think, in the long term that in that a generation or more we will need to deal with this kind of a situation. I think we have to look at it on that basis and I would hope that notwithstanding the fact the city has perhaps said, give us a yes or no answer, . . . participate in the capital cost of an energy waste recovery plant in the year 1990. I think we have to look at something beyond that. We have to look at it in terms of what can be done for that next generation and in the interest of all of us in terms of that environmental protection and in terms of the ability of the city to look after its waste and handle it in an effective manner.

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, again, it's a very positive proposal. We just don't have \$100 million which is the

upfront costs as we understand it placed on projections to provide for the City of Winnipeg. The issue of Sweden and Germany are somewhat different, I believe, in terms of the fact that Sweden, because of its lack of natural hydro-electric power and lack of natural gas has to in fact - the majority of their energy now is from nuclear plants. I think their last referendum . . .

MR. J. ERNST: We should go and have a look at them, Gary. I think that's the only way . . .

HON. G. DOER: Should we? Can we pair tomorrow?

MR. J. ERNST: You and I, right. Gerard's got his hand up, maybe he wants to come too.

HON. G. DOER: Gerard wants to look at it as well. Well, we've got four. We've got five.

MR. J. ERNST: Conrad wants to go too. He's got his hand up.

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, I've heard various reports on the environmental impact. I agree with you about the landfill sites. There are other environmental problems from energy from waste plants. I'll have to find that out. I'll have to do some more investigation with that, with our Department of the Environment.

The other issue is utility. The Health Sciences Centre, as I say, the assumptions based on what they would have to take to make this project viable. Those numbers weren't there in terms of potential utility, but that's not to say that something down the road wouldn't. But it's a good idea whose time has not yet come.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we ready to pass anything yet?

MR. J. ERNST: I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that \$100 million is a lot of money and that obviously the province doesn't have \$100 million. But I think if it can be phased, if it can be financed somehow, if we can elicit some federal participation, some municipal participation, heaven only knows there may be some private sector participation in terms of a situation such as this.

I believe that some of these plants are not necessarily all public-sector involved either, that there are private sector involvements, in the Japanese one, for instance, the waste recovery plant that they have in Northern Japan. So those options I think ought to be pursued. I don't think we should just throw up our hands and say, you know, we haven't got \$100 million, and that's it, forget about it. I think we've got to look into the future, Mr. Chairman, and I would hope that the Minister would again show some leadership and say: look, we've got to try and work around these problems, not simply throw up our hands in the face of it.

I just wanted to relate to the question of the Review Committee and then we could maybe pass the whole section. We did have some discussions about the Review Committee and what the Minister wasn't going to do with it at this Session of the Legislature and/or in the immediate future. The concern again, as I indicated in my opening remarks, was the question of the fairness in dealing with the question of ward sizes, notwithstanding the fact, Mr. Chairman, that into the

future some better system can be found to handle redistribution of ward boundaries. That's somewhat complicated as well because we're not dealing just with redistribution of ward boundaries, we're dealing with redistribution of ward boundaries within community committees. That's sort of a second problem laid on top of the first.

But the fact of the matter is that there are wards right now with half the size of population of other wards or, if you will, double the size of other wards. Where areas, such as South St. Vital, for instance, that the Member for Riel previously represented, has 40,000 people in; where in the case of the ward of, for instance, Charleswood, Mr. Chairman, is larger than the provincial constituency of Charleswood. Those kinds of situations are not fair, not fair to the member of City Council who is representing those areas, it's not fair to the area. They are not getting the kind of representation that they ought to get that other areas of the city are getting. It's unfair to the member there because he's got twice the workload, he's got the same voice, the same vote and, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, the same paycheque, as the member who has half the population and half the problems.

On top of that, it seems that those areas of largest population tend also to be the areas of greatest growth, and inherent in those areas of growth are all kinds, a multitude of growth-oriented problems, growing pains, if you will, Mr. Chairman, but growth-oriented problems dealing with new parks, new roads, new construction activity taking place and the problems associated with that in residential neighbourhoods, development of lands that are in conflict with the uses that are presently there, whether one comes before another, those kinds of things all create problems for those area councillors. And, I think, to reject out of hand, to not even deal with the ward boundary question, Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding anything else that was created in the act, is a gross injustice to the members of City Council, both present and who will be elected after the 22nd of October.

HON. G. DOER: Some of those decisions were basically made in the middle of an election when the results came out, and one of the key recommendations to get the boundary situation stabilized was to have a year delay and extend the mandate that wasn't knowingly given by the public, by one year and then get the boundaries in order.

I agree with you, the boundaries are unfair, and must be adjusted. I hope that in the long run, again, I've mentioned it before, it is my personal preference that we can develop a system that provides some automatic review of the boundaries of the City of Winnipeg, pursuant to The City of Winnipeg Act, and some automatic impartial provisions that allow the system to be untainted by whoever is in Provincial Government, in terms of who's appointed. Because, for example, if we appointed a Boundaries Commission tomorrow and put on three of our persons, they could come out with boundaries that the Province of British Columbia has come up for provincial elections, and we all know that gerrymandering does take place in some jurisdictions, and gerrymandering doesn't take place in other jurisdictions. I am proud of Manitoba, that the

boundaries are established in one of the most independent and fair ways in Canada, if not North America. It is not perfect, again, but certainly we would like to look at a long-term automatic review of the boundaries so the situation that's in South St. Vital and North Kildonan and Charleswood, some other areas, is taken into consideration.

Thirdly, we should have some way of having a fair criteria that - I don't know how you could do it in boundary wards - appreciates the under-represented groups, not in numbers, but in terms of resources, in terms of the future of the province and the city.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Riel.

MR. G. DUCHARME: It's interesting, the attack on what the Member for Charleswood has mentioned in regard to the Review Committee. I know that the expenditure was in the amount of probably a quarter of a million dollars to carry on the Review Committee and it's unfortunate that - and I'm not knocking the Minister there now - but it's unfortunate that something couldn't have been done before this particular election. Because, even three years ago, at the time of the last municipal election, you could see the increasing population of South St. Vital, not only where you had a natural boundary on the Seine, where you have Niakwa Place that could easily have been in the adjoining ward and could be easily handled, because right now you're looking at a voting population in that particular ward of about 25,000.

I went through there with a fellow who is considering running in that particular area and I drove through the area. I don't care if you started two and a-half months before an election - and I believe the whole idea of a campaign is try and meet as many of the constituents in the area as possible - but I did it three years ago and I went two months and didn't cover any of the apartments or a lot of the area that's now been constructed in the last three years, and it was hectic. It's going to be like a lottery, you're going to end up with five or six people running in Seine Valley ward and no one's going to know anybody in that particular area. It's unfortunate for those people.

The only thing I ask the Minister is, what can be done for instance after the election to share the particular workload of that individual that will be elected there? I was very, very fortunate in being elected as an MLA, that I have a very close person in the adjoining ward who doesn't have that workload and who has handled probably most of my problems and helped while I was a councillor - I'm not going to mention who it is - but I was very fortunate in that case now that he is handling those concerns, because he's in a ward where he'd probably get a call on a back lane being a little dirty, where I would end up with 10, 15 calls a day. And then you'd have a zoning matter and you'd have 28 zonings and two would be pertaining to the other three wards and the rest would fall on that one ward, so it's very unfortunate that has occurred.

Really, I hope and I agree with you, that we have to have something for the future that it doesn't happen again.

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, as I say, there's lots of things in the Cherniack Report, or the City of

Winnipeg Review that were positive, there were some things I think that weren't handled, in the longer term. I think again it's a personal preference, it hasn't been sanctioned by my bosses and caucus, who have to look at these things - I haven't heard back from the City of Winnipeg specifically on it - but I think the city is so important for any provincial government, probably more so than any other province in Canada with its population and situation in the City of Winnipeg, that we have to ensure that it's beyond gerrymandering and we have to have an automatic provision.

In the short run the boundaries are inequitable; in the long run I hope to have a system that not only provides equitable sizes but a fair means of establishing those sizes. And that's a longer term goal for The City of Winnipeg Act.

MR. G. DUCHARME: Just a comment, I hope the Minister doesn't expect real comments back from City Hall till after probably October 22nd.

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, I'm shocked. The City stated, at the last meeting - I invited them to provide us with a united position on the City of Winnipeg Review and they haven't told me otherwise. I understand they've been cloistered a few times on some of the recommendations. — (Interjection) — I know that, but provide some advice to them. I know some of the members opposite's opinions on The City of Winnipeg Act, have a couple of clauses and leave the rest to the City of Winnipeg; but notwithstanding that, I'm hoping they can, quite frankly, come up with something. — (Interjection) — I know your philosophy; you've told me, no staff, no clauses in the act, they don't exist, but we believe there is a role for Urban Affairs. Just send the money over. Jim Boley will send the money over, I know. Just sign the cheques.

MR. J. ERNST: I appreciate the comments of the Minister and so on. The fact of the matter is though that notwithstanding everybody's good intentions and the fact that it is inequitable and everybody agrees and that sort of thing, it's going to be four years, Mr. Chairman, before that gets rectified.

Yes, it is, it's going to be a four-year situation by the time that gets rectified or three and a half years, if you will. The election takes place this October. Those people will be elected for three years from those ward boundaries and I suspect - and perhaps I can be corrected if I'm wrong - that you can't change the ward boundaries once those people have been elected from them until the next election. That's going to be three and a half years from now, and unfortunately with everybody's good intentions notwithstanding, that problem is going to exist for that three and a half year period of time. I think that's wrong and I think it ought to be corrected and I think it ought to be corrected immediately.

I don't know, it may be somewhat arbitrary, but we've got all these urban policy coordinator guys hanging around the department there. They could adjust the boundaries fairly quickly I would think. They may not be perfect and they may not solve everybody's problem, but they're probably going to be a heck of a lot better in the short term, than leaving it the way it is now.

That, Mr. Chairman, I think is probably a more reasonable solution than attempting to just leave the status quo exist for the next three and a half years, because I think that's more unfair and would create more problems than would a quick and early adjustment of the boundaries in the interim.

I appreciate the time is tight, and I appreciate it would be difficult to do, but I think the Minister should also appreciate the kind of problems that it creates and hopefully he can see his way clear to resolving that fairly quickly.

HON. G. DOER: There were some problems with some of the proposed boundaries. One of them, for example, the historic reality of St. Boniface, etc., we felt we needed it and so did the City of Winnipeg, quite frankly, felt that they needed an additional look at the boundaries. We never even got names to suggest who would be on a Boundaries Commission. I think it would be very presumptuous of us and our people to suggest and impose boundaries.

MR. J. ERNST: It might give them something to do.

HON. G. DOER: I believe the existing boundaries are inequitable. I believe, in the longer run, we're better off having a system that automatically reviews it with an independent commission, similar to The Provincial Act, which I think is a model in Canada. I think we should try to use that model if the city agrees it's appropriate for the city and, yes, you're right, in the short run we could have done something better with, "down and dirty boundaries" to use your words.

MR. J. ERNST: Quick and dirty.

HON. G. DOER: Quick and dirty? I thought it was down and dirty. I'm sorry, I don't know these terms.

I believe we're going to provide some independence of this and I'd be interested to hear your comments in the future; I'd be interested to hear your ideas on that. I've listened to a lot of ideas. I don't always agree, but I listen to a lot of ideas.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, we can proceed into Item (e), the Canada-Manitoba A.R.C. Agreement. There's \$25,000 for A.R.C. Secretariat. Is that some continuing staff people to finalize the program?

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, the member will note there's a Recoverable, I think, of \$12,500 from Canada, isn't there I believe, on that A.R.C. Agreement? Yes, it's to complete commitments the province has made specifically to the Fork Development area that the Federal-Provincial Governments are involved in with the A.R.C. Agreement.

We do fund some projects of an individual who is working also out of the Department of Natural Resources on some other projects, as Mr. Dickson's been a secretary to ARC. I'm not exactly sure how much of that 12,500 will be spent in this fiscal year but it has been budgeted.

MR. J. ERNST: Could you give me an explanation of the \$90,000 budgetary item, which I assume must deal

with some sort of capital funding, or perhaps I shouldn't assume anything, perhaps you can explain what it's for.

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, I think there again, there's some recoverability from Canada, I believe, but the specifics are: 38,000 for the Trappist Monastery, Forks Park 49,000, the Lockport Project 3,000, makes a total of 90,000, 38, 49, 3.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, in earlier discussions we talked about securing funding for, I think it's 3.6 million ARC funding for the Forks Project or the East Yards Project as it were. Can the Minister advise how that's secured. I appreciate that if it's not going to be expended, it's likely not going to be in the Estimates. But how is it secured and where would, if one wanted to look to see if it was secured, where would you look?

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, I could provide the specific details to the honourable member opposite. The ARC Agreement was extended two years in writing, as I believe, between the two parties and it allowed for the \$825,000, I believe, to be expended for the Forks Park, which will be a modest park I think by all terms. We will be flowing \$49,000 this year as part of the provincial contribution. Some of the parks have, as I say, already been completed. It was a \$13 million project over seven years, if I'm correct, and some of that money of the last project really is the Forks Park, which is \$825,000, \$49,000 of which is the provincial contribution this year.

MR. J. ERNST: Okay, Mr. Chairman, I'm ready to vote on clause 3.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a) Salaries—pass; 3.(b) Other Expenditures—pass; 3.(c)(1) Canada-Manitoba Winnipeg Core Area Agreement, Payment to Other Implementing Jurisdictions—pass; 3.(c)(2) Payments to Other Provincial Departments—pass; 3.(d)(1) Review Committee, City of Winnipeg Act, Salaries (no money)—pass; Other Expenditures—pass; 3.(e)(1) Salaries (no money), 3.(e)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 3.(e)(2)(a) ARC Secretariat \$25,000—pass; 3.(e)(2)(b) Authority—pass; 3.(f) Riverbank Development—pass.

Resolution No. 139: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,025,100 for Urban Affairs, Urban Policy Coordination for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

Item No. 4.(a)(1) Expenditures related to capital, Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets, Payments to Other Implementing Jurisdictions—pass; 4.(a)(2) Expenditures related to capital, payments to Other Provincial Departments—pass; 4.(a)(3) Departmental Expenditures—pass; 4.(b) Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets: Agreement for Recreation and Conservation for the Red River Corridor—pass; 4.(c) Financial Assistance to the City of Winnipeg — the Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First off, can the Minister advise if this funding is unconditional.

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, the money to the City of Winnipeg is outlined in a letter to the Mayor and it

is for specific projects, and I think we've been back and forth over the debate on specific projects with specific negotiations between the two parties. It is part of the \$90 million six-year capital renewal program that has been discussed, I think, quite a bit in Financial Assistance to the City of Winnipeg. It is the amount of money that's part of the 90 million. It reflects some \$27,875,000 from last year and 13,134,000 this year that will be part of the ongoing negotiations with the City of Winnipeg for the six-year \$90 million capital program which was announced by my predecessor, and I think was very positive because it provided some stability to the City of Winnipeg.

It is broken down into a number of projects dealing with bridge renewal, dealing with street kilometre grant, noise attenuation study, dealing with bus purchase and refurbishments and we've already discussed that at length with the Flyer situation. The innovative transit, there's \$430,000 this year in that capital project. Again, we just got a report yesterday or the day before from the City of Winnipeg on where they want that money to go. In fact, I think we have an agreement on the innovative transit; there's a few things we're still hammering out. The revitalization programs, the Phase I of Spence Memorial Project and the Urban Infrastructure Environmental Projects combined sewer, flood relief, urban reforestation, which we discussed before and the sludge beds.

The total works out to \$13,134,000 plus money still to be negotiated between the parties as 834,000 that haven't been agreed to between the city and the province for a total of 13,134,000. I'm certainly willing to provide the specific breakdown for the members opposite.

MR. J. ERNST: Do you have a copy handy, it'll save a lot of trouble.

HON. G. DOER: I've got it on a note of other things, what to say to you if you say this, what to say if you say that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Riel.

MR. G. DUCHARME: Who will be filing under this . . .

HON. G. DOER: We have a letter to the City of Winnipeg that has it all outlined.

MR. G. DUCHARME: . . . (inaudible) . . .

HON. G. DOER: The only discrepancy here is, I believe, there's - well it announces it all, the 13,732, in the letter. There's 13,134 in the Budget. There's some discrepancies between cash flow and everything else, as you are aware, but this will indicate where the commitments are to the City of Winnipeg. I can get another copy for . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Mr. Chairman, I see it's virtually all conditional, up to a point at least anyway in terms of the capital assistance; although there's some flexibility, I suppose, in the Regional Street Capital Renewal

Program. There's conditions attached on which projects will be worked upon under the Bridges and Underpasses Program.

With respect to the Noise Attenuation Measure Study and Preliminary Design Work, first of all this is a very tenuous question, if you will, in the sense that if there is no commitment in principle to fund the construction of these types of facilities, not just on Lagimodiere Boulevard, but on major transportation routes across the whole city, then there is little point in expending in this case, \$200,000 of the taxpayers' money to study the construction of these kinds of barriers.

Mr. Chairman, this is a long-term, very expensive capital intensive project. If the city is going to build noise attenuation barriers on existing major transportation corridors, then it is going to be an extremely expensive process. There is no point in my view, in spending \$100,000 or provincial money and \$100,000 of city money on a study that will never ever see the light of day.

Mr. Chairman, unless that commitment is made in advance, and we asked the Minister of Environment when he appeared at the Executive Policy Committee of city council and said, you know, in support of looking at the situation. We asked him at that time, was the province prepared to commit long-term funding on noise attenuation barriers, not just on Lagimodiere Boulevard a month before the election, but overall? If the Ministers sincerely believed that noise attenuation barriers is a realistic matter to be dealt with and has a high priority, then is the Provincial Government prepared to deal with this issue city-wide on all major transportation corridors? The answer, of course, was the money was going to be double and the Minister indicated a commitment of funds just for a study, and just for Lagimodiere Boulevard, and did not deal with any other areas at all.

I think it's foolhardy. I think it raises false hopes. I think it raises expectations in the general public that are unwarranted, if we're not prepared to commit, at least in principle to the overall funding of these kinds of attenuation barriers across the whole city and perhaps even across the whole province - I'm sure that there are other areas of the province that are faced with major traffic noise as well.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister if in fact they are prepared to approve in principle the construction of these kinds of noise attenuation barriers?

HON. G. DOER: At our last official delegation meeting it was raised by councillors and it certainly didn't fall on deaf ears, that it may make more sense just to put the money - instead of studying the problems - in building the barrier.

Our officials now are discussing with the City of Winnipeg the total \$90 million proposal, \$27 million or so of which has been committed, \$27-28 million; a number of other millions that haven't been committed. We are discussing the Lagimodiere proposal. There's another one that has almost equivalent noise density; in fact, I think there's one slightly higher.

A MEMBER: Portage Avenue.

HON. G. DOER: No, I was not talking about sunny St. James, to the Honourable Member for Charleswood.

— (Interjection) — yes, but that's a long barrier. You have all those commercial enterprises. The private sector would go berserk, blocking off commerce.

Mr. Chairman, we think the citizens there have a legitimate problem. We think the Minister of Environment is legitimately sensitive to the noise in that area. Unfortunately, it's one of the only areas of the city where the Perimeter is not completed and that truck traffic is horrendous. — (Interjection) — Well, whatever. We would prefer to build that Perimeter Highway, of course, with the \$12 million, if we could magically create it, notwithstanding the protestations of the members opposite on the deficit. I'm sure we'd have to negotiate with many of the members who sit in the benches here about where the highway priorities would be if we were to get that \$12 million.

The cost of the noise barrier to the province will be about \$650,000.00. You're right, it may make more sense just to place it in with the barrier. It's about \$1.1 million to \$1.2 million. We are studying it now. We're discussing it with the city and you may be correct, that rather than study the problem, we should build the barrier in an area.

I don't see the plans at this point in time for the Perimeter for northeast Winnipeg. I believe personally we should have one but I know that the Minister of Highways has to juggle about 100 legitimate priority items. Those of us who represent Northeast ridings are trying to get that perimeter built but there's others members here who are trying to get other roads built as well.

So we think it's a legitimate concern of the citizens. The truck traffic on that road and the noise level is very, very high. I think it's the second highest in the city and you're probably right; let's not study it, let's do something with it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Riel.

MR. G. DUCHARME: He had to give one last kick of the cat and one who's been very sensitive to the noise along Route 165. We had the same similar problem and I remember that war of almost six years ago. However on Lagimodiere, you have a little different problem. You can't build a mound, you're going to have to end up building a wall. I agree with the Minister on this particular case, or whoever it was who mentioned that we should start spending the money on the wall, you just take a little bus tour or whatever you want and go to Minneapolis and check the walls there and what they've done in Minneapolis and forget about the \$200,000 that we're going to spend getting someone else to borrow your watch and tell you what time it is.

A MEMBER: I agree. Let's not study, let's do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Charleswood.

MR. J. ERNST: Given that the commitment, Mr. Chairman, is to fund noise attenuation barriers in general, then certainly I tend to concur with the Member for Riel and the statement by the Minister that forget the study, just build the noise attenuation barrier.

I think the underlying commitment is fine for that particular problem, but there are problems of similar

magnitude, Mr. Chairman, all over the city. This is not unique, this is not the only situation. Unless that underlying commitment is given, unless that expectation is going to be created out in the public that the province is going to spend up to 50 percent of the cost of noise attenuation barriers albeit over a protracted period of time, that they're going to fund 50 percent of the cost of those barriers across the whole city; then make that statement, make it public and then everyone knows that that's the situation.

But don't say in this particular situation we're going to do it in one area as a pilot project, or we're going to do it in one area as a demonstration situation, and then forget about all the rest, Mr. Chairman. That is not fair and that is somewhat deceitful in my view in that you're saying to the people of one particular area, you're okay, you've got a problem, we'll deal with you because the Minister of Environment happens to represent the district.

But, Mr. Chairman, it's not fair to the rest of the people. It's not fair to the people in the Minister of Urban Affairs' riding, for instance, who are also faced with noise problems from that same roadway. The same with the former Minister, I guess now the Member for Transcona, and a number of others who are faced with those kinds of problems. It's not fair to the Member for Assiniboia who's faced with the same kind of problem on the Perimeter Highway in the area of the racetrack, Mr. Chairman. So let's be careful how we deal with this.

Let us be careful of that, that the development adjacent to the racetrack on the Perimeter Highway is 20 years old or 15 years old; so this is not something that's new. This is not something that's just happened along. That noise has been there a long, long time. No different, quite frankly Mr. Chairman, than in Windsor Park. But let us make sure that we sincerely set out in detail, that we're prepared to fund those kinds of projects across the whole of the city, in fact across the whole of the province and not just in one or two particular instances.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to talk a little bit about the Infrastructure Replacement Program, although I noticed that there is some terminology related to that - Urban Infrastructure Environment Program.

Mr. Chairman, a couple of years ago, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities conducted a rather extensive study of urban infrastructure problems across the whole country. Those urban infrastructure problems are enormous, to say the least. Manitoba, I think just from the study of Winnipeg, Brandon, Dauphin and Thompson, was somewhere in the area of \$800 million in terms of infrastructure renewal required over the next 20 years.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to that a proposal was made - and I happened to serve on that committee for a period of two years with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, chaired by the Mayor of the City of Vancouver, Mike Harcourt; he is one these right-wing chaps, Mayor Harcourt - in any event on this issue certainly we were of a common mind. Not many others, but on this issue, certainly; that urban infrastructure problems facing municipalities across the country are enormous to a point that decline of - and it sounds a little melodramatic - but decline of civilization as we know it type of situation is going to occur unless major

inroads are made in terms of maintenance of that plant, of that infrastructure; the pipes, the sewers, the roads, the bridges, you name it.

Mr. Chairman, we've seen that to some extent take place in the U.S. where because of other demands for funding, because of limited capabilities, because of things like Proposition 13 and a number of other reasons, funding for infrastructure replacement has been cut back. And when it's been cut back, we've seen a rapid decline in the core areas of U.S. cities.

To some extent it occurred in Europe, although Europe has been able to overcome that problem over the years since the end of World War II and the result, I gather in part, from funding available through relief programs and things of that nature, but certainly in our situation we're not that bad off yet, but it's coming. It's coming rather quickly and it's going to be on top of us I think, Mr. Chairman, before we can really move to deal with it, unless we recognize the problem, unless we recognize that some commitment to the long term is required, and that we start doing that work now.

That position was advanced to the Federal Government. I understand that it was advanced to all 10 provinces, I believe eight provinces have concurred in that commitment. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is new money and it is a substantial amount of money and it is going to affect the province's economy and it's going to have some effect on the provincial budget and so on.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, it's also going to create a hell of a lot of jobs. Now we've had job creation programs of one variety or another. We have training programs under the Core Area Initiative; we have a whole myriad of programs dealing with job creation. Mr. Chairman, none create more jobs faster, quicker and with a better result than infrastructure renewal.

Mr. Chairman, the Canadian Construction Association indicated, I believe, that it's in the area of 28 man years of work now per million dollars of capital investment. That is in direct job creation. Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the number is with respect to spinoff jobs, the jobs created in the supply sector, the jobs created in the engineering sector, and a variety of other spinoff areas associated with capital construction of this nature. But certainly 28 jobs per million dollars of capital construction is reasonable, I think, and labour intensive. It creates jobs in an area of semi-skilled and unskilled labour, Mr. Chairman, and it goes to give the taxpayer a double whammy as it were in terms of the benefit.

It creates the jobs that the Provincial and Federal Governments want; it creates a healthy infrastructure in urban municipalities which I think everybody wants because if we're going to have economic recovery, if we're going to attract industry, if we're going to have vibrant cities with lower transportation costs and so on, then we've got to have those kinds of facilities and they've got to be in good condition.

In addition to that the Provincial Government, I think in a recent study that was done, gets its financial commitment back over about a three-year period. The feds get their's back in one year through income tax, sales tax and a variety of other taxes that the Federal Government levies, Mr. Chairman, that on major intensive capital projects such as these, they get all of their money back in the first year after the money is expended.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that to me, if you're getting the kind of labour that you want, the kind of activity that you want, the double whammy that the taxpayer benefits from, and get your money back in a year, I think that's a hell of a deal. I think it's time the Federal Government looked at that and got involved. Similarly the Provincial Government, I believe it takes about three years for them to get their money back through the kind of provincial income taxes and a variety of other sales taxes and so on that are applied to those types of capital-intensive projects.

So the Federal Government gets their money back in a year, the Provincial Government gets their money back in three years, and only the poor municipality really doesn't get its money back ever in terms of the kind of capital investment it puts in. It does, of course, gain the benefit of having the project and that alone is certainly worth, Mr. Chairman, a substantial amount. I don't think anybody wants to argue the question of whether it gets its money back or not.

The question I think that needs to be addressed is: should the project be built; what kind of job creation can we get out of it; what kind of ultimate benefit to the taxpayer is there once the thing is completed; and what are the overall benefits both to the province and the country in having a healthy infrastructure? I would hope the Minister is prepared to carry the flag for that issue again to show that kind of leadership we talked about earlier; to show his colleagues across the country and certainly to the City of Winnipeg that the province is interested in that kind of program and it should be gotten on with.

HON. G. DOER: Mr. Chairman, certainly I've read the material that's been produced by the FCM and letters that have been forwarded by the member opposite to us, to Mr. Wilson and I believe eventually to the former Minister responsible for Employment, the Honourable Flora MacDonald, as I understood it. I know the FCM has not got a tangible response from the Federal Government. There are two provinces to this date that have not endorsed the program: one is Alberta, the other one is British Columbia, as I recall, which is indeed unfortunate because I think it would make a lot more sense to have a united approach on the study. Hopefully the new Premier of British Columbia will be on board.

There is a federal-provincial meeting in fact starting Wednesday, not a federal - yes, a federal-provincial meeting, just a federal meeting - of Ministers responsible for Municipal Affairs and Urban Affairs where this will be on the agenda later next week. The Minister of Municipal Affairs will be going. Hopefully we'll be - I haven't asked for a pair because we're dealing with legislation in the Estimates so I didn't request that but there will be a follow-up meeting, which is the critical one, and hopefully with the Federal Government on the proposal.

I'm also hopeful the new Premier of British Columbia will be briefed on this issue and hopefully come on side. As we understand it, this week the new Cabinet in British Columbia will be sworn in - I think Thursday - so they may not even have representation. It's in St. John's, Newfoundland and the provinces are trying to build some inertia for this proposal to go to the Federal Government in support of the FCM.

We intend - we have raised it in our federal-provincial discussions with issues that are developing on the horizon; important issues to the province. We have raised this as a very important issue in federal-provincial relations in our estimation for the Premier's staff and they're certainly well-briefed on it and briefing the Premier on it. We intend on having intermediate meetings this September on it and I think it's a very worthwhile proposal and a lot of good work has been done.

We could argue about the employment benefit of construction on infrastructure versus other - there's been studies done on longer term employment creation. It doesn't have the same advantage as using money to lever private sector involvement that will be here for the next 25 years. For example, the million dollars spent on behalf of the Provincial Government in getting the \$30 million Carnation Plant will have a much higher return in terms of employment, etc., than perhaps this would, but it's still a very worthy project for employment for infrastructure. If three levels of government can get on it, it would be very, very useful for all of us.

I also would like to point out that our \$90 million six-year Capital Renewal Program was somewhat consistent albeit not to the level of the principles, I think, articulated in the FCM report.

MR. J. ERNST: Well, Mr. Chairman, I tend to agree, although the question for instance of the Carnation Plant; if it's fine for the Federal Government to put "X" millions of dollars into having the Carnation Plant expanded, but if there's no road to get to it, it doesn't mean very much. That's the kind of situation you say that in terms of leveraging private investment; if you've got the roads; if you've got the sewer lines; if you've got the treatment facilities to deal with those kinds of things; to have the municipal infrastructure in place; to accommodate the growth; to accommodate the expansion of those kinds of plants, Mr. Chairman, then everybody is going to benefit so that long-term job, not only the direct job potential but the longer term availability of servicing for those kinds of expansions for new plants to be constructed for others to expand and to continue to exist, in the longer term as well, make a considerable difference.

I also wanted to comment - I'm pleased to see the Minister is supportive of this program and he will be carrying forward the interests of Manitoba at any future meetings with respect to this, and I hope also the Minister of Municipal Affairs is able to carry that forward as well.

Mr. Chairman, I want to comment - I don't want to prolong this too much longer - but I did have a concern about long-term transportation projects that have been dealt with by the city in recent months and haven't really been dealt with at all over a long period of time.

If you look at the last 16 years of government in this province and in the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Chairman, there's been one new major transportation project built; one in 16 years. That new major transportation project was the Bishop Grandin Boulevard and the Fort Garry-St. Vital Bridge. That, Mr. Chairman, was a bit of a botch-up in the sense that at the western extremity of that, at the intersection of Pembina Highway, rather than build a proper facility, there was a bastardized

form created at that time, Mr. Chairman, which has really created more problems than it's solved in that particular area.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, the only reason that project was constructed, as far as I've been able to determine, was not that it was high on the priority list of the City of Winnipeg - because it was not - it was in fact I think the lowest priority, if on the list at all. But Mr. Chairman, it was built because of an acquisition of a land bank by the former Schreyer Government in south St. Boniface. That land bank was acquired in the expectation of providing expensive building lots in the future for people of Manitoba. So, Mr. Chairman, to utilize that land bank, they had to have a road to get to it so they built Bishop Grandin Boulevard and the Fort Garry-St. Vital Bridge as part of that access.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Chairman, the former Minister of Urban Affairs, and I gather the present Minister of Urban Affairs, now wants to shut off that land bank by moving the urban limit line into place in that area so you can't use the land bank that you bought 15 years ago and built a substantial highway transportation project to get to it. It all seems a little ludicrous, Mr. Chairman, when you consider the overall impact. But notwithstanding, one project in 16 years - new project I hasten to add - certainly there's been a number of replacements of bridges and repair of bridges and so on, Mr. Chairman, but one new project, one additional project, one supplement to the city's arterial lifeblood as it were. There have been no others, Mr. Chairman, and it's time.

The existing road system has been maximized, has been adjusted, has been tampered with, has been squeezed, manipulated as much as it possibly can to get as many cars and as many trucks and as many buses down those roads as quickly as possible.

Mr. Chairman, you don't perhaps appreciate - perhaps you do - the kind of problems that exist when one car stalls on Henderson Highway, or one car stalls on the St. James Bridge, or two centimetres of snow fall on the Slaw Rebchuk Bridge, that those kinds of every day occurrences, virtually, in this country, where we have severe climatic conditions, where we have transportation facilities operating at 100 percent or more of capacity, when one slight aberration will cause a major traffic tie-up, would cause a major snarl of traffic and accidents and a variety of other concerns, Mr. Chairman, the time has come to look at some additional major transportation projects.

The way that those transportation projects are going to be looked at, and they're not cheap, Mr. Chairman, they're expensive, there is no question about that, but the fact of the matter is that they have to be addressed. We cannot continue to ignore the kind of problems that exist because of that.

If somebody lives two blocks or three blocks or six blocks from downtown and simply travels from home to work, downtown and back, that's not very evident; but as the city continues to grow, as the demand for, not only trips to and from the downtown increases, but trips around the circumference of the city, back and forth into suburban areas, into new industrial parks, to railway shipping areas, the intermodal terminal, for instance, on Kenaston Blvd., any number of those kinds of trips, Mr. Chairman, cannot continue to be stifled.

If you asked the Member for Inkster, and of course he's not here, about the problems associated with the intersection of the CPR mainline on Keewatin, he'll tell you the kind of problems that are associated with that. We have a continuing, increasing, horrendous traffic problem building in this city. We have, through the graces of the former Minister of Highways back in the Schreyer Government, no freeways, no major transportation routes, per se, with the exception of Bishop Grandin Blvd. in the City of Winnipeg. None were built. Virtually every other major centre in Canada has major traffic movers, if you can call it that, Mr. Chairman.

We don't have those here and yet we've managed to survive up to this point, but it's not going to last a whole lot longer. We've had, as a matter of fact, amazing use out of an existing roadway system. Somebody said to me, from out of town, gee, it was very farsighted of the forefathers in the City of Winnipeg to create Portage Avenue such a great width. I said, would that it was great foresight on the part of our forefathers. The fact of the matter is there happened to be a street railway that ran down the middle and that's how come it's so wide. It wasn't really a great planning process then back in the early 1900's, but it has served our purpose, Mr. Chairman, and it has served us well and it's served us in lieu of the kind of major transportation projects that other cities have implemented and we've survived. It's not the greatest, but we've survived and it's, again, done yeoman service far in excess of what a lot of people anticipated.

But the time has come, Mr. Chairman, that we have to address some major transportation projects or we're going to be in significant trouble. Now the cost of these transportation projects is, as I said before, very expensive; but the cost of not doing them is also very expensive. During the Throne Speech Debate, I happened to indicate at the time - and I made a comparison of when the Slaw Rebchuk bridge was constructed into north end Winnipeg, the new one, the consultants hired by the City of Winnipeg addressed the question and said, what is the relative cost benefit of building alongside the existing bridge, completing that, opening it to traffic and then tearing down the old bridge.

There were additional capital costs related to the alignment problem. There were a number of other construction-oriented problems that were present in that kind of a scenario, but what is the cost to the motorist if you don't? What is the cost to the motorist if you shut down the Salter Bridge, tear it down and then build a new bridge over the same right-of-way?

Mr. Chairman, it was indicated, on an annualized basis, the cost to the motoring public by selecting that option, closing down the existing bridge, removing it and then reconstructing on the same right-of-way, was going to be in the vicinity of \$6 million annually, the cost to the motorists, of having to go either around and down Main Street or down Arlington, of the waiting time and the additional fuel costs and those kinds of additional operating costs for the motorists. Now that is a significant amount of money, considering it would have taken probably two or two-and-a-half years to complete that project. The cost then would have been up in the area of \$12 million to \$18 million. That, Mr. Chairman, is a very significant amount of money,

admittedly, not directly out of the pockets of the government, either city or provincial, but not to say that it isn't out of somebody else's pocket, and that's the pocket of the motoring public.

So that there are cost advantages to those kinds of projects and I would hope that, while not necessarily in this year's capital, that we can look at the capital for next year as a start on those kinds of projects. I know the city is budgeting and I know I'm going to get a shot about the Charleswood Bridge and so on but, notwithstanding the fact that is one of the projects and, Mr. Chairman, quite legitimately so.

The fact of the matter is that I have harboured interest long before the Charleswood Bridge and long before any specific project, the need for additional transportation projects in the City of Winnipeg. I have carried the flag, if you will, for those for some considerable length of time and have tried to protect the interests of the city and protect the long-term overall interests of the city in considering those transportation projects. The Member for Riel will no doubt remember the great fight we had over trying to protect the right-of-way through north St. Boniface for the eastern transportation corridor from Transcona. I think a major, major mistake was made, quite frankly, by the city in the way it did not ultimately protect that transportation corridor through north St. Boniface, and a number of other projects from time to time that have been dealt with.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that in future years, starting hopefully with next year, that the province will be able to make a significant commitment toward long-term transportation projects, not necessarily imposing their will, but trying to work cooperatively with the city in terms of dealing with the priority of those transportation projects and in understanding the need that there must be a start made somewhere, and there must be a start made soon if we're not going to wind up in a very serious traffic snarl, things like the Nairn Avenue overpass debacle, Mr. Chairman, sorely indicate the need for it.

HON. G. DOER: It certainly has been the priority of the department in this capital expenditure, and I think we talked about it earlier under financial assistance to the City of Winnipeg, to deal with the urban renewal projects first' or prioritize them somewhat first. But, as I said before, it wasn't an either/or situation, that we were open to discussions with the City of Winnipeg under our \$90 million capital program on other projects that would be worthy. I certainly (a) first of all, believe that it's easier to get to downtown Winnipeg in Winnipeg, and around Winnipeg, than any other major urban city that I've driven in and in previous responsibilities I had to go to a lot of other meetings out of town, Toronto, or Montreal or some of the cities of similar size like Edmonton, Calgary and even Vancouver which I find horrendous to get around in. I always found Winnipeg, whether it's in Charleswood where my brother lives or other areas of the city, I find Henderson Hwy., quite frankly, the worst traffic bottleneck that I have seen. But we're open to looking at the empirical data and discussing it with the City of Winnipeg.

In the last number of years, we did contribute a number of dollars to the Slaw Rebchuk Bridge that

you just talked about. I think our total contribution was \$9 million, although that's not a new facility, improving it, and the three acres additional with the access to it has certainly flowed traffic in a lot quicker basis. I think with some of the widening that's going on now through Memorial, etc., for the North Portage, hopefully, we can not open that Edmonton Street up, or not proceed with the City of Winnipeg plan and have the traffic flow on Spence-Memorial.

We provided money last year to Nairn Avenue Overpass and Rue Archibald Project Underpass; the St. James Bridge Rehabilitation Project; Main Street and Norwood Bridges Design Study; Keewatin Street Grade Separation Detailed Design Work.

In this fiscal year, there is some money for bridge and underpass renewal with Marion Street and Seine River renewal, McPhillips Street Underpass and the St. Vital Bridge.

As we understand it, the costs of the three projects that have been listed by the city are some 65 - I can't find the figure, but some \$69 million. Perhaps there are ways of looking at some of these projects consistent with the traffic flow and not bulldozing down major neighbourhoods. Do we need a six-lane bridge over the Kildonan area, or a four-lane, will it do, considering we're only a couple of miles away from the Perimeter on the one hand and not too far away from the Redwood Bridge and Disraeli on the other hand? Just to move some of that traffic, instead of going downtown and up to Inkster, or up to the Perimeter and down to the Inkster Industrial Area, maybe it would make sense to some intelligent movement across the way, notwithstanding the 11th hole at the Kildonan Golf Course. Hopefully, the old railway tressle - no, it's the 10th hole, isn't it? It's the 10th hole at Kildonan.

MR. J. ERNST: No, I don't think it affects the golf course at all.

HON. G. DOER: No, put it through the graveyard.

MR. J. ERNST: It's where the paddlewheel boats are.

MR. G. DOER: That's right. Well, one of the plans is through the 10th hole and the other plan was through the graveyard - which I wouldn't touch - and the third one was through where the River Rouge, I think, has their tour buses.

So, in answer to your question, we're open to that information consistent with the \$90 million. I'm not sure where we'll be going in the future. I think we should have a legitimate flow of traffic. We're not wedded personally to only public transit is the only way to go. I think public transit must be improved and must help the vehicular traffic. But I think in Winnipeg, the way the situation is, we're still going to have a lot of vehicle traffic and we should plan on that basis, based on empirical data and needed routes.

In answer to your question, we don't have \$35 million right now, in the next couple of years' budgets, and if we did proceed with any of these projects, we'd want to see what the data is, what the long-term impact is on neighbourhoods, traffic flows, etc., and prioritize on the basis of traffic.

I won't even pull out the . . . editorial.

Monday, 11 August, 1986

MR. J. ERNST: That's fine, except that the Minister kept referring to a \$90 million six-year capital development agreement for all capital projects. That, Mr. Chairman, comes to \$15 million a year which is not going to address, personally, any of the kinds of issues that we're talking about in terms of transportation. It's slightly more than what was proposed, at \$13 million for this year. In other years - and I don't have the numbers in front of me, so I'm simply going by memory - but it seems to me that they were significantly more than in other years in terms of the capital, Mr. Chairman. So I would hope that we're not just talking about that particular \$90 million.

It's fine to say \$90 million, because that sounds like a great deal of money, and it certainly is a great deal of money, but when you spread it over a six-year period, it reduces significantly and starts to pale in terms of the kind of infrastructure, the kind of transportation projects and other types of capital investment that are required. Fifteen million dollars, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, in the overall scheme of things starts to become a pittance when the city spends in excess of \$100,000 a year on capital investment on an annual basis, that \$15 million, quite frankly, starts to pale in the overall scheme of things, and that's without, Mr. Chairman, addressing some of the major kind of concerns that I talked about earlier.

So I would hope the Minister would start to look at perhaps trying to lever - and we refer the argument time and time again that, and I heard Iona Campagnola, for instance, the President of the Labour Party, this morning announce on Peter Warren that, for instance, in British Columbia, you had the greatest roads in the world, the greatest buildings and the greatest bridges but, when it came to people services, they had very little. Mr. Chairman, it's getting, in Manitoba, to be somewhat in reverse. Where we have the finest in people services, the finest in programs to deal with every minority and every kind of social problem that exists in the province, but we're beginning to ignore the plant, the plant that was invested in by our forefathers. It was constructed by our forefathers, paid for out of their tax dollars and if we don't maintain it, if we don't enhance it, if we don't build on that base that was constructed by those people, quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, we're going to lose that investment made by our forefathers, a substantial investment.

There has to be a balance, a balance between the two, and I think what has happened in recent years, the balance has tipped in favour of perhaps going too far in some of the services and not far enough in others. I think it's time that we took maybe another look at those kinds of things and said, for awhile we're going

to have to invest some of our capital into the plant that makes the country run, the plant that supports the civilization which we enjoy, the physical plant that allows us to move about, allows us to conduct our economy in the way we do, allows us to have those jobs on-stream and, Mr. Chairman, I think gives us substantially the quality of life that we enjoy today.

Thank you.

HON. G. DOER: Well, I wouldn't disagree that the quality of one's infrastructure is a key ingredient for the plant as we know it for the province. — (Interjection) — the member opposite, well, we don't mind debating these issues. We only get a chance to every six or seven months.

One of the important parts of that plant is where two-thirds of the provincial spending is going and that's health care and education where we do have, even though they are people services, as you would call them, they are also physical infrastructure services as well. But there is no question that we should maintain, not only the people services, but the physical infrastructures as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(c)—pass; 4.(d)—pass.

Resolution No. 140: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$21,395,700 for Urban Affairs, Expenditures Related to Capital Assets, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

Going back to the Minister's Salary. The members of departmental staff are excused.

Item 1.(a), Minister's Salary—pass.

Resolution No. 137: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$512,500 for Urban Affairs, Administration and Finance for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

Committee rise.

IN SESSION

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, C. Santos: The Minister of the Environment.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Urban Affairs, that the House do now adjourn.

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