

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, March 20, 1979

Time: 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY — MUNICIPAL AND URBAN AFFAIRS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee come to order. I would like to refer the members to page 71, Resolution 92, 1.(c) Other Expenditures, \$173,100 — the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, before we broke in the afternoon session, I was making the comment that as an urban member for the Constituency of Wolseley, I had a number of enquiries asking the minister if he could, to convey what he envisioned was the difference between the Urban Affairs of today and as it was before, and possibly touching upon the blockfunding aspect of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the block funding grant which we have introduced is in substitution for nine conditional grants to the city, namely: original streets maintenance grant; the transit operating subsidy; transit bus purchases; innovative urban transportation grants; land acquisition transportation right-of-ways; regional streets capital program; intercity public health grant; Convention Centre grants; Assiniboine Park and Zoo, both current and capital.

The basic difference between payment of an unconditional grant and the payment of the previous nine conditional grants, is that the City of Winnipeg will have the complete discretion as to how to utilize those funds and to spend them according to the priorities which they feel are best able to respond to the needs and priorities of the citizens of Winnipeg. I think this is undoubtedly a basic policy change in the Urban Affairs area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am wondering if I could draw the honourable member's attention to 3.(d) which is the block funding area. Would the member want to discuss it at that stage of the game or under the Administrative end of it?

The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Actually, Mr. Chairman, the block funding moneys come under 3.(d). It says right there: "Block Funding Grant to the City of Winnipeg." That's the area you want to . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is why I am asking the honourable member at which stage of the game he would prefer to have it discussed, under the Administrative end of it, under 3.(d), or under the Minister's Salary?

MR. WILSON: Well, I am prepared to wait till we get to the Block Funding section, except I should reserve the right, Mr. Chairman, if you allow the latitude of members opposite, I should like to get involved, because while there will be given a great deal of responsibility to the City Council to make decisions, I have a great concern as a core area MLA as to some of the problems that I would like to put on the record at an opportunity, and certainly the Minister's Salary is that flexible area, so that the councillors or members of my particular government would be aware of some of those problems if they aren't already.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the members of the committee, it is not my intention to limit the discussion. I've allowed a fair amount of latitude till now in the areas of General Administration, under the Minister's salary. If it is the desire of the committee, then we will proceed item by item, and that would apply to all members of the committee.

The Member for Wolseley. —(Interjection)— Order please. Was the Member for Wolseley finished?

MR. WILSON: Well, I'm quite prepared to wait till we get to the block funding section, but again I did want to ask some questions under Urban Affairs and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, one of the constituents of the Member for Wolseley wants to speak.

MR. BOYCE: That's correct, but I raised a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My apologies. I did not hear the point of order being raised. The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: I'm sorry, I'm left at a loss. Would you mind telling me what Item we're on?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're under 1.(c) Other Expenditures: \$173,100. —(Interjection)— Order please. On a point of order.

MR. BOYCE: If you would just once again, I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman — what page are you on?

MR. CHAIRMAN: On Page 71. I made reference to these various Items when we started the Committee.

MR. BOYCE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I didn't hear you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My apologies. Page 71, Item 1.(c) Other Expenditures.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, if you're under 1.(c) then I will pass, but I was under the impression that one of the gentlemen opposite had backed up to Minister's Salary, so I shall wait till the appropriate section to ask my questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask a number of questions of the Minister, and I'd like to start on the general makeup and operation of his combined departments because, you know, when I observe the operations of this department now I primarily regard it as a Municipal Affairs Department as opposed to an Urban Affairs Department and, although I recognize the Deputy-Minister who once graced my department and one or two other gentlemen, I have the distinct impression that the Urban Affairs Department has for intents and purposes disappeared all I wonder if the Minister could give us as an example a comparison of the staff as it was when he took over — I believe there were some ten or twelve members — and if he could make a comparison with how many people he had when he commenced and then how many there are at present who are specifically assigned to Urban Affairs and could provide us with that information, because my impression is that those people have either left or have disappeared within the department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I would refer the honourable member to Hansard from this afternoon where we discussed this matter.

MR. DOERN: Well, I'm not familiar with what the Minister's referring to. I mean I don't recall a discussion on this this afternoon in the House. If the Minister knows the figures perhaps he could give them to us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition. A point of order.

MR. PALLEY: On a point of order, I know that the Minister is, of course, referring to his report here this afternoon, but I would like to simply mention that when we're working with two Committees it often is very difficult for members to be present, not only in this Committee but also to be present in the other committee, but I think that the member wants to inquire now of that information so that he can deal with questions that he would like to pose. I would hope the minister could oblige him although he did give the information this afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The problem that I have to the members of the committee is that with two committees going if they want to interchange all the time we will be having a lot of repetition, and if the area is once covered I would feel that possibly the members could get whatever pertinent information had been related — could get the information from their colleagues, as such.

MR. DOERN: Well that's fine, I'll proceed and since I can't be on two committees at the same time, you can tell me when it's been covered. That would be very helpful.

One of the problems, I think, confronting the City of Winnipeg is that they're being blocked at both ends; they are being given a specific amount of money in a block funding program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister, on a point of order.

MR. MERCIER: I've just indicated to the Member for Wolseley that we're going to discuss block funding under 3(d).

MR. DOERN: You haven't heard what I've said yet, you're cutting me off in mid sentence. I heard what you said to the Member for Wolseley.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Member for Elmwood proceed, please.

MR. DOERN: I want to deal with new sources of revenue, and this is a question that I asked the minister in the House, and he gave me a short or incomplete answer. I want to speak about general sources of revenue and about the fact that there has been criticism by the City, of members of the City, in terms of the Provincial Government. For example, I want to refer to some remarks of Abe Yanofsky, who said that he hasn't heard a word about the new fiscal arrangements promised by the Conservatives in the election campaign.

I want to ask specifically of the minister that in addition to block funding, which he wants to hold aside, or we can hold aside, that the City asked the Province apparently for authority to levy taxes on liquor and pari-mutuel betting, and for a greater provincial contribution towards the cost of education. I want to ask the minister if he could comment on that. That was a request of the City to — and you know, I sat like him. e sat together, facing each other around the Cabinet table when he was a member of council asking for those kinds of things, and now he's on the other end of the argument, and according to newspaper accounts, at least, there have been requests by the City, of the Province, to ask for special new taxing powers, or special new sources of revenue and that these were denied. So I just wonder if the minister could comment on that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. It is certainly not my intention to limit the discussion of any item as such, I'm just wondering if possibly the area that the member is referring to would come under Municipal Budget and Finance. I'm at the disposal of the committee.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I believe there is some latitude allowable on the salaries. It's very difficult for members to ascertain where in this new layout some of these matters are. There's also the fact that we are on two committees and I am certainly interested in what's going on in Health, and I don't know whether we're going to have the opportunity to wait for the exact moment to come running back, and then you come running back and then that area has been passed. So there's no way out of that dilemma. But we do, in fact have some latitude on General Administration. I intend to make most of my comments here. Because I asked for one answer, I was told that we completed that, I couldn't have that answer. So I want to make sure I get the answers when I'm here and not wait, and then be told that that was passed five minutes ago.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, it really doesn't matter to me when we discuss these things. If people have points they want to raise, to express my own personal point of view, it doesn't matter to me when they're raised. But it's the decision of yourself and the committee. If you want me to go ahead and answer this at this time then I assume the members can raise any matters they want anytime.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Monourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: I'd like to address a comment to your concern, and I think it's an understandable concern, but it seems to me with two committees operating, it's going to be very, very difficult if we're going to do justice to each committee, and members do have to attend both committees,

if there's not a certain amount of latitude permitted during the discussion of Administration. I believe I can safely say that in the other committee during the discussion of the Estimates of the Department of Health that there has been pretty wide latitude exercised under the subject of Minister's Salary and Administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the Leader of the Opposition, as I indicated before, it is my intention to allow a fair amount of latitude and I have, I believe, and we're not discussing the Minister's Salary. In the previous committees that we've dealt with here, we've allowed to refer everything that was not possibly covered by members that could not attend at the present time to bring it up under the Minister's Salary and I would assume that we would proceed on the same basis again. As I indicated, I am not trying to cut off the discussion as such. If the members have problems attending both committees, this is addilemma that I need the guidance of the committee with. If we're going to leave it wide open, that is fine. I'm just stating to the Member for Elmwood, who raised a point, that we had covered 1.(b), we were up to 1.(c) and we had covered the Administrative Salaries prior to that. The Minister has indicated that he is prepared to discuss this at this stage of the game. If that is the desire of the committee, then we will proceed. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we should proceed. I mean, I read the General Administration as a co-ordination of departmental branches and giving internal policy, direction and guidance. That strikes me as a very broad framework. I'd like to hear the response.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Elmwood referred to rather a general area. I can indicate to him, with respect to the city's request for access to other areas of taxation that are in present legislation, the Minister of Finance has indicated in meetings with the city that he is prepared to review some of those area with the city of Winnipeg during the course of this year.

I would point out to him, and for the record, Mr. Chairman, that because the Member for Elmwood has referred to my record as a City Councillor, I want to indicate to him that I do not believe that at any time I voted in favour of increased taxation proposals. The area of block funding does come into the subject matter, Mr. Chairman, because we have indicated in the proposal to the City that this amount we have provided to the City for block funding this year will be increased generally in proportion to the increase and expenditures by the provincial government, which is related to the increase in revenue to the provincial government, so that there is a very direct relationship in the amount of block funding to the increase in revenue to the provincial government.

We have indicated to the City that we are prepared to review the amount of the base grant with the City of Winnipeg, through the course of this year, and I have to say, Mr. Chairman, that tomorrow night City Council will deal with a recommendation from their Executive Policy Committee for approval of a current budget, which only involves a mill rate increase of 2.1 mills, which is only a 3 percent increase over the previous year. The Deputy Mayor and Members of Council have indicated satisfaction with the amount of the base grant for this year. They have, I admit, indicated a concern over the amount for future years. But as I said, we're prepared to review that amount with them during the course of this year but I suggest hhat the fact that there is such a slight mill rate increase in the City of Winnipeg in its current operation that that's evidence of the aact that this amount is a pretty generally accepted amount for this year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Meer for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Well, I'd just like to try to pin the Minister down a bit, if I could. He is referring to a 2 mill increase, which I gather is about \$15 per house, but without education costs — and again I'm referring to specific requests, as mentioned intthe Free Press in January — one being a request to have authorization to levy taxes on liquor. Could the Minister comment on that specific? Has he denied the City that request?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: We certainly have not indicated to date any agreement with that request.

MR. DOERN: Secondly, there is a request for pari mutuel betting. Has he responded to that request from the City?

MR. MERCIER: It's my understanding and I think generally agreed to — and I would stand to be corrected — that when that matter was raised the City had virtually withdrawn that position

because it finally recognizes the problem, as did the previous government when they in fact increased the amount available to the track and to the horsemen — and I'm not very familiar with the details of that program — but I think generally it's recognized by the City, by the previous government and by our government, that there had to be a greater amount available at the track for the horsemen, who were running at the track, that there simply wasn't room there for additional taxation, and perhaps the Member for Virden would like to expand on that remark. He would have more knowledge of it than I, but that's the general situation, I believe.

MR. DOERN: The third specific mentioned here is a greater provincial contribution towards the cost of education. Now, my understanding is that rather than moving towards 80 percent funding that we're moving the other way. I'm just wondering if the Minister had any encouraging remarks for the Winnipeg School Board or the City of Winnipeg, in terms of increased funding for education, or are we going the other way?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I think questions like that are more appropriately directed to other Ministers, but I can certainly say that the objective of our government, as revenues become available, will be to reduce the cost of education burden on real property taxation. That's one of the reasons, I believe, why the Throne Speech indicated that the Minister of Finance would be introducing a White Paper on the Property Tax Rebate Program, and that that matter will be addressed in that White Paper.

Certainly the objective would be, in my view, that that's where the problem is, if there is a problem with respect to real property taxation. I think generally speaking the municipal tax for real property tax payers are not over-burdened with municipal taxation, that they get good value for their dollar. But the area that has to be dealt with and resolved is the amount levied against real property for education, and certainly the Premier and the Minister of Education have indicated that as funds become available that the intent will be to alleviate that situation. The Minister of Finance, again, has indicated the White Paper on tax credits or the Property Tax Rebate Program should address that problem.

MR. DOERN: I'm just wondering of that remark by the Minister is he suggesting that the City has not been, in the last few years and decades, not been getting value for their money, they haven't been tightly looking at their expenditures or haven't been getting value for their dollar?

MR. MERCIER: No, not in any way. No, I'm not suggesting that at all. I'm suggesting that the burden of real property taxation is not caused by municipal taxation for municipal purposes, that if there is a problem it is with respect to the cost of education levied against real property, and that is, I think, recognized by our government and the intention is to move in that area and attempt to reduce that area as funds become available.

MR. DOERN: The final comment in this series of questions I wanted to ask of the Minister was a remark again by Abe Yanofsky, who is now one of the Committee Chairmen, who said that he hadn't heard a word about the new fiscal arrangements promised by the government during the election. And the statement made was this: That provincial grants to the City in 1978 were cut back by \$1.1 million from the previous year. I ask the Minister whether he accepts that statement as a statement of fact, or whether he questions it, and I'd also ask him what his estimate is of increased funding for the next fiscal year. I'm just saying if it is true that there was a cutback of \$1.1 million in 1978, what is the Minister's estimate of either cutbacks or increases for the next fiscal year?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Well, I'm not sure of the question, Mr. Chairman. Are you talking about 79-80 Estimates?

MR. DOERN: Yes,

MR. MERCIER: You are referring to last year's Estimates?

MR. DOERN: Well, I'm quoting from where it says, 1978. I assume that that is 78-79; a reference to a cutback . . .

MR. MERCIER: One of the difficulties, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that the city's financial year is

on a calendar year, and the province is on a fiscal year, so I want to make sure which years we're talking about.

MR. DOERN: Well, in the last fiscal year, do you admit to an absolute cutback in terms of dollars, to the city of Winnipeg?

MR. MERCIER: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOERN: Then I ask the Minister, what figure he puts up against this figure; this figure says a \$1.1 million cutback, is the Minister suggesting an increase of X millions, or what?

MR. MERCIER: I can't answer that, Mr. Chairman, because I don't know what Councillor Yanofsky was speaking about.

MR. DOERN: I have a number of topics, some of which I'll hold, maybe I could ask for some guidance. There's one other I would like to raise; I would like to raise, perhaps, something on the funding of the McGregor-Sherbrook overpass, and so on. Does that fall into some particular area here?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder if I could refer the member to Resolution 94, which is Municipal Budget and Finance, under which the funding to the city falls into.

MR. DOERN: With respect to UTAP, Mr. Chairman?

MR. MERCIER: With respect to UTAP. It really doesn't matter to me where they're discussed. It could be discussed under Municipal Budget and Finance, but the figures don't show up here, because what we do is allocate federal funds under the UTAP program.

MR. DOERN: There is one other area I'd like to discuss in general, and that is the city's apparent decision to close its Amy Street Steam Plant. I put an Order for Return to the Minister a couple of weeks ago, asking for . . . sorry, it was Government Services, but it's related to this, so I guess the Minister doesn't have any preliminary figures on the questions — the main question being, how much would it cost the province to convert all of its buildings, including the Centennial complex if that steam plant closed? They would have to then install all sorts of furnaces in that complex. But I imagine the minister doesn't have any figures there.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is a question that the member correctly directed to the Minister of Government Services and he'll have to provide this.

Referring to a question earlier, because I want to try to answer all the questions. . . was Counsellor Yanofsky referring to the unconditional grants under the Provincial-Municipal Tax Sharing Act because there was in 1978 a smaller fund available out of the 2.2 points of personal income tax and the 1 point of corporation tax which reduced the amount of funding available to all municipalities. This year the amount has increased to a fund of approximately 21 million dollars and the per capita grant has been increased from \$17.75 per capita to \$19.25 per capita plus the continuation of the \$1.00 per capita grant for municipalities under 7500, and \$2.00 per capita grant for municipalities 7500 and over. That's probably what was being referred to, but as the member knows, the amount available just depends on the amount that is raised by those points of income tax and corporation tax and are not affected by any provincial government decisions.

MR. DOERN: The other general question I wanted to ask of the minister concerned the possible funding. Although this involves the Minister of Government Services I think in terms of some of the specifics, in terms of the policy, I believe it falls under the Minister of Urban Affairs. I just wanted to ask him again, given that the city would require 42 million dollars to construct a new plant behind the Concert Hall which would burn garbage, provide steam and heat to that complex which would not only heat provincial buildings but municipal buildings, federal buildings, and well over 100, maybe 200 private operations, it would obviously, I suppose, require a contribution from the province. And although I think the minister takes the position that he will respond if a specific request comes, I think there's a more aggressive possibility, namely if the minister were to head a delegation or participate in a delegation to go to Ottawa that they might be successful in obtaining federal funding, because my impression is that you don't respond sometimes to federal government, you'd rather go and prod them into action.

So I'm simply saying this, that if a request comes, or even in spite of a request coming, a specific

request from the city, is the minister prepared to go with the city and aggressively pursue a Grant, because I'm told there's funds available, that there are various programs in terms of the federal government for energy conservation, some \$380 million that are for everything from solar energy to the use of waste materials in terms of heat and energy, etc., that there are several hundred million dollars available and that by going to the federal government, encouraging and prodding them, some of these funds may come back to us. I'm just asking him what his general position is on that matter.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, in the dying few months of the previous government, the then Minister of Urban Affairs Member for Seven Oaks wrote to the City of Winnipeg in response to the City of Winnipeg's request for funding for this program, to indicate that the amount of Capital expenditures was so large that the federal government should be approached to determine if they would participate in the cost of this particular project. In December of 1977, I did indeed go to Ottawa with Mayor Steen to meet with Mr. Ouelette who is the minister responsible in this particular area to discuss this very subject and to request federal government participation. The city has never apparently received and certainly I've never received any indication from the federal government that they would participate in the funding of that project in any way, and I take it, it was on that basis that the decision was made by the city last year simply not to proceed any further with that particular project. But the request has been made to Ottawa, Mr. Chairman, and there's been no agreement for funding of the project.

MR. DOERN: Does the Minister have any sort of ball-park figure or feel in terms of how much of these some \$380 million in federal funds should naturally fall to Manitoba, and in what areas is he prepared to go after the federal government to get Manitoba's fair share of this projected program.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, as I indicated, we supported the city of Winnipeg in their request to the federal government and no reply was made. I think my job is one of co-ordinating the activities of the provincial government with respect to the city, but if there are any other areas dealing with energy and conservation of energy, the Minister of Finance is the Minister responsible for Hydro and the Manitoba Energy Council and that's where any further questions should be directed.

MR. DOERN: Then do I deduce that the Minister is saying, in effect, that he doesn't have a ball-park figure and he doesn't have any specific project in mind in terms of attempting to obtain federal funds for various energy programs, that he is backing out and deferring to the Minister of Finance in that regard.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I'm not backing out, that is the responsibility of the Minister of Finance.

MR. DOERN: But I'm asking, what is your responsibility in this regard?

MR. MERCIER: My responsibility in this area, Mr. Chairman, I believe generally is to support municipalities in this particular area in request for funds to attempt them to obtain them if it's at all possible.

MR. DOERN: But surely the Minister has the following responsibility. The Minister of Finance is not the Minister of Urban Affairs, and surely the Minister's responsibility, if not to head delegations and to provide leadership, is to provide programs, to throw up programs, to have somebody in the department looking at federal programs and attempting to access them. So I assume when the Minister of Finance, who knows something about energy, says to the Minister of Urban Affairs, what should we go for, that you have some specifics. I'm asking you whether you have any specific programs to put forward to access these federal funds. If we go on a straight population basis of 1/23rd, or whatever of \$380 million, then I assume that we have some \$15 million that should naturally accrue to us. Now, maybe if we're aggressive we can get \$30 million. But is the Minister saying that he's just leaving all of this to the Finance Minister and he's not going to make any proposals to him? He just says, let us know if you get any money and then I'll give it to my people and they'll see whether they can spend it. Isn't there anything coming forth in terms of concrete demands, either in terms of a general direction or in terms of a specific proposal or proposals so that the whole government will be able to talk turkey. Surely they're not going to go to Ottawa and say, can we have ten or twenty million dollars for an energy program. They have to spell it out. And isn't the Minister prepared to spell it out to this committee?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, it seemed to me that the most practical project was put to the federal government in the form of a request from the city. The federal government can't see their way towards participating in that particular project, the project we've just been talking about, for the city of Winnipeg. The Waste Disposal Project received no positive response at all from the federal government and that is the only area, only project in this particular area that I have dealt with. Any further questions, Mr. Chairman, have nothing to do with these Estimates and should be directed towards the Minister of Finance.

MR. DOERN: I'll just ask one more question at this point and leave the floor to my colleagues. When a decision is made, or if the government is confronted with the situation, I assume that the Department of Urban Affairs, in conjunction with Government Services, or the fragment of Urban Affairs, or whatever is left of Urban Affairs, in conjunction with Government Services, should be able to determine the specifics of what it will cost to provide new equipment to heat those provincial buildings in that centre core area. I'm just saying that I assume that the Minister would want that information as much as I do, and the government would, to be able to make a decision on what they're going to have to do in terms of building new heating plant in the area, which I have a feeling is going to cost a couple of million dollars. I'm just saying that it may be necessary for the Minister to keep pursuing and keep pressuring the federal government on this project, because I think this is another example of the city making a wrong move, to this extent, that assuming they can get funding, and that's of course the key, they should be proceeding in that direction, because we're also getting into other areas where they are systematically closing down incinerators which can, I think properly dispose of garbage and other waste materials, and reverting to land fill. And in the long run, I have a feeling that the switch to land fill is just absolutely the worst direction that a modern, urban centre can move in.

We've seen problems, there's been questions raised on city council by some councillors and I'm sure that my colleague on the committee, who is fresh from council will recall some debates in that regard, but there's been even more current debates, expressions of concern about waste materials, there's the disastrous incident of the St. Boniface industrial park where the city developed a landfill site for industrial purposes and then it's been paying millions of dollars in compensation and so on. —(Interjection)— I think, well, that snow melter, that was a tremendous idea, I forget who came up with that but

But I it melted with the last spring runoff. was just going to ask the Minister if he doesn't think that there should be some leadership given by his department. I don't know how the Minister is capable of leadership, given what appears to be a winding down of this department, a reduction in staff, and too heavy a workload. I don't know how we really can have a Minister of Urban Affairs or an urban government policy under those circumstances. But I'm just saying to the minister, does he think he has any responsibility to offer some leadership and/or some support to the City of Winnipeg, or is he simply assuming that he's going to sit in his office, and when the City comes with the official delegation he's going to, you know, shoot the breeze with the boys, ask them how things are going and simply on occasion respond and on occasion perhaps provide some funding. I mean, where is the leadership coming in terms of the Province? Does the minister see any role in that regard for his department or himself?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, as I've already indicated numerous times to the member, we supported, at the Provincial Government level, as much as possible, the request from the City of Winnipeg, for Federal Government financing of a new concept in waste disposal for the City of Winnipeg and substitution for the Amy Street plant. We, in the City, did not receive any favourable consideration at all by the Federal Government. The previous government indicated, prior to their leaving office, through Mr. Miller, that the amount of the capital expenditures involved in that particular program, was that it was so large that it could not possibly proceed without Federal Government assistance. That has not been obtained. I'm certainly prepared to follow that up with the new Federal Government in a few months time, and perhaps there will be a change of heart at that level, with a change of government.

The one point I want to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, is that the Member for Elmwood made a Freudian slip. He made the comment, "Here we have another wrong move by the City of Winnipeg." And that just typifies the whole approach of the previous government towards the City of Winnipeg and municipal politicians, because in their view, Mr. Chairman, the only possible people that could make the right decision was the Provincial Government, And they weren't prepared to give the City of Winnipeg and municipalities responsibility to make their own decisions, Mr. Chairman, and the comment that it is just another wrong move by the City of Winnipeg Council, puts on the record their whole approach towards Municipal Government and there's a substantial change, Mr.

in the approach towards Municipal Government. We're prepared to let Municipal Government make their own decisions and not interfere with those decisions because they're best equipped to make those decisions, Mr. Chairman. I'm glad the Member for Elmwood exhibited his approach towards Municipal Government because now it's on the record and we know what the difference is between members on the other side and our Provincial Government, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I cannot let that remark pass, and I simply say that if you say to the City, that they cannot have new sources of revenue, and you're providing them with this phony block funding proposal in which the taxpayers will be badly hurting as a result of that, the City isn't getting as much money as it requires. It's being shafted on a number of proposals, including transit and the Convention Centre, and you're saying that they can go it alone. You want them to be big boys and go it alone. You give them an inadequate amount of funding. You're not providing them with direction. You have no Department of Urban Affairs. You have a few people, who have been stuffed into corners of the Municipal Affairs Department, and you say that this is really tremendous; it's called laissez-faire. With inadequate resources and inadequate funding you can make your own decisions, we're not going to interfere. I say the City of Winnipeg is worse off, worse off than they were in the last few years, and I think that that will be demonstrated by the articles that are appearing in the press about how the City feels about what you are doing, and what you're not doing, and I think that the situation has deteriorated significantly since our government was in office.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I find it difficult to indicate any concurrence with the remarks from the Member for Elmwood, particularly when he should be aware, as most other people are aware, that the approach of block funding with the City of Winnipeg, was endorsed by City of Winnipeg Council. They said it was a concept they had been fighting for for years, and years, and years — the right to be able to make their own decisions on priorities.

The member made reference to the Convention Centre, Mr. Chairman. The Convention Centre grant is included in the block funding approach, and I would point out for the benefit of the Member for Elmwood that the Province's share of the deficit has declined each year, from 1975-76 to the previous fiscal year. That that amount was used as the base for the block funding grant and the amount of the block funding grant will increase, and that figure will still be included there. But there's an opportunity there, Mr. Chairman, for the Board of the Convention Centre, on which the City has a majority of representation, to reduce the deficit entirely. But that amount of money included in the base is still used in the block funding grant. So they continue to have the benefit of that, as they continue to have the benefit of \$6 to \$7 million worth of equity interest from the Province and lands that were purchased for transportation right-of-ways, they will be able to dispose of surplus lands, and create funds for the future purchase of lands.

Mr. Chairman, let me refer to one example of the interference by the previous Provincial Government in their refusal to allow the City of Winnipeg, for example, to extend the Fort Garry-St. Vital bridge project across Pembina Highway to Waverley Street. I invite them now, Mr. Chairman, I invite them now to drive south on Pembina Highway at 5:00 p.m. and try to go through the absurd traffic situation that has been created. Created, Mr. Chairman, by the decisions of the members, who are sitting on that side of the table, not to go along with the request of the City, who had considered that matter thoroughly and formed the view that a traffic hazardous situation would be created if that project was not extended across from Pembina Highway to Waverley. But they still refuse, Mr. Chairman.

They talk about the dismantling of Urban Affairs. They wouldn't even consult with the Department of Highways, Mr. Chairman, on a street and traffic transportation matter. They had a couple of their experts; their so-called experts up in a little corner room somewhere in the building, who knew beans-all about traffic, design the project on the back of a matchbook cover. That's the kind of expertise we had, Mr. Chairman, to deal with in the City of Winnipeg. And you can drive down Pembina Highway tonight and you can see the result. The City's going to have to, very shortly, complete that project. But it should have been completed in the first instance as the City requested, but they chose to interfere in that project and that's just one example, Mr. Chairman, of the interference of the previous government with the decisions of the City of Winnipeg Council.

MR. DOERN: I hope to conclude on this point, but I want to tell the minister what state of affairs the City is in at this time under his government, his provincial government. He comes from the City. He is now the Minister responsible, and these are some of the needs that the city has that are, I believe, going wanting. There are serious recreation problems. There are serious core area problems. There is a need for a steam plant. There is a need for new incinerators, a new sewer

system, and God knows what else, and I give him the following specifics, which come from the Parks and Recreation Branch of the City. This is the effect of the restraint policies of this government, and they are spelled out in detail. We are getting the following. You are having shorter hours of arenas and outdoor pools. You are having the cutting of temporary summer help; a reduction in grass cutting and paper picking operations; City outdoor rinks. In some cases, you don't have boards anymore; you have snowbanks. You have less maintenance of parks, playgrounds, athletic fields, arenas, community centres, pools, outdoor rinks, and you have less supervision.

And we know all about supervision and the lessening effect, because we had the notorious incident of the lifeguards last summer and, as one councillor put it, he said, "The streets are going to be dirtier." And that's the kind of city, the kind of mess, that is being left, in my judgment, because of inadequate provincial funding and the lack of leadership. So I now pass to one of my colleagues.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat again for the member's benefit, the City of Winnipeg, this year — tomorrow night in fact — City Council will consider a budget which will only have a mill rate increase of 3 percent, Mr. Chairman, and the report from the Board of Commissioners to the City of Winnipeg Council indicates that there are no serious reductions in services.

But I appreciate the Member for Elmwood would never accept, Mr. Chairman, any of the opinions of City Council or the administration, Mr. Chairman, because he knows best. He knows best.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When we started consideration this evening I referred the Member for Wolseley, who had the floor, that he should discuss the items under Item 3, and having allowed the latitude that I have, I would extend the courtesy to the Member for Wolseley to either have the floor now or wait until we get to Item 3. The Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I don't object to the Member for Wolseley having the floor in terms of latitude, but I don't believe he is next in sequence. If you have a speaking order, I think you should follow it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was my ruling that I referred the member to curtail his remarks to Item 3 at that time. After that, the Minister indicated he was prepared to discuss the item and I allowed a fair amount of latitude and, in all courtesy, I am extending the Member for Wolseley to . . . If the member wants to curtail his remarks until Item 3 comes up, that's fine; I'm just extending the courtesy to him. The Member for Wolseley, do you want to wait until the item comes up under the . . . ?

MR. WILSON: That is correct. I will put my name up when Item 3 comes up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAWLEY: I am letting the Member for Wellington go ahead of me, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wellington.

MR. BRIAN CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, I was interested this evening in pursuing the staff reorganization, as it is somewhat euphemistically referred to. I understand there were some 11 staff — this is an approximation but I think it is relatively accurate — there were 11 staff persons formerly associated with the Urban Affairs Department and I understand — and I stand to be corrected, if there were more or less — I understand that some of these people have been reintegrated into the system in other parts of the department and others have been let go, and I was wondering if we could have some idea what capacity those persons served in that were let go, that were laid off.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, there were two, and if the member wants any further details it's in Hansard from this afternoon.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, with respect, I'm sure it is in Hansard, but I take it that there are two laid off. Am I to understand, then, that all the rest were redeployed?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, we are not going to repeat what was said this afternoon. It was discussed this afternoon. He can read Hansard tomorrow and if he has any questions of what was in Hansard, raise it then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I indicated to the Members of the Committee at the start of the evening that certain of these items were covered and the question came up before from the Member for Elmwood, and I'm not trying to constrict the discussion as such. The only problem that I have is if members are not here when certain items get covered we can endlessly repeat them. The Member for Wellington. A point of order, the Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Of course the Minister doesn't have to answer anything, but in adopting this particular attitude, I wonder if we could make arrangements through Hansard to have available the draft or the blue-line or something, because it's two or three days before this comes out. You know, if the Minister wants to adopt this attitude then we have nothing to do but start asking for the details on every particular expenditure, down to the last penny, you know which the opposition is entitled to do. But nevertheless, to expedite things I think the Minister doesn't want to repeat it and repetition does delay things, but nevertheless if the Minister wants us to read these questions tomorrow relative to Hansard then we should have available a copy of Hansard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The problem, to the Members of the Committee, that I have is if some of these items have been covered do we re-go them every time a new member enters the Committee here. Whatever the Committee desires; I'm at your discretion. The Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Speaking on the point of order that was raised, Mr. Chairman, I would remind you — and I think what I'm doing is really simply restating your own observation of approximately 45 or 50 minutes ago — that it would be somewhat irrational and inordinate for the Chair not to take cognizance of the fact that there is a very important Estimates debate proceeding in the House and that members, of necessity, because of a variety of interests, are forced to proceed between the two meetings in order to fulfill their obligations and do justice to their workload.

A MEMBER: Is this not important, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CORRIN: No, I'm just suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that I was one of those who, by necessity, sat in the other House to participate in debate this afternoon but I am prepared to proceed, having heard what the Honourable Minister has said. I am quite prepared to proceed, because my friend and colleague has instructed me as to some of the observations that were made this afternoon by the Minister. I might note that much time could have been saved if the Minister simply would have told me what he said. It wasn't altogether that inordinate a demand. It would have taken probably 35 to 60 seconds. But we now know, and will proceed. Do I still have the floor? I was speaking on the point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wellington.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, I am advised that the Minister indicated — and he can correct me if my advice is wrong — that two persons were laid off. Could the Minister indicate the nature of the work that those two persons did? I don't believe that he did that this afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I believe I did. One was an administrative officer and one was formerly with HESP Secretariat.

MR. CORRIN: I'm wondering if it's not true — and I stand to be corrected — if it's not true that a social policy planner was laid off. Perhaps I should put it to the Minister. Is it not true that a social policy planner was laid off?

MR. MERCIER: That would be the second of the two I mentioned.

MR. CORRIN: That individual's name would be Mrs. Silden, would it?

MR. MERCIER: If you wish to raise names, that's correct.

MR. CORRIN: Would the Minister be able to confirm that another person that was laid off was an Urban Planning person and her name being Mrs. Maureen Grant?

MR. MERCIER: No, she was not. As I indicated this afternoon, for the benefit of the Member for Wellington, Mr. Chairman, the department made a concerted effort to redeploy people and employment was found for her.

MR. CORRIN: So the Minister is advising the Committee that Mrs. Grant, formerly employed with the Urban Affairs Department, has been redeployed and is currently employed with the provincial government?

MR. MERCIER: Yes.

MR. CORRIN: Would I be correct in assuming that the other person who was laid off then was also a financial analyst assistant, one Mr. Cinnamon? Is that correct?

MR. MERCIER: Yes.

MR. CORRIN: And would I be correct in suggesting that there were three clerks; to be specific, a clerk, a typist, and an administrative officer that were laid off?

MR. MERCIER: No.

MR. CORRIN: There were no lay-offs with respect to any of those designations?

MR. MERCIER: No, I told you. Two people were released; that's all.

MR. CORRIN: I would ask, in view of the fact that the social policy planner, the person responsible, as you have suggested, for HESP, which I guess is a designation in acronym for Health Education and Social Policy, and the financial analyst assistants there are now missing and, presumably — think it's safe to presume that the Urban Planning person is no longer employed in that capacity within the department; is that correct?

MR. MERCIER: She's employed in the Planning Branch.

MR. CORRIN: I would ask the Minister whether or not there is any integration of function as between the various areas and pursuits, the various areas of discipline and pursuits *vis-a-vis* Urban Affairs. I'm considering, I suppose, the areas of Urban Planning, Social Policy and Financial Analysis now. I am wondering whether there is any attempt to pursue an interdisciplinary approach with respect to these areas of work.

MR. MERCIER: There has been an integration of staff.

MR. CORRIN: If the Minister would tell me, how do we integrate the work in those three areas: Urban Planning, Social Policy and Financial Analysis? How do we now integrate the work?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, individuals have been transferred into various areas of the department in Budget and Finance, and Provincial Planning and Municipal Planning.

MR. CORRIN: And with respect to my question, though, what I am concerned with, Mr. Chairman, is that we establish how these individuals who have been transferred to various divisions within the department integrate their work. What efforts are made to assure that the people who do Urban Planning work talk to the people who do Social Policy work and, in turn, those people talk to the persons who do financial assessments and evaluations? What I want to know is what mechanism there is within the department to assure that those various pursuits are integrated on an interdisciplinary basis.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, that's a function that is performed at Directors' meetings and is the responsibility, particularly, of the Assistant Deputy Ministers and the Deputy Minister, in reporting to me.

MR. CORRIN: Well, in that regard, I would ask whether any of these people, any of the people who were formerly involved in Urban Affairs, or, for that matter, any of the people who are now involved in the department are pursuing, on an exclusive basis, Urban Affairs issues. In other words, whether or not anybody, by way of professional orientation, is being assigned the responsibility of pursuing the Urban Planning function within the department.

MR. MERCIER: Yes.

MR. CORRIN: Could we have some idea of who that person or persons might be?

MR. MERCIER: No, Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to discuss the names of particular individuals, but I would indicate that in our Provincial Planning Branch we have transferred a person who will be directly responsible for the Winnipeg development plan, review and incorporating concerns that will come through the Provincial Planning Branch as a whole. He have individuals responsible for direct liaison with the City of Winnipeg and City of Winnipeg issues. As indicated in the Throne Speech we have specifically one or two persons serving on a task orrce dealing with a review of the core area services.

MR. CORRIN: I was wondering — you indicated that there were persons, whose responsibility was direct liaison with the City of Winnipeg. What positions do they occupy?

MR. MERCIER: Senior Urban Co-ordinator.

MR. CORRIN: I take it then that there's one individual whose responsibility would be liaison with the City of Winnipeg, is that correct?

MR. MERCIER: Yes. Not the only one, but one chiefly and mainly responsible for the liaison function.

MR. CORRIN: Dealing with the liaison function, what would that now be? I presume that it has something to do with the City's joint delegation and I would presume that it may have something to do with this core area Committee, but is there anything more that's involved in that right now?

MR. MERCIER: Those would be his two main areas of responsibility.

MR. CORRIN: I would ask the Minister, and I do so respectfully, whether he considers it sufficient that there be only one person seconded within his department to service the needs of communication and liaison as between the Provincial Government and the City of Winnipeg government, whether he is of the opinion that that is a suitable and wholesome arrangement and will facilitate adequate communications in the future?

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, with respect to that function, when I say one person, that is one person dealing with specific issues and for communications. There's certainly DeputyMinisters, people in our Finance area and in our Planning area who are involved in areas affecting the City of Winnipeg. It's not the function of one person.

MR. CORRIN: Can you indicate that there are now persons in other departments who are responsible for working out and working through issues respecting the City as well, but I'm concerned that there seems to have been a diminution of persons who are actually inter-acting as between the province and the City of Winnipeg who are overseeing and responsible for joint policy development, if you will, between the two branches of government. We had an indication that there were 11 or 12 some-odd employees formerly maintained in the Urban Affairs Department. We have a definite indication that two of them were laid off and others were sent into other areas of endeavor.

Given the fact that we seem to have only one person whose job is now direct liaison, I' wondering whether there has been any strain, whether there has been any indication that this is unsuitable

in terms of the functions to be served. And ii address the Minister's concern to the need for good liaison. He, himself, as a matter of fact, buttresses my argument in this respect by suggesting that the former government, of course, as he would have it, was insensitive to the needs of City Council and I would wonder whether he wouldn't agree with me that it does make sense, to hypothesize, that sensitivity is usually based on good communication, and good communication usually necessitates time and work and energy, and therefore it necessitates competent staff persons being deployed in the endeavor. I would ask whether he's of the opinion that, having only one person acting as a facilitator of direct liaison, is sufficient in order to deal with the issues that arise and the sums of money that are expended, and we're talking about enormous sums of money, of course. I would ask him whether he considers that suitable and adequate for the purpose?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I just finished saying that there was not just one person. We have a person named as Senior Urban Co-ordinator, who has an important function to play, but there are a large number of other individuals within the department who deal with City problems. What we are also doing, perhaps to a greater extent than was previously done, is involving other departments in government, other Ministers, in aspects which come under their jurisdiction. There's a fundamental position here, Mr. Chairman, and what we are trying to do is not duplicate the services that can be rendered by other departments; for example, in the Health and Community Services Department. We're not trying to duplicate those in our department. We want to use the expertise that is available in that department and in other departments and not duplicate them in Municipal and Urban Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, there is no difficulty whatsoever with communications with the City of Winnipeg. I meet with the City of Winnipeg regularly and almost on demand. The City can meet with me, and they know it, at any time that they wish. We have met like that and continually ever since I assumed this Portfolio and there's been no difficulty whatsoever in that regard. Also, because the member used the word competent, there's no question in my view with respect to the competence of the people employed in this department, particularly in respect to their relationship with the City of Winnipeg.

MR. CORRIN: The Minister indicated earlier in his — call it a debate, for lack of a better term — with the Member for Elmwood, that he had not been personally satisfied with the competence — using his word — of two — I think he indicated two transportation experts whom, he said, were closeted in some portion of this building by the former government. It moves me to wonder, given the fact that he wasn't satisfied with the competence of the former so-called experts, to be charitable to him, I wonder whether he's taken the pains and exercised his new prerogative and replaced these experts with those of his own. I'm wondering who does transportation analysis for the Province of Manitoba in terms of the urban scene.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, we certainly have the Highways and Transportation Department, we have our involvement in the Winnipeg Development Plan Review, in which transportation is a key area, and have experts and consultants employed in that review. In addition, one of the main purposes of the establishment of the block funding grant is to allow the City to make the decisions with respect to Street Transportation projects which they wish to proceed with, particularly — if that had been in effect it would have avoided the disastrous decision that was rendered by the previous government with respect to the Fort Garry- St. Vital Bridge project.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister makes reference to so-called disastrous decisions that have been taken by the provincial level of government, and I suppose he raises the spectre of intervention, noble intercession by the provincials here. I'm wondering, in view of the fact that the City of Winnipeg isn't the only group responsible for the quality of life in Winnipeg, and I, as a former councillor, am cognizant of the responsibilities of those who hold office at City Council, but I'm wondering if the Minister wouldn't agree with me that we, too, as provincial representatives and particularly as urban provincial representatives, have responsibility with respect to the quality of life in this our capital city.

And I would ask him whether he wouldn't agree with me, since the provincial tax dollar is what indeed enables and allows things to happen with respect to new innovations in the transportation field as an example, whether he isn't concerned about the impacts that occur — and I'm talking about the possible negative or adverse impacts that may occur to the quality of the environment in our city when those decisions and those dollars are made and spent by City officials alone. I would respectfully suggest to him, although I appreciate the need to give that level of government a measure of autonomy and equality, that they are not alone in their commitment to be vigilant respecting the environment of our city, and I would ask him whether he wouldn't agree with me

that, if their decisions are not appropriate, if their decisions, being inappropriate, cause deterioration within the fabric of our city's social life — and I'm now thinking, for instance, of a decision that's being made relative to the Sherbrook-McGRREGOR OVERPASS — if decisions made by the City Council might lead to the decay of a still restorable, conservable, inner city community. I'm wondering whether he wouldn't agree with me that it will inevitably be us, the provincial representatives, who pay most of the Social Service costs respecting those decisions. And I'm wondering, in view of the fact that at the tail end of the equation we might have to pick up the bill, whether it wouldn't make good sense at the front end to be party to some of the decisions.

I know that Home Rule and whatever other slogans are prevailing — and of course I suppose it's an old chestnut, that the question of more autonomy for the urban level of the municipal level of government has always been hotly contested, but I suppose that those who do most of the hollering tend to be those who have slightly less fiscal responsibility in the sense that they are not responsible, as I've said, to pay the high costs entailed by bad planning decisions, that they rather fortuitously can pass on to someone else, namely, provincial government.

I'm asking the Minister, and I'd like to hear the Minister's response, whether he would agree with me that it might, in view of that, make sense to participate more co-operatively with the City but not on a wholly delegated basis, on a basis whereby all decision-making is delegated to the City and provincial responsibility in this respect is seemingly abrogated. I would ask him whether he thinks that block funding, even if it were wholly adequate, wholly suitable to the purposes of the Civic Government, whether he really thinks that that sort of autonomy will ultimately be of benefit to the people of the City of Winnipeg, or whether he thinks that there shouldn't be a finer tuned integration as between the two levels of government.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the question is hypothetical. It is just another indication that the Member for Wellington, now that he has achieved a seat at the provincial level, has suddenly been endowed with a greater degree of wisdom than those people who perform important, just as important responsibilities as at the municipal level.

MR. CORRIN: I'm not sure why my colleague, the minister, concludes that I think that I may have been endowed with more wisdom. I would remind him, and I'm sure that his memory is as good as mine that my position hasn't changed. My position has been consistent for five years. I've always felt that there was a need for more liaison between the various levels of government. I've advocated liaison committees of all sorts when I was on City Council. I thought that one of the major problems, one of the problems that was leading to much of the malfunction, the unproductiveness of much of our municipal activity was the fact that we did too much fighting and not enough talking, and that positions were never articulated as suitably as they might be, certainly not from the public point of view in any event, certainly not so. There was a great deal of obfuscation and distortion disseminated certainly, by representatives of the council on which I sat, and possibly that would be true of provincial representatives as well.

I would submit to the minister that I am concerned that there is no special group within his department that has within its purview solely the question of urban affairs. I'm concerned because I think that inevitably this is going to lead to a sorry state of affairs. I can't imagine moneys being expended in these quantities with only so few people, and in such a separately organized manner, being responsible for informing the minister and through him the Cabinet and his government of the circumstances that prevail relative to the City's needs.

This whole scenario suggests to me, is a doomsday scenario, and it suggests to me that ultimately we're going to come to some sort of cataclysmic impasse. I don't think that it's fair that the Provincial Government impose a formula relative to block funding on the City. I don't think that's the way it should work. I don't think that it's that simple that you can say you're going to be block funded a specific sum of money and you work within that and you have autonomy within that. I think that whatever level of money that should be expended in that regard should be done on an equitable basis, and should be done only after extensive negotiation in order that both sides positions are well known, and made well known to the public.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, might I suggest to the member that possibly this discussion would be best held under the Minister's Salary. I think as such we're deviating considerably from the context as such.

MR. CORRIN: You're entitled to suggest that, Mr. Chairman. I don't know that we're deviating. It seems to me that in this respect we've agreed to deviate because, I suppose because of necessity. In any event, I won't be very long. I would just indicate that I am personally concerned about the block funding system. My concerns are, of course, not mirrored but shared by City Council members,

the Chairman of the City's Committee on Finance has expressed concern, public concern, the Deputy Mayor has expressed public concern. For that matter, the former, if my memory serves me correctly, the former Deputy Minister of the Minister's Department in a letter to the editor, has expressed concern about the block funding formula. I would suggest that none of those people to my knowledge are affiliated with my party. Two of them I am certain about, and the other one I don't know what his politics might be. I would suggest that the block funding may work an express hardship on the City of Winnipeg.

I must say that I was fascinated and it leads me to another question. I was fascinated that the minister did indicate one area, call it an action area that was of some vital concern to himself and his department. He made a brief mention to a core area committee, and I think he indicated that people have been seconded to serve on it. I'm curious about that; I suppose I'd like to know why the concern about the core area? I'm not knocking it and I'm not critical but I would like to know what has elicited this response, and I'd like to know what the terms of reference of the committee are to be and I'd like to know what persons will be constituted as members of the committee, and what their responsibilities would be?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a couple of comments. The member referred to the fact that while he was on City Council, he felt there was too much bickering and fighting. I can assure him that since our government has taken over the bickering and fighting has of it at stopped because frankly there's been no evidence all. I indicated last year during my Estimates, when I was asked, I believe by the Member for Seven Oaks, my view on whether the Municipal and Urban Affairs Department should be brought together, but it really was only a matter of form, whether they remain separate departments or were united in one department, the City of Winnipeg is still a very important municipality in the Province of Manitoba, and it just has to be when you consider the population, 560,000 people in the City of Winnipeg, 440,000 outside of the City of Winnipeg. So I regard it as a very important municipality and it is treated accordingly, and does get special attention in my department and from myself, and I don't mean by saying that to in any way belittle other municipalities throughout the Province; they all get. I think, excellent and satisfactory attention.

Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate also that when the Member for Wellington referred to imposition of a formula; there has been no imposition of a formula. I said earlier this evening that we have met a number of times with the City of Winnipeg's official delegation to discuss block funding, that we have indicated we would review their concerns with the amount of block funding, the base that has been established for block funding because they've indicated publicly that the amount allotted for this year is quite satisfactory. And the Deputy Mayor has indicated that publicly, Mr. Chairman, contrary to the comments of the Member for Wellington.

He referred to a letter, Mr. Chairman, from Mr. Andrew Currie, who was a former Deputy Minister of the department, a person whom I respect, whom I had excellent dealings with when I was on City Council, but he concluded his letter to the editor by saying, "We'll know when we receive our City tax bills and we read bottom line". And earlier tonight, Mr. Chairman, I referred to the fact that we know that because tomorrow night City Council is going to consider a current budget which will only have a 3 percent increase in the mill rate, and I would suggest to you that that's proof positive of the satisfaction of the amount of money that is included in this year's block funding grant.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the establishment of a Task Force to deal with core-area services, it was announced in the Throne Speech, the Member for Wellington will recall, my department will be involved in that. I think because of the peculiar nature of the services which are more related to health and community services that further questions with respect to that matter, would probably more appropriately be directed towards the Minister of Health and Community Services. We are serving on that committee and attempting to co-ordinate the activities of the committee and be involved in them, and be aware of them but it's a primary responsibility of the Department of Health and Community Services.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, with respect to that proposed 3 percent increase in the mill rate tomorrow night, I must say that I think it's important that we now issue a caveat. This is a prophecy, I suppose, and the minister would be served well to remember past experience with respect to budgets that have been tabled at council, as he will undoubtedly recollect, what is presented by the Executive Policy Committee on budget night is very, very seldom what is actually passed later in the evening. I would suggest that he should be temperate in his enthusiasm or should temper his enthusiasm for his block funding formula until at least he's had the opportunity on Thursday morning to catch the news. It's possible that that proposed 3 percent mill rate increase could turn into something far greater and far less palatable to many taxpayers, but we'll deal with that, of course, as time

passes.

MR. MERCIER: Certainly, that will be the responsibility of the City of Winnipeg Council.

MR. CORRIN: Yes, but we shouldn't be left with the impression this evening that we have a fait accompli, and the 3 percent is indeed going to be the final appreciating factor with respect to City of Winnipeg taxes. Only Thursday morning will tell.

I'd also, with respect to the new and enhanced level of co-operation that the minister is so proud of, and if it's true of course it's justified, but I would remind him, and I do so admittedly somewhat facetiously, Mr. Chairman, that times are undoubtedly much easier now that a Provincial Conservative Government can liaise with a City Council Government constituted of some 17 card-carrying Tory members. And perhaps I say that with some degree of envy because I am sure that it does smooth the waters, and oil the path. But I think the reality is that that co-operation may well be collusion and only time will tell.

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, if there's any truth to that remark, it would only appear that the wisdom previously expressed by City of Winnipeg electorate at the municipal level, has now spread throughout the Province.

MR. CORRIN: Mr. Chairman, I took note as I'm sure my friend did in giving his concern with the inner-core the other day of the effects of that wisdom as reflected by the remarks made by an elected member of his party; one elected to the City of Winnipeg School Board, which can only be equated with something that I was uttered from the mouth of one Marie Antoinette, who we'll all remember shortly thereafter lost her head. It was something equivalent to let them eat camps. That's how I think most of my constituents would have interpreted it. I say that, as I said, sardonically, facetiously, but it was the equivalent of let them eat cake, only this time it was referring to summer camps.

I would suggest that there is a need for considerable concern in the urban centre area, the core area. I am pleased to hear that there's a Core area Committee although the minister forgot to tell me what terms of reference have been struck, and he forgot to tell me which persons have been seconded to serve on it. He indicated that it was cross-departmental, that it was interdepartmental, but he didn't indicate what the terms of reference were and he didn't indicate who was seconded to sit on it.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I didn't forget to tell the member, I just didn't tell him. I referred him to the Minister of Health because the Task Force will be reporting to the Community Services Committee of Cabinet, which is chaired by the Minister of Health and Community Services, and I directed him to ask any further questions to that minister, who has primary responsibility.

MR. CORRIN: Well, this is one of the reasons I have so much concern about the lack of the specified Urban Affairs' staffing. I want to know who, in fact, is accountable to the Minister for this sort of review.

You know, many papers — just thinking back over the past few years — many papers have been written about the inner core of the city in the past seven, eight years. There was the Main Street position paper tabled by the Social Planning Council. There was the Main Street 1980 prepared by the City of Winnipeg. There was the Development Plan Review that was tabled a few years ago by the province and the City. There was the Urban Institute Housing Report that was tabled to the City. The Social Planning Council recently did a housing needs analysis, the Social Service Audit that was performed in the late 1960s. It goes on and on. There have been many reports tabled relative to core area problems in the city. We all know that.

It seems to me that we have a tremendous amount of data. We've compiled a tremendous amount of data. I'm not suggesting that, because we have a lot of data, the establishment of a special committee is unwarranted. I would imagine that it would even best suit the purpose because they could synthesize the data and the information and co-ordinate the function and effort of the government in trying to remedy the many problems that are cited in all these various reports. But I'm wondering if there is no accountable staff persons within the Urban Affairs sphere, I'm wondering if the total effect of this whole thing is to have this great diffusion of responsibility throughout the Civil Service, with no one really accounting for the urban area. I'm wondering who — that's why I wanted to know what the terms of reference are and who's serving and I want to know who they report to. Do they report to you as the Minister of Urban Affairs? Do they report to the Honourable, the Minister of Health and Social Services? Do they report directly to Cabinet or to the Premier? Who is accountable to who, and who reports to who?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the Member for Wellington that there have been a lot of studies done, and that's why it is now, I think, appropriate that there be an interdepartmental task force to review that whole matter in order to synthesize it. The task force will report to the Community Services Committee of Cabinet, which is chaired by the Minister of Health and Community Services, of which I am a member and which the Minister of Education is a member. I think this interdisciplinary, interdepartmental approach, is the correct one and the correct approach to take, and a good approach to take.

As I indicated earlier, I have staff who will be on the task force, but as I indicated earlier too, we are not attempting, in the Department of Municipal and Urban Affairs, to duplicate the expertise that is in the Department of Health and Community Services, or that is in the Department of Education. We will co-ordinate and attempt to bring to the deliberations of that task force and that Committee of Cabinet, and Cabinet, concerns of Municipal Government, and that's the co-ordinating approach that we fill on this task force in the Committee of Cabinet.

MR. CORRIN: I am pleased to hear that the Minister acknowledges the need for the interdisciplinary approach, Mr. Chairman. I tell you that I'm pleased to hear that because, of course, as we know and as has been acknowledged, that was precisely the approach that was taken, as I understand it, by the former department responsible for Urban Affairs, and I stand to be corrected if I'm wrong. I understand they took an interdisciplinary approach and that they had established an overview that took into account Urban Planning expertise, social poliyy expertise, as it relates to the urban scene, and had a financial evaluation capacity. I'm wondering, in view of the fact that this formerly was all embodied in one department, and it was only a very small department, and in view of the fact that there seems to be some agreement as to the benefits of an interdisciplinary approach in this field, albeit specifically to core area concerns, I'm wondering if the Minister could advise me why it was deemed necessary to dissolve the former department, or if the department couldn't be maintained as a separate entity, why it couldn't be absorbed as a division into Municipal and Urban Affairs, why it couldn't have been allowed to retain its former status with perhaps an assistant Deputy Minister having a responsibility for all the staff and their business would be ongoing?

I don't understand why, and this is something that has escaped many people at this table, why it was necessary to integrate those staff personnel and their functions in the manner that was ultimately decided upon.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the personnel from both departments have been integrated. Some people have specific responsibilities in the areas of municipal matters outside of the City of Winnipeg, some have specific responsibilities with respect to the City of Winnipeg matters in an integrated department. The only difference, I seem to gather from the comments of the Member for Wellington and myself, is that we're not attempting in the Municipal and Urban Affairs Department to duplicate, for example, the resources available in the Department of Health and Community Services, and we are just as concerned about those problems but we're going to use the expertise that exists in that department, for example, and other departments.

MR. CORRIN: I appreciate the Minister's willingness, first of all, willingness to share responsibility with the other Ministers, because I think that's essential. I think that, in order to establish a sufficiently objective overview of the problems, it's necessary that the problem solving force be willing to accept an interdisciplinary and more comprehensive base. So I laud the Minister for that, but I still don't understand why it was necessary to disperse those dozen odd people into the department rather than allow them to maintain their positions within some sort of separate Urban Affairs Division. I don't understand why Urban Affairs seemingly was relegated to such an inferior status within the department. I don't understand why they couldn't have been allowed to continue as an autonomously functioning division within the department.

It makes imminent sense to me that they should have been allowed to do so because I have to presume that the persons who were employed there had significant experience, they had backgrounds that would obviously lend themselves to a vita and ongoing review of Urban Affairs, and I don't understand why, unless the Minister is going to tell me that that particular department was not efficient, it was inefficient in one sense or another, or was not staffed by competent people. Of course, if that were the case you could simply replace them with competent staff, but I would like to know specifically why those dozen-odd people were dispersed, why that path was chosen as opposed to any other. Was it because of restraint? Was it because that, for some reason or other, it was felt that their integration within the division would make the department operate more efficiently from a fiscal point of view, from that standpoint? What was the rationale accepted by the Minister and the Cabinet for the restructuring?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Wellington is incorrect when he suggests that the staff members from Urban Affairs Department have been treated as of secondary importance. As I indicated earlier there are people in the department with specific responsibility relating to City of Winnipeg matters. I reiterate once more for the last time, I regard the City of Winnipeg as a very special municipality within the department obviously because of the population and the more difficult problems that it has to deal with, and that is the essence of the whole approach towards the City of Winnipeg and I have to reject any suggestion that, through integration of the staff in the department, the importance and the response of the Provincial Government to the City of Winnipeg is in any way being down played. It is still of very high importance.

MR. CORRIN: Yes. On another topic, I would ask the Minister if he could indicate to us whether or not he has taken into consideration the request by the City to amend the City of Winnipeg Act in order to facilitate the City's refusal of demolition permits for the purpose of saving historic buildings.

The Minister will recollect that there was considerable discussion relative to this topic as a result of meetings with the City's Historic Buildings Advisory Committee and representatives of the Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce.

The City Solicitor, if you will recollect, in a report indicated that the method the City had been using to hold up owners who had made bona fide demolition permit applications was not air tight and wouldn't be suitable for use if it were challenged in Court, and it was indicated that, on his recommendation, that it would be necessary there be an amendment to the City of Winnipeg Act in order to facilitate the protection of historic buildings in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. MERCIER: Can you indicate the date of that newspaper article?

MR. CORRIN: February the 1st of this year, Mr. Lennox indicated and it says, "City Solicitor, Duncan Lennox, said in a report, the emergency method the City has been using," in referring to the way the City holds up demolition permits presently when they want to save historic buildings, "wouldn't stand up in Court against an owner who had made a bona fide demolition permit request. The Historic Building Group requested an amendment to the City of Winnipeg Act and June Westbury, who is the Chairman of that particular committee, indicated that the recommended changes aren't too big to ask for."

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chair I don't recollect receiving that request for an amendment. It may not have been passed by the appropriate committee or council. I'll check into it and let the member know tomorrow, but my staff and I don't recollect having received that at the moment.

MR. CORRIN: I thank the Minister for that response, Mr. Chairman. I would indicate that this whole question has been reviewed and the question of demolition permits and their refusal has been reviewed extensively by the City of Winnipeg, and I might indicate that I have correspondence that goes back to 1977, all of which is indicative of the need for some added jurisdiction endowed by the Province to the City in order to give the City sufficient teeth to forestall or refuse building demolition permits.

This is of serious concern, not only in the area of heritage preservation of historical building sites but also in the question with respect to buildings used for housing purposes. As a former community committee member in the area of the centre city formerly known as Midland, we were often requested to deal with situations where building owners, landlords, were requesting demolition of their premises for one reason or another, and very often we had crises of conscience. I'm sure the Member for Wolseley will recollect some of those evenings because we were faced with citizens' groups, usually tenant groups, who indicated they had no suitable alternative relative to their housing needs and very often, elderly people who are accommodated at low rent and have been resident for a very long time and were asking the city whether they could take some action in order to protect their residential situations in view of the fact that there was, and probably still is, a housing shortage with respect to certain sectors of the economy. It was a very sorry state of affairs when

we had to advise them that we couldn't do anything for them.

I would, just to refresh, I'm feathering my own nest in a sense, Mr. Chairman, because to refresh and maybe the minister has already recollected, refresh his memory though, June 15th of 1977, I made a motion asking that a report go forward from the Environment Commissioner's Office to Council in order that we could give consideration to what could be done in this respect. Ultimately I'm advised after I departed, we both departed soon thereafter, apparently the matter was dealt with and the city has apparently now received a report with a recommendation that would establish an Anti-Demolition y-Law, but to my knowledge, in order to put into place and enact the Anti-Demolition By-Law we'd first require that the City of Winnipeg Act be amended suitably in order to afford sufficient jurisdiction and latitude for the city to draft the necessary ordinance. I'm through, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have the Member for Winnipeg Centre on. He's not here. Next is the Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I would like to correct the Minister of Urban Affairs who said that the City of Winnipeg budget is going to announce a 2 to 3 mill increase. Under the best of conditions, the City of Winnipeg budget will announce a 2 to 3 mill increase for the upper income groups and there will be, at least, an additional 3 to 4 mills for the people in the lower income groups who will pay that mill rate at the fare box of the bus when they get on the bus, which is just par for the Conservative course, Mr. Speaker. Three percent for the upper income groups; seven percent for the lower income groups because the Conservatives have never yet been able to get it through their thick skulls that moneys paid into the fare box are taxes just as moneys paid when you send in your money with your tax bill. They know it, but they think that the people of the Province of Manitoba don't know it and therefore, Mr. Speaker, they have facilitated — not facilitated, they have through their home rule policy literally forced some of the Councillors of the City of Winnipeg and assisted many others who are very happy with this arrangement to charge 4 mills on the bus to virtually the entire lower income group population in the Province of Manitoba. We're talking, Mr. Speaker, and I'm using the figures that the city gave, that 2 mills is \$15.00 per house. 2 mills is \$15.00 a house. And I say that the lower income groups use that bus at least once a day on the average return, one person which will be \$36.50 a year if we talk about it every day. And that's 4 mills. So when you're gloating about being able to keep the mill rate down to 2-½ mills for the upper income groups, let's remember that it's at the expense of the lower income groups who will pay 4 mills into the fare box. And when you've gloated about reducing the estate tax on people who inherit over half a million dollars a year by \$8 million, let's remember that it had to be paid for by 2 cents a gallon by everybody who went to the pumps to buy gasoline.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's euphemistically referred to as the policy of user pay. It is better described as losers pay and it's the people who the Conservatives regard in the loser's category. That is, Mr. Chairmnn, —(Interjection)— it's the Minister who gloated about the fact, and then he said something that was very interesting. All the years that I was sitting here, and I don't like to go back, I like to look ahead and not talk about what happened before, but I remember the member and his colleagues every time there was a mill rate increase they said it was the provincial government's fault. Today, he sat there in his chair and smugly said that if they don't happen to keep it to 3 and it goes up to 4, that will be the responsibility of the Councillors of the City of Winnipeg. No longer, no longer are mill rates at the municipal level the responsibility of the provincial government which my honourable friend used to say all the time along with his colleagues. Now the tax increases at the municipal level including the tax increases of 4 mills at the fare box are the responsibility of the city councillors. How did this happen, Mr. Speaker? By something which is euphemistically called block funding, and which would more properly be called fund blocking because that's what it is, Mr. Chairman.

Let's look at it for what it really is. The present finances that go to the City of Winnipeg are based on the following categories of activities, and I won't have them all but I'm sure I'll have quite a few of them. Major streets, things like bridges, like the Sherbrook - McGregor overpass; the transit deficit; Health and Welfare; the Convention Centre which is a smaller one; the Provincial parks and those, Mr. Speaker, and if I've left out any, I don't think I've left out a great number, would have totalled probably about \$32 million, but in order to grant so-called autonomy — and we're going to examine just what this so-called home rule is in a moment. The city says we'll give you 30 million and you can spend it how you like. Now, can you just imagine these Councillors sitting around and spending this 30 million how they like? They're no longer going to have to put any money into the Convention Centre, they can spend it how they like; they're no longer going to have to spend money on major roads, they can spend it how they like; they can take it out of the major roads and give a mill rate reduction to the people of the City of Winnipeg; they're no longer going

to have to pick up a transit deficit, they can do whatever they like with what they've been putting into the transit deficit. How obtuse can one be? This is not block funding, this is fund blocking. Those areas of activities which have been financed for the provincial government and the province sees it quite well, in those particular areas the increases are going up faster than inflation, and they'll go up still faster with this loser pay policy because the transit deficit will increase, it will not go down. It has proved to be increased every time you increase the fare, transit deficits have increased and it will increase this time and there'll be more cars on the highway and the City Councillors who don't have to spend money on major highways anymore because they have been granted their freedom by the home rule Minister of Urban Affairs will not spend that money on major highways. They will spend it, I presume, on reducing the mill rate.

And what would the minister do if they did that? What if they called the minister's bluff and said that we're not going to spend \$255 million on operations, we're going to give the people of the City of Winnipeg a tax holiday. We're going to take the \$30 million \$225 and reduce Expenditures by 30 million and million will be spent and there won't be any money spent on major roads. We'll close the Convention Centre, we'll eliminate the transit system, we will stop the Health and Welfare activities of the City of Winnipeg, and we will not build such projects as the Sherbrook-McGregor overpass. Do you know what the minister would do, Mr. Chairman? I'll tell you what the minister would do.

He will say, we're going to take our \$30 million back. That money was given to you on the basis of certain understandings of obligations that the City of Winnipeg were going to perform for the citizens of Winnipeg. How did these things get started in the first place? Why are major streets partly provincially funded? Because, Mr. Speaker, unlike the minister, you know nature doesn't separate the provincial highways as they approach the city from the provincial highways when they are in the city and somebody smarter than the minister felt that the city cannot accept full responsibility for major roads in the city because they are connecting roads to all of the other roads in the province and it's not only in the City of Winnipeg, it's in other places that this is done. So the province assumes some responsibility for major highways, and when the minister says, which he has said, that the province interfered and stopped a civic program, I charge that the minister is not telling the truth. — (Interjection) — I heard the minister say bullshit.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what happened was the province said they would not contribute to that project. Is that not correct? Is that not correct? Who's bullshitting now?

MR. MERCIER: You finish your comments then I'll answer you.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you that you have his version, and I will give mine: That the province had no right to stop any projects; that if the councillor wanted to flex his muscles and show home rule, that they could have gone ahead with the project; that they would have had to tax the residents of the City of Winnipeg for it; that all of the areas that had to be dealt with were in their jurisdiction and that the only thing that stopped them proceeding is that they weren't getting provincial contribution. Is that not the case? But nobody stopped the project, nobody interfered with them going ahead with it. What they didn't want was home rule. They were granted home rule, go ahead with the project, tax your citizens for it, but they said we don't want home rule, we want money, shared costs from the City of Winnipeg.

Mr. Chairman, there was no stopping of the project. What the minister says is bull shit and I ask you to take the two versions and see which one is correct. The minister said the province interfered and stopped the project. I say the province said it would not contribute to the project, that it had no right to stop it and the city had a right to proceed with it. And didn't, because they didn't want home rule. They wanted shared cost programming which they'd had up to now. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that what this fund blocking is doing is that those programs, the cost of those programs are going to go up faster than inflation. The city, which is going on block funding, or fund blocking, the province is going to increase the fund blocking consistent with inflation and the amount that the province would have had to contribute if they had continued to be participants in the program would be higher than they're going to get by fund blocking. And so this government decided on fund blocking.

Now why does the city go along with it, Mr. Chairman? And you know, although there have been some mild complaints, I think that the Member for Wellington will have to give some allowance to the minister that there has been less bickering, there has been less bickering. Because, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that under the previous government and this is fair game — I really believe that there should almost be as a matter of the nature of the animal, a constant push by a municipal government to a provincial government. And when it stops, that's not a sign of a healthy municipal government, that's a sign of a sick municipal government, or worse. What the municipal government knows now is that their provincial brethren are so weak that they have entered, Mr. Speaker, into

a collusive arrangement to keep quiet, to not rock the boat, and in effect are engaged in a conspiracy to injure the people of the province of Winnipeg to maintain . . .

MR. WILSON: The province of Winnipeg?

MR. GREEN: The City of Winnipeg to maintain, in an effort to maintain what will be an impossible attainment, a Conservative administration in this province. And that's what they're doing. And they are doing it, Mr. Chairman, at the expense of the City of Winnipeg, at the expense of the citizens of the City of Winnipeg. Is that not apparent from the forcing of the loser pay principle? Is it not apparent from the fact that we're going to have a mill rate increase for the lower income groups of 7 percent and a mill rate increase for those groups who never need a bus ride, which is the upper income groups, of 3 percent?

There's a reason for it. None of it is by accident. None of it relates to home rule. None of it relates to autonomy. The City Councillors will have no more control over the \$30 million Budget, the \$30 million fund blocking that they are receiving this year, than if they would have received it as part of shared-cost programming. As a matter of fact, they will lose a great deal, because these geniuses in the City of Winnipeg — and I include my member, the Member for Wolseley — who tell me, as their constituents, that I am better off owning City Park and having the city residents pay for it rather than it being made a provincial park, in which I still don't . . . And everybody pays for it, are going to cost the people of the City of Winnipeg the operating costs of that park indefinitely because they have now taken the province off the hook of making it a provincial park.

You know, the Minister of Mines said, "Well, there was this hooker that if they ever took it back, they would have to repay the Capital costs." And the province waived repayment of the Capital costs. And therefore the City gets the . . . It's funny; it's absolutely funny. The City gets the park back for nothing and the City residents are saddled with the cost of paying for that park.

MR. WILSON: Right on.

MR. GREEN: Right, right on.

Mr. Chairman, it's bizarre. It's Alice in Wonderland. I really want . . . Even the citizens of Westgate. Even the people whose one poll put him in, they won't sustain such a proposition. They do not feel that they are any the less owners of City Park, if it's a provincial park and the operating costs and Capital costs are paid for the province, than if it's a City Park and the operating costs are paid fully by the City of Winnipeg. All they know is that it costs them more money. They get no more advantage and one disadvantage. And my honourable friend, the Member for Wolseley, says, "Right on." Well, I hope that that becomes his program in the next election campaign, because, you know, we have difficulty beating him but this will beat him. This will beat him.

One more point about my friends at the municipal level, Mr. Chairman. I want to indicate, Mr. Chairman, that the same people who are at the municipal level and who ridiculed the province for many of its expenditures have now got a project which has cost them a minimum of \$35 million. Its losses have been \$3 million per year — \$3 million per year every year. That's a minimum, in addition to which it loses, I think, an additional \$500,000 on operating costs.

And it's there, Mr. Chairman, entirely to be a subsidy to the tourist industry and private enterprise. The capital cost of that building was roughly \$23 million. If you add \$2.3 million, which is 10 percent every year, plus its operating costs, it has lost over \$35 million and loses \$3 million a year. Because when the capitalists start accounting, and it's their own project, they don't include interest charges. There is \$30 million in Capital in there and they lose \$3 million a year, which they don't show on the books. That was a provincial-municipal project.

I still, Mr. Chairman, think it's a good project. I still think it's a good project but I wonder at my Liberal and Conservative friends having something which loses \$3 million a year every year and they don't make a fuss about it. They don't sell it to private enterprise. They don't get rid of it on the basis that they are losing money. It is a very unusual thing that my Liberal and Conservative friends are doing.

So, to sum up, Mr. Chairman, the province never stopped the City from doing anything that they wanted to before, this province will not permit the City of Winnipeg to take, let us say, the amount of money that is going to finance the Sherbrook and McGregor Overpass, and then say that they're not going to finance it and leave them keep the money. This government is not that stupid. If the City called the Minister's bluff you would see the province jumping in immediately. Assuming the City of Winnipeg took — what is the provincial share of Sherbrook and McGregor Overpass? Is it \$5 million? I think it must be at least that. If that money was given to the City of Winnipeg

on the basis here is a block fund. We are going to close our eyes as to what you do with it. And the City did not build the Sherbrook and McGregor Overpass, which that money was given as part of the operation, he would soon see the end of block funding or, what is a more appropriate word, fund blocking.

So I say to the Minister, let him not try to fool the Province of Manitoba into the suggestion that the Province has given the City a good deal. The Province has given the City a bad deal. What has happened is that the City Councillors, who are more politically motivated to protect the provincial government than to deal with the needs of their own citizens, have entered into a collusive agreement to keep quiet.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, obviously there are some facts that have to be corrected. The Member for Inkster refers to transit fares. Mr. Chairman, the transit fares in the City of Winnipeg, even with their proposed 5 cent increase for adult fare, would remain, according to my information, the lowest fares in the country.

Fare revenue, Mr. Chairman, comprises about 43 percent of the cost of operating the transit operation in the City of Winnipeg. In other provinces, one that the City has referred to and I have noticed in the media is that in Ontario fare revenue or the fare box must account for 65 percent of the operating expenditures. I would suggest to the Member for Inkster that what the City are proposing is a pretty fair and reasonable approach.

He grabs figures out of the air — 4 mills for certain people; 3 mills for other people; 7 percent for some people; 3 percent for other people is, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, totally inaccurate.

The comment that he refers to about the responsibility of City Council that they raise the mill rate again was taken out of context of the discussion with the Member for Wellington, wherein he suggested that Council might, at their Council Meeting tomorrow, increase the mill rate more than the 2.1 mill rate that is going to Council after thorough discussions with each Community Committee, each Standing Committee of Council, the Executive Policy Committee and public representations that have been made to them.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Inkster referred to the provincial responsibility for highways, and I don't deny that, but that provincial responsibility for what he terms as provincial highways within the City of Winnipeg was used as part of the base in establishing the \$30 million block fund.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what we're doing in that fund is that it's the City that will make the decision as to which projects they want to construct. They won't be tied to a conditional grant from the provincial government.

He says the provincial government, with respect to the Fort Garry-St. Vital Bridge, refused to make a conditional grant on the extension of that Fort Garry-St. Vital Bridge project from Pembina Highway to Waverley. That's right, but it shows the whole fallacy of conditional grants. At the same time, Mr. Chairman, they said, "We will participate in a conditional grant for Leila Avenue in the north end of the city," which wasn't a priority of the City. And here's what we get into, Mr. Chairman. The provincial government interfered in the priorities of the City, through their Conditional Grant Program and the block funding grant to the City will allow the City to deal with projects on the basis of the priorities, to serve the residents of the City, that I suggest that they know best which those priorities are.

But again, the Member for Inkster will not accept the responsibility of City Council. He will not accept them as responsible politicians in Manitoba. He suggests maybe they are going to abandon this whole thing and they're going to throw all of the money into a mill rate decrease. Again, Mr. Chairman, just suggesting and bringing out his whole approach towards civic politicians. They are irresponsible, in his view. It's a conspiracy, a collusion, just indicative of the whole attitude, Mr. Chairman, of the previous provincial government towards the municipal government in the City of Winnipeg.

He refers to Assiniboine Park. That amount of money, again, has been included in the provincial grant. The previous provincial government could have made a grant to the City. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, they wanted to give some money to the City at the time, and they wanted to because they were embarrassed by what had happened with the amalgamation of the 13 municipalities in the City of Winnipeg; they were embarrassed by the fact that the costs had risen to the highest denominator and that the mill rate, as a result of the amalgamation imposed by the previous government on the City of Winnipeg municipalities was embarrassing them because the mill rate was going up too fast as a result of what was predicted by many individuals but ignored by the previous government. They were embarrassed, they had to find a way, Mr. Chairman, to get some more money into the City of Winnipeg in that year. It was election year. They had to reduce the mill rate some way to avoid the taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg taking it out of them in the provincial election, and that's what they did, Mr. Chairman.

Again, he raises a spectre of fees now — fees in the Zoological Gardens. There has been no decision or even discussion that I am aware of but certainly no decision of imposing any fees or admission fees on entering Assiniboine Park.

Mr. Chairman, the Member for Wolseley said it's a scare tactic. That's exactly what it is: scare tactics on fees, scare tactics on transit increases, scare tactics on everything, Mr. Chairman. And I have to reject out of hand all of the remarks of the Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, you know the Minister really worried me because he said that I had better get my facts correct, and the Minister does have a point; I am concerned when my facts are not correct. I am less concerned when people disagree with me in argument, but if I make a statement which is factually wrong, I am concerned. And when the Minister said that my facts were wrong I sat down and listened. Where are the facts wrong?

I said, Mr. Chairman, that there will be a 4 mill increase, on the basis of 10 cents a day to lower income families in the Province of Manitoba. I based that on the fact that 2 mills represents \$15.00. Two mills represents \$15, therefore \$36 would represent 4 mills. Now, which fact is wrong in that thing?

The Minister says, "Oh yes, but Winnipeg's Transit System is already cheaper." I never said it was more expensive. So he has corrected a fact that I didn't make. He said that in Ontario 65 percent of the rate is used. If I had said, Mr. Chairman, in Ontario 30 percent is used, then he would have corrected my fact. I don't look at Ontario as an example. Mr. Chairman, I say that the transit fares should be continually reduced almost to a minimum, that that is the way . . . And on Metro Council I advocated it, and I will say it now — I have no problem — that we should aim at having a no-fare transit system, that that should be the aim, because that is the cheapest type of system. You ask any transit authority anywhere how they base the cost of the system, and they take the total expenditures, they divide it by the number of riders, and they say the cost per system is X dollars per rider. If the riders increased and the expenditures stayed the same, the system costs less, because you're getting more transportation for the same money.

So to tell me that they pay 65 percent in user fees in Ontario, and that I should get my facts straight, I wonder which member of this committee heard me say that they didn't pay 65 percent. Which member here heard me say that in Ontario, they paid other than 65 percent. He made one statement, Mr. Chairman. I said that the city of Winnipeg council budget tomorrow will have a 4 mill increase for lower income groups, by virtue of the policy of this government, which is endorsed by the Minister. That fact is correct. The Minister congratulated himself on that. He said that I think that they're doing the right thing, that there isn't enough paid by the losers. The loser fee should raise more money. So which fact is wrong?

Whether the argument between him and I is correct, he won't decide by extrapolating facts. That, we'll argue in another form. When I said that the city of Winnipeg had the right to continue with that program, if they wanted the tax for it and the province could not interfere — was I wrong? The Minister endorsed it. At first he said it was bullshit but now he said it's correct. Mr. Chairman, the city of Winnipeg could have proceeded with that program.

He said that the province has no right — first of all, he said that the province does have a role in highways, and if we are talking about major highways and contributing to them in the city, the province does have a role. Then the province is entitled to discuss its priorities as to what roads it needs in order to link provincial highways. That's all that was happening. But Mr. Chairman, the argument rests between us. Where did I misrepresent a fact, and I ask you to go through that entire Hansard talk that I made, where did I misrepresent that fact to this committee? I said, and I repeat, the province declined to participate in that program, the city could have gone ahead with it, but they would have had to raise their own taxation and have to pay for it on their own, with home rule an autonomy. They could have done it themselves.

But they preferred to deal with that program on a participating basis. He said, Mr. Chairman, that with Assiniboine Park, that that was done because Winnipeg had a tremendously high mill rate by virtue of unicity. Well, we dealt with those figures in the old parliament, to and we showed that the taxes in other cities, that had not gone unicity, went up faster than they went up in the city of Winnipeg, that Toronto, which has a two-tier government, during the same years, that the taxes went up at a higher rate than they went up in the city of Winnipeg. And one thing that we have done that no government will ever revert to, is the Minister going to undo and go back to a two-tier government, and foist on the citizens of Winnipeg what a Conservative government previously foisted on them and was defeated by reason of doing so, another metro government? No. Why don't you advocate a metro government? Because you know that not only would the Member for Wolseley, who was only 30 votes away would get beat, but you, who are about 130, would also get beat. Go advocate metro government in Osborne constituency.

You know, Inez Trueman voted. Inez Trueman, who was in Fort Rouge, knew better than to

vote against the provision of one city government in the city of Winnipeg. The member says, with respect to Assiniboine Park, yes, we had a by-election and Mr. Walding was elected. In the by-election where a St. Vital constituency, the council appeared to be very much opposed to one government, that's right, and in the campaign on that issue, Jim Walding was elected. Assiniboine Park. He says that it was done for that reason. The Minister has not been around long enough.

In 1967 or 1968, and I will get you the Hansard if you want it, before metro government was created, before I was a Minister of the Crown, I advocated and urged the then Conservative government to make a provincial park out of Assiniboine Park, that Assiniboine Park was located within the boundaries of Greater Winnipeg but served all of Manitoba. But if the Minister thinks that the idea came up on the e seat of one's pants in 1973, I have to say that his facts are wrong. Not only will I say it, I can prove it. I will show him in the pages of Hansard an address by myself, urging the Roblin administration or the Weir administration, it was one of the two, to make a provincial park out of Assiniboine Park because it was unfair that the people of the city of Winnipeg should support that park.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am happy that we are still in disagreement, because with regard to philosophical positions on metro government or on government in Winnipeg or on other issues, I would have a problem if I were in agreement with my honourable friend. That would be my problem. I couldn't get elected in Inkster constituency if I was in agreement with my honourable friend. As to facts, there is no disagreement. We have both stated the facts, and the argument that stems from them will be the debate that continues. But I made no mis-statements to this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Firstly, I wonder if I could caution all members of the committee in the choice of their words at times. Secondly, I wonder if we could possibly . . .

MR. GREEN: . . . Mr. Chairman, I learned that from the Minister of Highways and the Attorney-General.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was meant for all members of committee. Secondly, I wonder if we could possibly get back to the item under consideration, 1.(c). The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I want to make one comment. Again, to make sure' Mr. Chairman, that my position is clear on the block funding. As the Member for Inkster indicated, the previous government refused to participate to cost-share, or to make a conditional grant on the extension of the Fort Garry-St. Vital bridge project. But did agree — or indicate they would — and did make conditional grants to other projects which they deemed to be of a higher priority. What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that with respect to transportation routes in the city of Winnipeg, the city of Winnipeg council is best equipped to establish those priorities to be responsible to their electorate and the method of block funding which we have indicated will allow them to proceed with projects that are deemed by city council to be of the highest priority to the residents of their city, without any interference from Big Brother at the provincial government level.

MR. GREEN: And I'm going to be very brief with my final word on the subject, I promise the inister. That I suggest to the Minister that if the city of Winnipeg stops using those \$30 million for the areas that I have referred to, namely major roads, transit deficits, health and welfare, the other ones that I mentioned in my speech, which are now uncontrollable costs of the city of Winnipeg on which they have no option but to spend, but if they found an option, Big Brother would be back on the scene bfore you could say Jack Robinson.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to — and I didn't ask the Minister and I wanted to make some remarks — but before I do, before we end tonight I would like the Minister to indicate specifically the numbers of staff man years that were on staff in both departments, since they are now amalgamated, I'd like them as of January 1978 in both the Department of Urban Affairs and Municipal Affairs, and also to indicate how many staff were actually on staff during that period because there is a difference. There are staff man years and there could be vacancies of the positions. So that those two figures could be given as of January 1978, and as well, if they can be transferred and shown for the same period in January 1979, when the departments have been amalgamated.

MR. MERCIER: I'll just put together those figures in a moment, if that's all right with the

MR. URUSKI: Thank you. If I can continue, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. MERCIER: If I might, Mr. Chairman, staff advise me they're using the fiscal year numbers and they don't have January to January.

MR. URUSKI: If we can go as of whatever period they want that will correspond to the period this year is fine with me. If you want to provide February as to February or March as to the end of this March, that's fine.

MR. MERCIER: We'll put something together and respond.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you. I'm sure that the payroll accounts can certainly indicate the numbers of bodies on the payroll at any point in time, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to make sure that I understand clearly the amount of money that is intended before I open my remarks in general, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the funding for the city of Winnipeg. If my understanding is right, part of that funding is the revenue-sharing of the growth taxes with the province, is it not part of that? Is that in addition to that?

MR. MERCIER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The \$30 million block funding arrangement is exclusive of the unconditional grants under the Municipal and Provincial Tax-sharing Act, which to the city of Winnipeg will be almost \$12 million this year, and are also exclusive of social assistance grants, capital contributions to hospitals, the hospital discharges, exclusive of regional library grants, ambulance service grants, Dutch Elm Disease grants, weed control grants, development plan review grants, are also exclusive of the urban transportation assistance program under which this year we've allocated \$7.6 million towards the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass, and will be exclusive of any moneys which may come under the community services grants program which is presently under negotiation with the federal government.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you. So then the Minister is indicating to us that there are a number of programs in which the city is still tied to the direct funding from the province of Manitoba.

MR. MERCIER: Those are mainly, Mr. Chairman, statutory and province-wide grants.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, was the agreement with the city of Winnipeg with respect to the city park not a written agreement with respect to the maintenance and upkeep of the city park00 was that not a contractual obligation?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, that agreement has been terminated by mutual agreement.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, is that not possible then, if the province is indicating that they are going the route of block funding, is it not also available for the province to do the same kinds of things in the other areas that he just mentioned? If he was really talking about total autonomy by the city of Winnipeg?

MR. MERCIER: We haven't moved in that direction to date, Mr. Chairman. Those are the nine unconditional grants that we referred to that were specific grants relating to the city of Winnipeg. The province-wide grants have remained as they are for the present.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: So then there is not a clear-cut delineation between what the province intends for block funding in relationship to some programs as to others. There isn't a clear line which indicates that we will block fund the entire expenditures with the City of Winnipeg based on whatever formula we establish but we will pick and choose which areas we will allow the expenditures to be free and open and other areas where they will be kept as they have been in the past.

MR. cchairman; The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, that is the delineation. I've described the nine conditional grants that we have done away with to provide one unconditional grant, and described the continuing grants that will continue to exist that are generally province-wide and statutory. I don't intend to make

any change at certainly the present time.

MR. URUSKI: I'd like to get some indication from the Minister then in a general way what the \$30 million that he's speaking about covers.

MR. MERCIER: The areas?

MR. URUSKI: Yes.

MR. MERCIER: Oh, I described that earlier, Mr. Chairman, but I'll do it again. They cover the regional streets maintenance grant, transit operating subsidy, transit bus purchases, innovative urban transportation grants, land acquisition, rights of way for transportation, Regional Streets Capital Program, Inner City Public Health Grant, Convention Centre Grant, Assiniboine Park and Zoo. I would say that in developing that the City waived its interest in \$6 to \$7 million equity interest and passed Land Acquisitions so that the City, if they wish, could proceed to dispose of surplus land as they wished and, in addition, on terminating the Assiniboine Park and Zoo Agreement, waived approximately \$1 million in past contributions of the province to capital projects in Assiniboine Park and Zoo.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the Minister for supplying that information. In his comments insofar as the Urban Affairs Department, the Minister to the Member for Wellington indicated that there were usages, or use of staff from other departments to co-ordinate inputs with respect to liaison with the City of Winnipeg in terms of planning and various projects. I wanted the Minister to indicate who co-ordinates the other departmental inputs in terms of various liaison and studies between the province and the City? Who is doing the co-ordination? Who pulls all the staff that the Minister says is now being utilized from other departments, and pulls their expertise that he says has been available in other departments and has not been used so some of the staff that have been in Urban Affairs that are now redundant, who have been let go, they're no longer needed because there's expertise in other departments, who is doing the co-ordinating and pulling in the information and advice from all the other departments and how is the mechanism set up? What happens now?

MR. MERCIER: The Ministers in the other departments who would be asked to respond, are responsible for co-ordination within their departments.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Ministers from the other departments — well, Mr. Chairman, this Minister, in discussion with members of the committee, has indicated that he had no direct interest in terms of the questions put to him by the Member for Elmwood in respect to funding or on energy matters in terms of the waste disposal and energy plant in the City of Winnipeg, and other matters. They are left with the Minister of Finance. Does the Minister of Municipal Affairs co-ordinate this committee and pull the other departments together, through the other Ministers when requests come in from the City, or how is this done?

MR. MERCIER: Well, certainly we attempt to co-ordinate in the responses from other departments, but you know, give me a specific situation — we're talking very generally, and . . .

MR. URUSKI: Well, we are talking very generally, Mr. Chairman. Specifics were put to the Minister insofar as what his department does in terms, or has done, and how has it acted in terms of the moneys that may be available from the Federal government, and he's responded to that. But he did indicate that it is not his responsibility. Is there anyone in his department who is assisting him in giving direction in policy thrust, in terms of, let's say, specifically for transportation. Who is consulting him or assisting him in reviewing, say the transportation policies of this province as they would relate with the city?

MR. MERCIER: That's again a very very general question. For example, if a request has come in from the city to consider an amendment to the Highway Traffic Act to allow left-hand turns on one-way streets or something, my department would forward that request to the Department of Highways for consideration in developing a response, and I'm sure that if an answer wasn't forthcoming as quickly as we thought it should, we'd attempt to get the answer quickly and communicate it to the city. You know, you're going to have to be more specific. I don't know what the purpose is of discussing things as general as that are.

MR. URUSKI: I will try and be as specific as I can. In his remarks to members in committee, the Minister indicated that in general his department acts as a liaison between the various departments in consultation with the requests put forward by the city council. The Minister of Highways, in his discussion in this committee, on his Estimates, indicated that he has no input insofar as the City of Winnipeg is concerned, as to their planning and what effects their planning of their streets are in relationship to the provincial Highways Department. He has no input he indicated to this committee and he has no desire for input.

This Minister has indicated that he is providing block funding to the City of Winnipeg, which handles all the regional streets and he indicates that this funding is allowing the city to be totally autonomous. There will be no more meddling, no more interference by the province of Manitoba in the city's streets and operations program. What is the Minister going to do, in terms of his liaison? The Minister's department, Highways Department, his colleague is twinning No. 7 Highway to the perimeter of the city of Winnipeg. The province will end up, likely, building an overpass to that point. Is the Minister telling me that if the city does not twin Metro Route 90, the province of Manitoba will not get involved in that area of planning and transportation and cost-sharing with respect to the city? Is he telling me that he is going to keep hands off in this area?

MR. MERCIER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I can say the Minister of Highways under the previous government never had any involvement either. They weren't consulted. Urban Affairs consulted some other so-called experts. And I want to complete my answer. Mr. Chairman, I think the most important area of transportation planning, from a provincial standpoint, that is being done, is the review of the Winnipeg Development Plan Review, which is dealing with transportation in which my department is involved, which I believe are involved in some consultation with the Department of Highways in that aspect.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I beg to differ, Mr. Chairman, because I sat here on the Highways Committee last week, and I asked the Minister of Highways, your colleague, as to what input in planning and design in research is his department involved in with respect to the projects that the city is coming forward with and intends to undertake, and what implications they have for the province of Manitoba. He has indicated that he does not intend and there is no input from the Department of Highways in terms of transportation studies and implications on the province of Manitoba that the city is putting forward. He made those statements, those very statements, to this committee, Mr. Chairman. And now the Minister of Municipal Affairs gets up and says that he is utilizing the Department of Highways in terms of planning, expertise, in terms of dealing with the transportation study of the City of Winnipeg, in direct contradiction to what the Minister of Highways has told us.

MR. MERCIER: My advice Mr. Chairman, is that we have, serving on the Winnipeg Development Plan Review, one staff member and other people indirectly involved, but that they, in reviewing the Winnipeg Development Plan, a major aspect of which is the transportation plan, do have a person named as a contact within the Department of Highways, who is consulted with, particularly in respect to the areas of connections between the City of Winnipeg road system and provincial highways.

MR. URUSKI: The Minister indicates that in the event that the city will. . . of course, he is now able to tell us that of course the city of Winnipeg will go along with its spending of the block funding in all aspects that may affect the province adversely. They will do all those streets that need connecting to provincial highways that are being upgraded now, where connections will be needed. Is the Minister assuring us of that?

MR. MERCIER: Well, I have some respect for the responsibility of the elected people at the city of Winnipeg, even if this member doesn't, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, the Minister can have all the respect he wants, and I have respect for the members of whatever elected group they come from, but the Minister has indicated that there has been interference in the past in terms of setting the spending priorities of City Council. Is he now able to say that there will be no interference by the province?

MR. MERCIER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: Well, I too have some question and some concerns, because I am a core area councillor, and like the Member for Wellington but the Minister's far too modest and he's put things on the record that just don't seem to be sinking in to members opposite. I worked with him for a number of years, and when he says he's going to give special importance and special attention to the Urban Affairs problems, I can tell you with credibility that he will do that. And, you know, he's simply telling you that there was nine conditional grants versus one grant without the interference and the heavy hand of Big Brother, and it's a known fact, and it's too bad the Member for Inkster isn't here, because, you know, he raises his voice and makes all kinds of noise and I'm very glad that he put it in Hansard, because I'm going to use it against him, because he's been making all kinds of noise about home rule and the share of growth taxes versus his envisionment of the third level of government, which is no rule under the Member for Inkster.

And the comments the other night — I was surprised that the media didn't report them, because it would have given a clear indication of how those two members stood, the Member for Seven Oaks and the Member for Inkster. He says the City Council is sick; the Member for Seven Oaks called them dolts; he charges collusion agreements and conspiracy. Has he no respect for members on city council that share some of these views, like Councillor Zuken and Councillor Skowron and the elected members of his own party that are making these decisions on city council? I mean, is there no respect for the majority of people, regardless of where they come from? Is there no respect for the third level of government? That really concerns me. If you want some examples of the situation, we've just turned around and I applaud him. Let him use the city park issue because the voters of Winnipeg for years have asked to keep that asset.

Where do you think we get the \$30 million figure from for the conditional grant, I mean for the block funding grant? The cost of maintenance for the city park is in there, but you listen to the Member for Inkster, and he says he wants to make it a provincial park. Well, I'm very sorry, that's an asset that our forefathers put together in planning, and is still there, and like many other urban centres across North America, they're very proud of that asset. And I'm very pleased that there's no repayment to the capital costs and the waiving of that conditional agreement. You see, the heavy hand of the former government under the Member for Seven Oaks, and certainly the Member for Inkster, who he says since 1968 has always demanded that the name be changed and turned into a provincial park.

I say to him, let him keep going to the electorate and let him stay in the area which he represents because he's going to need that majority when he comes out with ridiculous statements. No more money for the convention, no more money for transit system, and I'm quoting him, no more money for major highways, no more money for health and welfare, no more money for the Sherbrook-McGregor Overpass. How does he think that we arrived at the \$30 million? And I'm repeating myself. He can't get away with saying those type of things. They have no validity at all.

He's trying to say that the deficit is \$3 million a year on the Convention Centre. I'm on the board, and the deficit provincial share last year, ending on August 31, 1978, was \$324,778, or approximately thereabouts. And yet, the Member for Inkster won't talk about the overall benefits, the umbrella benefits of the Convention Centre, of the \$330 million industry called Tourism and related service industry. He doesn't talk about the umbrella effects and the development that has taken place downtown. That doesn't count. He just goes in there and comes up with the ridiculous statement that we are going to give no more money to the Convention Centre.

The comments that they made the other night certainly shouldn't go. The Member for Elmwood — it's too bad he's not here too, because he's an example of government interference. The additional \$2 million costs in the Osborne Street Bridge was just one small example, and the fact that they wanted Leila Avenue finished, obviously for political considerations over many of the other traffic expert plans that the city of Winnipeg had.

He talks about that my Minister has to spell out his energy policy, his energy program. Where is the \$45 million? His energy program was, I think to purchase eleven electric units that are now in mothballs.

But I wanted to get back to some of the concerns, because I think the Minister should be congratulated and he's laid a lot of my fears to rest, because as a core area representative, we have some special needs and some special concerns and we are concerned that in the past on city council that some of these needs have not been recognized by some of the suburban councillors; but I think he said there's going to be a review of all the data of the core area that has been made to date, and he said he has a special interest in the urban affairs and the City of Winnipeg, certainly. And, my concern is that we have to get all of these MLAs, like the Member for Wellington. They could be the watch dogs of the survival of the core area and their needs, because they certainly have a platform to air their concerns.

I really welcome the disposal of some of the surplus land, because no levels of government

ever wanted to seem to want to get rid of surplus assets and surplus lands, and things like that, because there was always this interbickering and things going on like this. I really think that this will lead to the core area development and the selling of a lot of these derelict holdings to the private sector, which will develop the core area. I've made a plea with my own government to consider selling what I consider a derelict parking lot in the core area — it certainly holds enough excess snow — that's across from the Convention Centre.

But I would like to ask the minister if there has been any consideration, because certainly the quality life in the core area and in Wolseley, is affected by, what I call an assessment problem, and maybe I'm asking, "Is there any consideration for an assessment review." I feel very bad in speaking selfishly for my own tax bill compared to North Kildonan, and I'd like to see a sort of a market value assessment review, because you know, in the core area of this city we have the through traffic, we have the old sewers, the old streets. We've got all those half-way houses and institutions, that the suburbs won't take. We have a fantastically high crime rate, because they insist on equal number of motorcycle policemen and everything in some of the areas. We have most of the public housing in the core area, because the zoning commitments won't allow certain things of those to take place in the suburbs, with many many, old housing developments and old housing in the core area. And, I'm putting these on the records because these cause a number of social problems, yet our tax bills are higher than North Kildonan in many instances.

We have the undesirable business ventures, that North Kildonan bans. We have all the x-rated films, all the porno shops, all the arcades; we've got all that in the core area. We've got all the by-law infractions. We're a storage ground for garbage — all the derelict cars that are there. We've got all the examples of the separation and what the core area riverbank conditions are like, compared to the suburbs.

I say that from my point of view, representing Wolseley, and living in the core area, I think that our tax bills, and we're the old city of Winnipeg, and we all have these biases towards the old municipality competition, or whatever, and we're concerned about the city of Winnipeg core area taxes being far greater for what we get than certain municipalities, and I think that's important.

I'd like to see again, some involvement by our government and it's not imposing any condition on the city, but I think we have to recognize, like the state of California and others do, that in order to fight crime we've got to have some kind of a per capita grant for the core area. Maybe it should be out of liquor revenues, I don't know.

So, I think the minister is being far too modest; I think this block funding has been done with a lot of research. I think the co-operation is there; I don't buy what the Member for Inkster says, that there is a conspiracy and there's collusion. I know Councillor Skowron, and I know Councillor Zuken — I've worked with him for a number of years — and Councillor Wade, and I can't see for the life of me . . . and even Councillor Keeper, from the core area and others.

You know, the Member for Inkster thinks that he's the only one that envisions a lower fare for transit — why, Councillor McGonigal was pushing for no-fares all the time that she was on the particular council. It's nothing new; the Member for Inkster always wants to grab hold of these things as if only the poor people ride the bus.

Also, he alludes to \$36.50; you know, most union contracts only call for 220 working days of the year. Does he think he's going to fool me with the figures of \$36.50, talking on a daily basis, when we know that there is no person that I know that travels the bus 365 days of the year.

So, I think that we should give this a try; I have a lot of concerns, and I just want to put on the record, that the task force review, with all the data and all the reports that are there, whether they're from urban studies, whether they're from Mr. Levin's report, whether they're from social planning council or whatever.

I have never thrown away any of those reports, and if they welcome opinions from elected MLAs, I'll be one to offer my suggestions, as I'm doing and putting on the record now. But it won't wash, and I'll be very very disappointed if there is any credibility given to that insincere speech that the Member for Inkster gave, saying that no rule under him is a lot better than our block funding, and our share of growth taxes that we are going to be looking at, and surely he's not going to try to fool the people by saying that we don't participate in the upkeep through sharing of the growth taxes for highways and many of the things that are there.

And, I just want to close and it seems to me that a study has to take place for the McGregor Bridge, because as soon as you build a small McGregor Bridge, you've got to condemn the Arlington, so you're still one bridge behind. So, all of these things in my opinion, should be left to the planning, traffic experts, and certainly the City of Winnipeg has a large staff in the Planning Department, under commissioner Henderson and I, for one, don't like the second level of government close to an election, saying, "We're going to do Leila Avenue and we're going to block off the St. Vital-Fort Garry thoroughway, and we're going to hold up the Osborne Street Bridge for a couple of years,

and we're going to do a lot of things, and all at the expense of people that have spent hours in planning, and whether it happens to be traffic, or transit or whatever. So, I welcome the change from the conditional grants under the former regime to letting the third level of government if the members opposite — excluding the Member for Inkster and the Member for Seven Oaks — if the majority and the Leader of the Opposition of the party opposite believe that they should have a third level of government, then let's go along with the block funding, let's go along with the minister's commitment tonight that he's going to give importance to the City of Winnipeg and their problems. I just wanted to put that on the record, because I think he's been far too modest in the accomplishments that this block funding will have on co-operation between the two levels of government and getting some things done. And, instead of fighting and bickering all the time, the name of the word is "production and co-operation".

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: I have one specific question, and perhaps minister's staff could provide it to him. This item that's under discussion, I wonder how much is contemplated on being spent relative to travel? But, in more general terms, Mr. Chairman, earlier the minister made a statement, and I agree with the Member for Wolseley on this, he should be commended, because he has enunciated Conservative policy, which is really in terms that people can understand, the regressive preservative policy.

Now, we hear much about constitutional debates going on in this country at the present time, and what the minister has enunciated is a policy which I find very strange, because we've spent thousands and thousands of years evolving this system of human beings dealing with their own affairs. In this country, we have developed a division of power, and one of the things that permeates the whole system, is that those bodies which are delegated the responsibility to set up creatures of their own, can delegate authority but they can't abdicate the responsibility. The municipalities are creatures of this Legislature, and the Unity Bill, which was passed by this Legislature was an imperfect act as all human acts are. And, having dealt with the minister in his former capacity, I found in his capacity at that, he was most reasonable; but he is now apparently developing a tune that everything that was done by the former administration is bad. And, he even refers to his own civil servants, which I take exception too, as those so-called experts, and I'm not going to look at anybody, but I'm glad to see that some of the very competent civil servants, which serve this province of Manitoba well, have survived the damned purge.

MR. MERCIER: On a point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of privilege, the Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the so-called experts I referred to were not employed in this department.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Hansard will speak for itself, Mr. Chairman. I recall the Minister's words well when he used them in the context in which he used them. I deal with you, relative to the point raised by the Minister, Hansard will correct me if I am wrong.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, just for the sake of clarification, the reference I made was not made with respect to any person employed in this department.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, the City of Winnipeg Act, which changed, for a considerable number of people, the administration under which they lived, was a major thrust which was unique in the world — in the world.

No., one of the things that was left on the table under the prior Metro government was the WATS Study. What the Minister alluded to, to the extension of the St. Vital over to Waverley, I would like the Minister to come out and say he is reimposing the WATS Study, because that's implicit in what he says, that he is going to tear this city in half from north to south.

Now, let him go into River Heights and tell them that he is going to put the traffic through that Waverley Street district. It's okay to come over here in the City of Winnipeg, in the old City of Winnipeg that this individual used to represent, the infamous Conservative Election Committee on the City Council where the power is out in the suburbs, and the old City of Winnipeg in absolute terms is almost powerless on City Council. It's okay for them to play games over here with the

relocation of the CPR and better transportation north and south, what the people in the north end need, but let them go over there where their power base is and tell them that they're going to send that traffic north and south down through their district. But they're not doing it. Let them come out and say that they're going to support the beltway and this north-south corridor, because this was the position of the ICEC, whatever they wanted to call themselves when they were over there on City Council, and I doubt very much if they have changed their opinion now that they're here on this particular government.

I have heard a number of statements made, and I wish to thank the Member for Wolseley because he has given me an excellent thought. I will print what he says in a juxtaposition to what the Member for Inkster would say, and I will pay for the distribution in the constituency in which I now live, and we will see about those 30 votes next time around. But, Mr. Chairman, maybe the Minister's staff has provided him, how much is being spent on travel?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the amount budgeted is \$28,200, which I am advised was the same amount budgeted the previous year.

MR. BOYCE: We're dealing with an item of this budget, Mr. Chairman, that, given what the Minister has said — and he differentiates between government, I know, because their policy is entirely different than our policy — but the Minister has enunciated their policy and if they carried it right through to its ultimate conclusion they will wipe this out because they will do nothing.

The provincial government has the responsibility to the citizens who live in urban communities and municipalities throughout this province to deal with the federal government. Now there may well be, at some point in time, a change in the Constitution of this country, where municipalities, cities and other entities can deal directly with the federal government, but at this point in time they have not. They haven't got the Constitutional, legal or any other kind of authority to deal with the federal government. They haven't got the expertise to deal with this government, either academically or experientially, so that a lot falls on this provincial government to deal with the feds.

Now, we will make this case by case, as we go through this government, this regressive preservative government, who has gone back as if nothing had happened in the last eight years. There is not a Unicity there. There's not a different entity. There's not shifts in populations in this province. And they refuse to face up to the responsibility in dealing with them.

Now, I asked about travel, because one of the things that has to take place in this is the negotiations with the federal government so that they can come up with the best possible deal for the citizens of this country. Now, we were faced, prior to 1969, with an attitudinal thing which is permeating this government just the same as it did then. The federal government came out with a plan, and I use this as an example to make this case, they came out with a plan to build technical vocational high-schools across the country — this is prior to 1969 — in the Province of Alberta, those rabid reds out there, who believe in public enterprise and advancement, they took, just gonged onto that like that. I think they built 15. We built one — we built Tech Voc High-School because this government refuses to accept the reality that they're elected to accept the responsibility to deal with the federal government relative to every damned cent that's coming to Manitobans. And this, just shows, look, no increase in travel, because it just epitomizes what this government is doing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Ministe.. The Member for Wolseley.

MR. WILSON: I have a point of privilege. My point of privilege is this, that I've sat here very modestly, listening to the Member for Inkster, and the Member for Wellington, and the Member for Winnipeg Centre, who all live in my constituency, continually tell everybody that I only won by 30 votes. I think the record should show that I won by 82 votes, and that if those members had been made to vote in the riding in which they ran in instead of where they live, I would have won by 85 votes. So I think the record should be sttted. —(Interjection)—

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of brief remarks with respect to the comments of the Member for Winnipeg Centre with respect to the WATS Report and he referred to the Fort Garry-St. Vital Bridge. I have to say that it seems ludicrous in my view, and certainly did in the view of city council and the transportation planners there, that the province and the city would build a stretch of road from Lagimodiere Boulevard to Pembina Highway and not complete it to Waverley, and by not doing that, overburden the Pembina Highway with traffic, and it's proving out now.

In establishing the policy that we have, I don't know where the member draws in the WATS

report, because we have had no discussion, no communication, whatsoever about the WATS Report. As I say, we are involved in the Winnipeg Development Plan Review, part of which will deal with transportation planning, and that's been ongoing now for two years, and transportation will be dealt with jointly in that, between the city and the province.

With respect to the constitution, the department yet hasn't built any technical-vocational schools. But I would reject any suggestion from the member that we have not involved ourselves as a department in matters dealing with the federal government. The main project in which the department has been involved in with the federal government is the Community Services Program, which was announced over a year ago by the then Minister of Urban Affairs at the federal government level, Mr. Ouellet. We had extensive meetings at the officials' level, we had a ministers' meeting in one of last year in Toronto dealing with this particular matter with ministers from all provinces. We thought we had worked out an agreement with the federal minister. He then reneged on that agreement and forwarded suggested agreements in the fall of last year which contradicted the agreement all of the provincial ministers thought they had with the federal government. They have kept referring to it publicly.

It has put us in a difficult position with municipalities who keep reading about it, expecting funds to be able to come through that Community Services Program. Up until March 12th, there was no legislation in place to authorize the program. There have been no agreements signed among any provinces. There is no money budgeted at the federal level. It is a unique kind of a proposal in that they expect under that agreement, if we can ever, us or any other province, ever come to an agreement with them, that municipalities would spend money this fiscal year, but would not be reimbursed for it until the following fiscal year of 1980/81, which is contrary to all agreements with the federal government. But we've been extensively involved in that one, which is really the main and only dealing we've had with the federal government in Municipal and Urban Affairs. But we have pressed that one as much as we possibly can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister has difficulty seeing the relationship between what I've said and the projection of it, I agree that he has a problem. If he can't see that, then he has a problem. It is regrettable. But even if his case were valid, one of the classic examples under a strictly conservative government was the Spadina Expressway. They finally came to the conclusion that they had made an error.

But nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, when the Minister says that they're having difficulty negotiating with the federal government, I can well understand why. Because, for some reason or other, this particular government, in negotiations with the federal government, have used the forum to try and make political hay out of it. It's always passin' strange to me, that the First Minister from Alberta goes there and makes a tough case for his position relative to the province. The Province of Ontario goes there and makes their case. But the First Minister goes there and tries to make political hay, and earlier this evening the Minister himself used this committee as a forum.

Now, I'm a traditionalist. In fact, in some senses I'm more conservative than members opposite, in the sense that I have a profound respect for parliamentary procedure, that when governments are elected — this particular Minister at this point in time happens to be the Municipal Affairs Minister for this province. And he is administering things on my personal behalf as a citizen of this province, as well as every other citizen in the country regardless of what political stripe they are. But if I was on the other end of a negotiating team, and I was attacked in this particular way, then I would be hard to negotiate with also. But, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the Minister could give us an item-by-item breakdown of this particular item. I'm interested in the items on this particular expenditure. —(Interjection)— Mr. Chairman, I have asked for an itemization of this particular item. If the government chooses not to give it to me, then let that be recorded.

MR. MERCIER: Under I.(c), professional fees, \$500.00. Other fees, \$7,500.00. Membership fees, \$700.00. Furniture and furnishings, \$7,000.00. Printing and stationery supplies, \$35,700.00. Postage, telephone and telegrams, \$13,200.00. Machine utilization, \$11,900.00. Automobiles, \$9,200.00. Advertising and exhibits, . . .

MR. BOYCE: I'm sorry. Automobiles . . . ?

MR. MERCIER: Automobiles, \$9,200.00. Advertising and exhibits, \$2,100.00. Publications, \$4,900.00. Freight express and cartage, \$400.00. Travelling, \$28,200.00. Miscellaneous, \$21,500.00. Educational assistance, \$6,300.00. Plus grants, \$24,000.00. Grants, Mr. Chairman, are Intergovernmental Committee on Urban and Regional Research, \$8,000.00. The Union of Manitoba Municipalities, \$6,000.00. The Municipal Secretary-Treasurers Association, \$1,000; and others,

\$3,000.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: How do they compare to last year, just roughly, Mr. Chairman?

MR. MERCIER: They are the same.

MR. BOYCE: There's no increase in these grants?

MR. MERCIER: No. Pardon me, there is a \$700 increase in the Intergovernmental Committee on Urban and Regional Research, and \$800 in other grants.

On the first one, the Intergovernmental Committee on Urban and Regional Research, I'm sure you are aware, is funded by all provinces, and that's our share of the increase in grants for that.

MR. BOYCE: Could I have the memberships? Could you give me a breakdown of what these memberships are, please?

MR. MERCIER: The membership is not broken down in here, it's related to memberships by financial branch, and financial organizations, and planners in the Planning Associations, basically.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Chairman, I've raised the question, and we are entitled to know just exactly to whom this \$700 is contemplated on being spent, so I wonder if the Minister could take it as notice, and give us a list of to whom the membership fees are paid, and for whom.

MR. MERCIER: Yes.

MR. BOYCE: In going through the list, I see that we've broken down things as small as \$400, and \$500, and we come to a miscellaneous, \$21,000.00. I wonder also, rather than take up the time of the Committee tonight, if we could get a breakdown of this \$21,000 as to item by item for the miscellaneous item?

MR. MERCIER: That is itemized here, Mr. Chairman, the \$21,000.00: Union of Manitoba Municipalities dinner, \$15,600 — the former Ministers know all about that longstanding tradition in Manitoba, that has gone on for years; Dinner — Association of Assessing Officers, \$750; and luncheon meetings, \$1,000; Manitoba Urban Association dinner, \$30,000; Urban Affairs, \$1,150.00.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will agree that this \$15,600 has been an ongoing occurrence, but if we are going to restrain ourselves, just exactly where are our priorities. You know, I find it passing strange that we're asking people to pay increased Pharmacare deductibles, and \$15,600 for a dinner, for fellow politicians, if you will. How does this compare to last year, through you to the Minister, Mr. Chairman?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, we have also expressed concern about the cost of this dinner as budgeted for. My understanding of it is, I guess it has been continued to be budgeted for since some time in the 1950s, the 1940s I'm now hearing. It's been a traditional matter, I take it, for the Department to hold, during the Union of Manitoba Municipalities Convention. I appreciate the member's concern, and the fact that it's budgeted for doesn't necessarily mean that it will be held. If the member is suggesting to the government that it not be held, we will certainly give that serious consideration.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, we've focused on one item. Are we now advised by the Minister that there are contained in this Estimate, money which he doesn't intend to spend? You know, the process traditionally has been that the government presents their Estimates after going through an exorcistic exercise of some intensity before these are presented to the Legislature; and the government has adopted the position that they are going to expend these funds and that they are well contemplated and well thought through, and they accept the responsibility for so recommending them to the Legislature. Now, the Minister is suggesting on this particular item, that he is willing to re-think it. Can the Minister, under this administrative item,

point out to us the other items which would fall into a comparable category?

MR. MERCIER: No, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest there are none like this one. I said this has been a traditional dinner held by the Department of Municipal Affairs since apparently the 1940s; what I was doing was asking for the member's suggestions and recommendations. There's always traditionally amounts of money in most departments that goes unspent, just because moneys are in a budget doesn't mean that you have to spend it. Perhaps the member would like to indicate to me whether or not the dinner should be held for the 1,000 Councillors of the Union of Manitobas Manitoba Municipalities.

MR. BOYCE: Well, if the Minister would like to resign and recommend that I fulfill his function, then I'll make the decision.

MR. MERCIER: If you aren't prepared to make a recommendation, or a suggestion; I'm prepared to make the decision, don't worry about that.

MR. BOYCE: Well, the Minister is quite cute, I see he's entertaining his colleagues. I hope when the Member for Wolseley is reporting on the proceedings of the Legislature, he points this out to his constituency, the frivolity with which the Minister takes my question.

If I may continue, Mr. Chairman, I would ask for the protection of the Chair against the interruptions. I have it figured out here, if the Committee is interested, all I have to do is shift 16 votes.

A MEMBER: In Wolseley.\$

MR. BOYCE: In Wolseley, yes. —(Interjection)—

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Wolseley on a point of privilege.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of personal privilege. They continue with his ball-faced lie started by the Member for Inkster. I think they should check the library or the records.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please, I would suggest that we choose our words much more carefully.

The Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Chairman, we're not going to get a decision out of the Minister on this one, I can see that.

Now, on automobiles, that's just a transfer, is it not?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: And what was the question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BOYCE: Is the \$9,000 item there for automobiles?

MR. MERCIER: Who does it relate to?

MR. BOYCE: Yes.

MR. MERCIER: It reads: 3 general service vehicles, 36,000 miles at 12 cents, \$4,320; 3 subsidized mileage, Assistant Deputy Minister, Director of Administration, and Personnel Officer, \$3,000; Municipal Audit Committee, \$1,000; Municipal Advisory Committee, \$880; for a total of \$9,200.00.

MR. BOYCE: Are these all government automobiles, or are they employee automobiles?

MR. MERCIER: The first 3 are government automobiles; the next 3 were personal automobiles with mileage paid — presubsidized mileage. There's no change from the past.

MR. BOYCE: Well, under this item, perhaps rather than go through it item by item . . . you see, I'm faced with the printed word here, this item and the breakdown under the particular sub-items, it says: "This particular Branch gives internal policy direction and guidance to the rest of the

So, perhaps if I could ask a question at this time, relative to the three that are listed against this particular item, as well as other items within the Minister's Estimates, those vehicles which are driven by the individual, are these cars owned by the individual, or are they on lease arrangements from the private sector?

MR. MERCIER: I'm advised that they're owned by the individuals.

MR. BOYCE: I see. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, through you to the Minister, is this relative to these three, or is the Minister making a general statement relative to all vehicles which are paid for by the public purse, under his administration?

MR. MERCIER: Well, I indicated that the first figure I gave there related to 3 vehicles owned by the government, and the next 3 were owned by the individuals, and there is a subsidized mileage rate.

MR. BOYCE: Yes, I understand what the Minister is saying, but I'd like him, if he can, answer the question. Are the cars owned by these individuals or are they leased by these individuals?

MR. MERCIER: The answer is that they are owned by the individuals, they are their personal vehicles.

MR. BOYCE: I understand the Minister, perhaps the Minister doesn't understand me, and maybe I'm not presenting it too well. But, nevertheless, he's telling us, in effect, that no civil servant, under his administration, is leasing a car from the private sector, and recovering through mileage rates, moneys from the public purse. Is that it?

MR. MERCIER: What we were talking about was three vehicles owned by the Assistant Deputy Minister, Director of Administration, and Personnel Officer, for which they receive a mileage rate for the use of the cars for government business.

MR. BOYCE: That is just the case relative to these three. The Minister isn't commenting on a more general case relative to his whole administrative unit?

MR. MERCIER: there is somebody within my Department who leases a vehicle and claims a mileage rate for government business? The Department is not aware of any. I wonder if the member would explain what difference it would make as to whether the individual leased it or owned it?

MR. BOYCE: With your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, if I had adopted this policy that I was going to cut down the public fleet, one of the arrangements which might be made is that individuals would be encouraged to lease automobiles, because their mileage allowance which they would recover on a mileage basis, would exceed that for which they had leased the vehicle in the first instance. For example, if I went to one of the car dealers in Winnipeg who lease cars and made an arrangement to lease a car at the rate of \$300 a month and knowing full well that my mileage would be recovered from the government at the rate of \$350 a month, and the minister has said that he is not aware of this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, there has been no attempt to reduce the government fleet in this case. There has been no change in the regulations, I am advised, during the past four or five years that if someone uses a car over 12,000 miles then they are assigned a car from the government fleet. I take it they are not allowed to claim mileage for more than 12,000 miles. That's when the transition takes place to a government fleet car.

MR. BOYCE: Is the minister telling the committee that it is still extant in the Service Manual, that this instruction is for all departments?

MR. MERCIER: That's my advice, Mr. Chairman, perhaps the member would like to raise the question further with the Minister of Government Services, but that's our understanding.

MR. BOYCE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, that's all for the moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Within that item on Other Expenditures, there was a figure I believe of, was it \$35,000 for Furniture and Office Furnishings, or something like that? Do those figures include in this expenditure, the movement of any decentralization of any offices or branches of the department to any areas within the province or are those expenditures covered under Other Items further down either in the Planning Services where that department might have been decentralized or the Assessment Branch?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, there is no money in there for moving out decentralization of offices. It's apparently for normal changes which are forced on the department for equipment rentals, or . . .

MR. URUSKI: Can the minister indicate just in a general statement, are there moneys within the budget of Municipal and Urban Affairs for shifting of personnel either from Winnipeg outward or anywhere within the Province of Manitoba in terms of decentralizing or shifting office staff?

MR. MERCIER: Not in here, Mr. Chairman.

MR. URUSKI: I won't go any further, but I wanted a general answer whether there are funds for that type of movement provided within the department?

MR. MERCIER: There would be a limited amount of funds that we might utilize for that purpose.

MR. URUSKI: That's all I have on this item, Mr. Chairman.

MR CHAIRMAN: 1.(c)—pass; 1.(d) \$110,000 — the Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. URUSKI: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister could explain the nature of the studies and the projects that are being undertaken under this item. The amount is similar to last year. What shifts are taking place; what studies are being undertaken, and what are the projects in nature?

MR. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, this is to cover that province's share of the Winnipeg Development Plan and Review. Contributions to date include \$45,000 in 1976-77; 27.2 in 1977-78; 44.2 to date in this fiscal year, 1978-79, and the province is required under the agreement with the city to pay the city 25 percent of the operating costs of the review to a maximum of \$293,000.00.

MR. URUSKI: What is the provincial share in 1979-80 of this \$110,000.00? The whole works.

MR. MERCIER: We estimated it at \$110,000.00.

MR. URUSKI: There are no staff components in that, that is strictly cost-sharing with the city or their administrative costs of staff within this amount of money.

MR. MERCIER: No, there is no staff attached to that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(d)—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Chairman, just before we go further and to save me asking the same question on every item, can the minister tell me if there are any accounting changes made in the presentation of these Estimates, other than the Reconciliation Statement?

MR. MERCIER: There is only one and I referred to that in my opening remarks. It's between services in the Finance Department and not double-billing the computer costs — the Assessment Branch. I referred to that in the beginning. I indicated under Municipal Services and Research that there was a significant reduction which relates to accounting procedures. Previously the assessment computer costs were included in this branch — that's the Municipal Services and Research — for recovery by the branch from the Assessment Branch. We have eliminated that double-billing process and accordingly the computer costs will be shown only in the Assessment Branch.

MR. WALDING: I could ask the minister for an explanation of that when we get down to it if he would prefer it, or would he like to give me an explanation of it now? I don't mind which way.

MR. MERCIER: It's just been a double-billing that has been eliminated.

MR. WALDING: Was it a matter of one section billing another?

MR. MERCIER: Yes. Perhaps we can deal with it when we get down to that and I'll try to provide a simpler explanation that we both understand.

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

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my colleague, the Member for Winnipeg Centre and jointly with him, I think we owe the Member for Wolseley an apology. And I say jointly with him because I was party to this arithmetic. He did not come within 16 votes of losing his seat. I checked the figures, and he came within an average of, oh, one vote per poll; about 38 votes of losing his seat. He was put in the same league, security-wise, politically speaking, as the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

A MEMBER: At least 100 percent safer than that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion is Committee Rise. All in favour? (Agreed)

SUPPLY — HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would draw the Honourable Members' attention to Page 48 of the Main Estimates. We are on Resolution No. 64: Social Services and Community Health, Clause (d) Continuing Care Services, (1)—Salaries—pass — the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think there was a bit of a misunderstanding between the Minister and the staff and myself, before the dinner hour.

The point that I was trying to make by saying that those receiving the home care, that there were more now that were eligible for the personal care placement. I am not, of course, trying to make a point that this is not costing money — that's exactly the point. The Minister said, if there's more people that would be in personal care homes, well then it's going to cost more money. Well, there's no doubt about that, we know that the construction of more personal care beds is going to cost money. The point that I'm trying to make is that it hasn't a plateau, that's the point that I was engaged with, because I am saying that there are more people now that are eligible for the placement in personal care homes, than they had before, so therefore it only stands to reason if there's 26 and 32 that would require hospital care, then that leaves 40 percent that are at home that would be at home without proper care, and this is where we're squeezing. And also there is no doubt that with the short staff, with the reduction in staff — big reduction in staff — that there is less panelling, there would even be more.

So, Mr. Chairman, the point that we were trying to make is that there hasn't been an increase at all in this program, it's been rather a decrease. The Minister said you were underspent, and we were underspent last year — I know that. I know that we were underspent.

We were underspent the first year quite a bit, probably more the first year because it took us a little longer to get the program going, but our last year in office, the Minister must remember that he was responsible for the administration of this program for nearly half a year — from the 22nd of October, when he became the Minister responsible, until March 31st, of last year — so, this is the point that I was trying to make.

I wonder if the Minister could give us in detail the number of homemakers, registered nurses, LPNs, and so on; would he break down the staff, please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is the breakdown on a typical month of the Home Care Program: 1,560 homemakers; 145 registered nurses — in Winnipeg those are VON personnel — otherwise they are employed in the community where the service is needed; 50 LPN's, 30 aides and orderlys, 53 therapists throughout the province, that service is purchased from the Canadian Arthritis and Rheumatism Society.

I just want on that point of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, Mr. Chairman, just let me say that when we're talking about those percentages that I gave him earlier about the 26.6 percent and 32.6 percent, etc., that because the program is in place and functioning effectively and efficiently, those are percentages of people who would have to be or might have had to be listed for personal care home placement or for hospital admission or for longer stays in hospital, but they didn't have to be because of the home care service available to them. In other words, you know, the 26.6 percent we're talking about in the personal care field, those are not people who were paneled for personal care homes but they are people who might well have had to have been listed who might well have applied, probably would have applied, perhaps would have been paneled for personal care depending on the determination of the panel, but didn't have to be because home care was available to them. If home care had not been available to them, they would have in our view sought help through the Personal Care Home Program. That is the point that I am trying to make with those percentages.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: But that is not correct, Mr. Chairman. I asked for the percentage of people eligible for placement in a personal care home and if this is the case — they have to be paneled before they would be eligible for that. And if that is not the case — then if those 32.6 percent are just people who might have asked to go to the personal care home, what kind of figures are those? And if that is the case, give me the percentage of those that are waiting to go into personal care homes. You mean to tell me that they are not receiving home care? Those that you haven't found a place, that are on a waiting list, they are not receiving home care, because the 26 percent or the 32 percent are people that might have come over. That's not the case at all. Those are the people that are eligible and then the other percentage, the last figure, are those who would have trouble and they're the ones that might try to get into a personal care homes, that they don't have to be in a personal care home, but without any help they would have to be. That's the difference between the two groups.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I thought at 4:30, Mr. Chairman, that I gave the honourable member that statistic. The percentage of persons on the waiting list, receiving home care pending placement in personal care homes, is 36.9 percent for the fiscal year now ending, compared to 42.3 percent in the previous year.

MR. DESJARDINS: Those are figures of the people on the waiting list.

MR. SHERMAN: That's right.

MR. DESJARDINS: Then they are higher.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, it's lower, I mean . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: It's more than last year but it's higher than 32 . . .

MR. SHERMAN: 36.9 percent compared to 42.3 percent. What the previous figures were for 1976 and 1975, I don't have. But I've got 1977 and 1978 and it was 42.3 percent in 1977 and 36.9 percent in 1978.

But the point is, Mr. Chairman, the point that must be made, is that there are, indeed, fewer applicants. The waiting list for personal care homes and personal care placement decreased by 20 percent in Winnipeg in the past year.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh come on. With the lack of beds . . .

MR. SHERMAN: And it decreased by 19.8 percent outside of Winnipeg. We're talking about the waiting list for personal care homes. There were in fact less applicants. There were 582 less applicants panelled for placement this year. That is less applicants. There are simply fewer applications, Mr. Chairman, and we are responding to as many of those applications, as many as we can in the spirit that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface himself subscribes to, and that is with home care assistance wherever that's possible, because it's desirable on the part of the applicant, it's desirable on the part of the system and on the part of the program to keep them

in their homes through home care if we can. And that's precisely what is happening with the home care program and the personal care home program in relation to the number of applicants in the community today.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, we're probably comparing apples and oranges. As far as I'm concerned, when I ask for a percentage, and when I talk about a percentage of those that are eligible, I'm talking about people that definitely should go in a personal care home, that have no business, even with all the — there's a different group. Even with all the home care, home care is not good enough for them. They should be in a personal care home. That's what I'm talking about when I talk about that group. And therefore if there's no place for them in a personal care home, what we used to do then, we used to spend as much money — it would cost us as much money for them, and sometimes more money than if they were in a personal care home. I don't think the Minister is listening to this. But I am saying that the people that I'm talking about, that should be in a personal care home, that there are a certain amount of them, that because there's no room, there's no beds, we used to give — there was no other way. We had home care, but that was temporary, until we found them a place. And those people cost us at times more than it would cost if they were in a residence — if they were occupying a personal care bed, because there was no other way, you had to take care of those people.

Now, if my honourable friend is talking about, he's got so many figures that he's got me more than 100 percent. —(Interjection)— Okay, but you still haven't, because you've got more than 100 percent of your people — of the service. You gave me 26.6 percent of people that are eligible for the personal care placement, and you say that those people don't have to go, it's not the intention of sending them to a personal care . . .

MR. SHERMAN: Right.

MR. DESJARDINS: Then you say requiring hospital care. You gave me 32.6, and then you gave me at home without proper care, would be at home without proper care, and it would have to be in a personal care home if they were at home without proper care, or just suffer, like so many are now. You gave me 40.8. And that gives me 100 percent. Then you give me 36.9 — you said, well those people, we're taking care of them because we can't get them in, they're on the waiting list and we're taking care of them. I didn't go to a Marxist school and I didn't go to the same school as the premier of Manitoba, but it gives me 136.9 percent.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, we are comparing apples and oranges, because the 100 percent that I gave the honourable member and that he's referring to now, that is the total number — that is the total package from the point of view of the program in home care that we delivered to home care service recipients. The other figure I gave him relates to admissions into personal care home care, and into the personal care home program. Perhaps —(Interjection)—

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . Well, it's not the same thing.

MR. SHERMAN: Well it is the waiting list for admission to personal care homes.

MR. DESJARDINS: What happens to them?

MR. SHERMAN: Those who are admitted into personal care homes are obviously . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, no they're not.

MR. SHERMAN: . . . eliminated from the total figure. There is a remaining number that have been left on the waiting list pending placement, and that is served by care services.

MR. DESJARDINS: What percentage?

MR. SHERMAN: Perhaps it will help the honourable member if I give him this figure. In the year that we're looking at, there were 2,233 persons assessed for personal care home placement.

MR. DESJARDINS: How many?

MR. SHERMAN: 2,233. Of those 2,233, 1,600 were actually placed. Now, our departmental information is that across the rural area of the province, the waiting list has decreased, and that

figure I gave you earlier, has decreased 19.8 percent, and in Winnipeg it has decreased by 20.2 percent.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, right now I'm not concerned about that. That won't answer my question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: They are wrong figures, Mr. Chairman. The Minister's figures . . . 22,033 applied, or were paneled. 16,000. . .

MR. SHERMAN: 2,233, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, 2,200. All right. 2,200 and 1,600 were placed.

MR. SHERMAN: That's right.

MR. DESJARDINS: So that leaves 600 that aren't placed. Now what do they receive? Do they receive any home care at all?

MR. SHERMAN: That is the subject area to which the percentages I gave the member earlier apply. 36.9 percent of those are receiving home care, waiting for placement in personal care homes.

MR. DESJARDINS: 36 percent?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, 36.9 percent. In other words, some receive home care — some don't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.—pass.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh no, no, no, not 1.—pass. Some receive home care — some don't. And we're only talking about people that are waiting, that have been paneled and are waiting for a personal care home. So what the hell happened to those that aren't getting home care? And they're not in a hospital, and they're not in a personal care home.

MR. SHERMAN: Some of them are in hospitals, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm not talking about those.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, some of that number are in hospitals. The fact that they've been assessed for personal care doesn't remove them from hospitals. Some of them are in hospitals. Some of them are in their own homes. But some of them are in hospitals. Some of them are being served with home care while they're waiting for personal care placement.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, sure, it would be all of them that are waiting. I would imagine that all of them are waiting, and if they're not placed in an institution, that they must receive, or they certainly would qualify for home care. That's exactly my point.

Well, Mr. Chairman, we could play with figures forever. It doesn't change anything that I say. I doubt very much — no, I don't doubt — I don't believe that the waiting list is reduced. I might believe that the official waiting list is reduced, because either you've changed your criteria, or you're not panelling the people as fast as we were. There is a bigger percentage of older people now; all of a sudden there's no change in the health habits of our people from one year to another; and then you have closed some personal care homes; and you mean to tell me that all of a sudden the list is going down? I don't believe that. I'm not accusing you of misrepresentation, but I don't believe it.

I believe officially — officially — because that's exactly the point we've been trying to make; that's you are squeezing; that you are not giving the service that was given before. And that's exactly what the people are saying also.

MR. SHERMAN: There is no unofficial list.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, sure there's an official list. When I was Minister, I was asked that question, and I'd ask staff, and practically every month that changed, or even two or three times a month.

It is the most difficult thing, because you'd get a different list every day, from this thing, and I don't believe that there's only 600 people who are waiting for placement. There are some that might give up.

There's more people that are going to private nursing homes, and don't forget that I asked the Minister was this a universal program; and the Minister said that he hasn't changed anything so far, it is just that he doesn't necessarily agree with the definition of health. But this was not a program based on means; this was need. I know of some people who have been panelled, who were definitely accepted as qualified, eligible for placement in a personal care home, and they were told, "Well, you have money, you go to this personal care home." I think this is important. There's a lot of figures — you can bring figures every day — and there's another thing, what kind of panelling is being done? What is the panic?

I always felt that the only people that would — because we had a waiting list, I'm not going to pretend we didn't, that's why we announced a 5-year construction program, and that's why we built some of them that this government had inherited — but our idea was although it has started as a universal program, and even the lowest class of help technically was covered in this, but in practice it was no longer. We did not accept any more of those, and the only people that were qualified, were those that it was felt could not stay at home, even with as much home care as possible.

Well, let me explain this. When the cost of home care became more than the cost of keeping people in a personal care home, there was no point, so those people should be in an institution, and I certainly don't believe, Mr. Chairman, nobody will make me believe, that there is less of a waiting list now. All right, let me put it this way, that there's less people who should be in a personal care home that are not right now than there was two years ago, I don't believe that at all. —(Interjection)—

Well, all right, the home care service is something else. Now the Home Care Service — I've asked the Minister what it was — and he's saying we can't say you underspent, because he told us that we was going to underspend again this year. So the amount doesn't mean a damn thing, Mr. Chairman. He could add another \$3 million now. If he's not going to spend it, it doesn't mean a damn thing. And he was going to hire these people. He gave me an average of an ordinary month and it was practically the same thing as two years ago, I think they had about ten people less, maybe we had more volunteers than they had. I don't know because we're not talking about the many hundred of volunteers, so therefore, it's approximately the same.

The only increase from two years, not last year, from two years was an increase of \$130,000 and all that or practically all that Home Care assessment. Well I would think that most of it, the biggest percentage is staff, people, labour, labour, and if you mean to tell me that on an increase, on 7.6 million that in two years with inflation that we had is only \$133,000.00? I think the minister before the dinner hour said that it was an 8 per cent increase in the wages. Was that in two years? In two years. Well again, we've got the people right at the bottom of the ladder, they're the ones that are getting the lowest. And begrudge that, we got that the MMA, and I don't maybe it should be more, maybe there's more money from Ottawa. It was 8.2 in one year and these people get 8 percent and I don't believe it not if it's the same people. It doesn't make sense. You know, what kind of arithmetic is that? But even if it was 8 percent, that's in two years. You know it's the same, it's the people right at the bottom of the ladder. Some of them, because you have many housekeepers and so on which is the bottom of the ladder minimum wages and they're getting 8 percent so the minister said. I would think they're still on minimum wages. Why would they get an 8 percent if they were getting minimum wages I don't know.

But anyways, Mr. Chairman, the point is that this is a scheme I don't think this government, I'm not talking about the minister, he says he likes this program. I don't think that this government like this program, I think this is one of the programs they feel they're stuck with, the other provincial Conservative governments do not have this program or not have it the same as we have and I think they're trying to cut it down. That's exactly the way it looks to me, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to leave on the record the impression that there are only 600 people on the personal care home waiting list. That was never said. What I said was that last year there were 2,233 persons assessed for personal care placement with an estimated 1,600 persons actually placed. That doesn't mean that there's only 600 people on the waiting list. It means that while 2,233 persons were assessed, 1,600 were actually placed. The total waiting list, and I agree with the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, there's considerable inflation and exaggeration of the waiting list. If you're going to deal in unofficial lists, you're never going to be able to deal with reality because in some cases, in fact, there are persons on two or three lists.

The official list, and we have it broken down by region for the province, the official list shows

a reduction in the number of Manitobans on the personal care home admission waiting list. And the honourable member may not like that, but that happens to be a fact.

MR. DESJARDINS: What is the number?

MR. SHERMAN: The waiting list, as of January, 1979, for Winnipeg, is 929.

MR. DESJARDINS: So?

MR. SHERMAN: And for rural Manitoba it is 925, for a total of 1,854.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, that's more than we had.

MR. SHERMAN: No, just a minute.

MR. DESJARDINS: Damn rights it is.

MR. SHERMAN: We hear arguments and discussions about waiting lists ranging all the way from 1,000 to 3,000. That's why I said there was no official list. The official list shows 929 and 925, for a total of 1,854 . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Right; that's more than we had.

MR. SHERMAN: . . . as of January 1st, 1979. As of January 1, 1978, which can hardly be blamed on the present administration — at that point in time we had been in office 2-½ months — as of January 1st, 1978, the official waiting list was 2,417. And what I'm trying to tell the honourable member . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Not the official list.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, the official list.

MR. DESJARDINS: No way, no . . .

MR. SHERMAN: Based on a regional breakdown. What I'm trying to tell the honourable member is that there has been a reduction in demand. . There has been a plateauing of home care services because there has been a reduction in demand and applications in that field. I do not purport or pretend to stand here for one second and argue that there aren't personal care beds needed, or that there isn't personal care accommodation needed, I agree with my honourable friend on that point, but the waiting list and the number of applicants has gone down, has reduced. And he knows from his own time as Minister that it was always expected that when the services came into play and came on stream that there would be a surge of applications and a substantial waiting list that would ultimately level off and plateau out, and that is exactly what is happening. When he talks about the increases for homemakers, I'm proud of the fact that we have been able to increase homemakers' rates by 6 percent, and that's an hourly rate.

MR. DESJARDINS: You told me 8 percent.

MR. SHERMAN: No, I didn't; I said 6 percent. That is an hourly rate. And I would remind the honourable member that 6 percent is consistent with increases in the public service, with increases in the health and hospital field, insofar as professionals other than doctors and semi-professionals and general hospital workers are concerned. It's consistent with the kind of budgetary increase we have talked about; it's consistent with every increase except the one recently announced in the MMA fee schedule, and I don't think my honourable friend and I, either of us, are inclined to argue or debate that 8.1 percent, because he recognizes, as I do and as all Manitobans do, that something has to be done to retain our doctors in Manitoba, and they have slipped in the national rankings in terms of income earning opportunities. But generally the 6 percent is consistent with the whole budgetary approach of the government. And it is a part-time job; it's not a full-time job, as he knows, and it is an hourly rate. So that, depending on the number of hours they are prepared to work and willing to offer their services, their incomes can be flexible accordingly.

MR. DESJARDINS: You know, we can argue this all night. There is no doubt that you can make

lists mean what you want them to. The Minister said that our last official list was 2,417, and that's not the case; I'll find that during my last Estimates, if I compare the list we had.

Now, the Minister said that it's going to plateau, or that it has plateaued, and I'm saying that it hasn't, because it will plateau. I read why we started this plan; we want to keep more people out of personal care homes. We want to get people out of acute hospitals. We want to get people out of Rehab. Hospitals earlier, okay? All these things. And that's what it's there for. And that's only part of it. You can't take care of the field of health and just look in one area and that's it. It's like a jigsaw puzzle; that is one component. The other component, if you are going to have a good program, you need acute beds. We've got enough acute beds — maybe a few too many acute beds. Some people will argue that, because they want to have everybody have an acute bed and some of the members of the medical profession with more beds would generate more revenue. But in general even the medical profession now admits that we have enough acute beds. But we haven't enough personal care beds. There is no way that we have enough personal care beds, and the Members of the Conservative Party, when they were sitting here, and during all the campaign said — and that was one of the big accusations on the former Minister of Health, talking about myself — that I was responsible because we didn't have enough personal care beds.

All right. And then besides that now every year there is a bigger average of people in the rank of the senior citizens, people over 65, for instance. And I'm not saying that every person over 65 has to go into a personal care bed; I'm not saying that at all, but I mean the ratio of sick people I think increases all the time. Now, it might plateau some time. It was a new program — about two years, and now it's about four years, and there is no way that it is going to plateau that much now.

Now, you know the list . . . People say "What's the use with this government?" Or if you haven't got the staff to panel them, how do you know there is going to be a list? You know, we had 80.5 people and you've got 13. You know, how are you going to have that? Now you shake your head, or your staff shake their heads, but I want to know when we get to Regional Development what the hell is going on. You know, it's the same staff that always wanted more when I was the Minister and all of a sudden everything is fine. —(Interjection)— All right, well then I'd like to know that all of a sudden everything is fine, when we were told that we needed more.

The point that I am making is that this government is reducing this program. There is no doubt about that. There is no doubt about that at all. And the Minister is saying, "Well, all right. We're spending the money. We're giving you a big increase." Well, if we're going to compare the amount asked for two years ago with the amount asked for now, the Minister is asking \$133,300 more than I asked for two years ago, for exactly the same thing.

The Minister just finished telling me that this year over last year — and we missed a year because I am talking about two years — that this year over last year there has been an increase, or the staff were given a 6 percent increase. And a 6 percent increase on \$7 million, my friend has calculated that, he tells me it's closer to \$500,000, so how could that be? So there is a reduction because you are not . . . If you consider inflation and so on, there is no darn way that this is more money, that only \$133,000 is more money for the same people. So I say that there is a reduction, and from the complaints that we're getting, there is also a reduction, and then, as I said, these people are now placed or are told to go into private hospitals — people that have been panelled. I know of some people that have been panelled that were told "yes" and they were going to be placed on the list — and mind you they were glad to have that because there were no other beds — but why? Why would they be treated in any different way when it's supposed to be a universal program. And that's exactly what happened, because these people were sent. They said, "You have money; go and spend your money first."

And I want to know, and I have asked the Minister if there had been a change; the Minister said priorities. All right, I'm talking about priorities. It was supposed to be a program based on need, not means, and apparently this is not the case. So Mr. Chairman, we certainly don't buy that this program is that — the Minister's first remark — and this is what got my dander up when he said that we were throwing money away, or he said that — he didn't say that about me — but my Honourable friend from Seven Oaks, and I was the Minister responsible for that program.

I think that it was pretty well the same kind of program, guided the same except that now there's less money and the direction you are going that you've got to squeeze a bit like all the programs in this department. It only stands to reason that they can't talk about saving money and spending less money than we did, and then say that they're running exactly the same kind of programs that we are and serving as many people, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't see how the Honourable Member for St. Boniface can say it's less money, when in 1977-78, as I pointed out earlier, the Budget was \$400,000 underspent, and that was a Budget that we inherited. In 1978-79 the Budget is \$400,000 underspent. We have, and our government and the previous government has consistently over-budgeted in this particular area, and I don't mind that, and we're probably over-budgeting again this year, but we're budgeting for \$7.7 million on Home Care Assistance and, as I pointed out, that represents an increase of, I think, 8.8 — it came out to 8.8 percent over what was actually spent in the program last year and what was spent in the program last year was what was spent in accordance with the needs, the necessities, the requirements and the applications, so I don't see how he can say it's less money.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: You want to compare apples and oranges and it's . . .

MR. SHERMAN: Well, I don't . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, you are.

MR. SHERMAN: How my honourable friend can argue that we're comparing apples and oranges when we're talking about \$700,000 more. We're still talking about dollars. We're talking about an 8.8 percent increase there; we're talking about a 6 percent increase on the hourly rate for homemakers, and also, Mr. Chairman, I'd remind my honourable friend that we have announced that we've introduced an Adult Day Care Program, a \$200,000 program which we'll get to when we get to the commission end of it. . .

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm glad you mentioned that. I'm glad you mentioned that. I'd forgotten about that.

MR. SHERMAN: . . . which is associated with the individual Personal Care Homes to provide Adult Day Care, to help keep elderly persons where they want to be, in their homes in their communities. —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon? I beg your pardon?

MR. DESJARDINS: Is the Adult Day Care under that?

MR. SHERMAN: No.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. Could I ask the honourable members to please direct their remarks to the Chair so that we in turn can make sure that all of the remarks and questions and answers in the House are properly recorded. I was discussing with the gentleman that does the recording and he has had great problems in getting it all recorded for Hansard, so I would ask all of the honourable members to please direct your remarks to the Chair and please be recognized by the Chair before speaking. The Honourable Minister, please.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I won't belabour the point but I want to put those statistics and figures and facts on the record. The program has not been reduced. It is meeting the demand. The demand has plateaued, and we have increased the expenditure and we have added a \$200,000 Adult Day Care Program.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'll try to follow your advice. This has been a yearly problem with me. You might have to remind me again, but I'll certainly try, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, well, this is not the place to talk about Adult Day Care, but I'm glad the Minister reminded me, because he made a statement that this was something new, that they had a new program, and that was not the case. That is not the case. We had a program. We had a pilot project in two areas at least. There was one at the Tache Hospital that we had a Day Care program, and to say that it is something new is not true. Okay, that has to be put on the record also.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I said that the Minister is comparing apples and oranges. I am taking a figure of the requested, or not requested, granted during the Estimates — requested and granted during the Estimates, and I'm comparing that all along. The Minister is saying that it is true that every year it has been underspent, underspent, I would suspect that in our time because the program was just starting, and underspent now because they don't want to spend the money. And

the the Minister did that on every program last year, he wants to have it both ways. He accused us of extravagance, of throwing money around. They took, as our Budget, the Budget that the Ministers never saw. They took what was prepared by staff, the first run at it, and they would know the way it is prepared now — all the departments ask for everything that they can get. The senior staff of the department looks at it, it comes back in the Policy Committee, comes back to the Minister, the Minister takes it to Management Committee — we did, anyway — the Management Committee then will work it with Cabinet and it is slashed. But they took this amount and they said, "Look at the money we saved." Isn't that right? Isn't that what they did with all the departments? And now they want to turn it around to suit their purposes and they are saying, "You asked for that but you didn't spend it." How can you have it both ways? How can you have it both ways?

Now, another point, another point. I'm comparing what he did last year, and this is the report of last year we're talking about, not this coming year, and that was down from the year before.

And then another point, Mr. Chairman, they take credit for saving the people money. We came in and those crazy Socialists were going to really get you in trouble. There was all kinds of horror stories, but we cut things to the bone. You know, this is what we inherited, but we cut things to the bone. Now, my honourable friend is saying, "You underspent in 1977-78." And he took over on October 22nd, and he was responsible for the Budget, the money that was left there, he certainly underspent as much as I did, or at least five-twelfths because he was there for five months, and this is what I'm talking about when you're comparing. I have compared what we asked for and received my last year in office, what the Minister asked for and received last year and what he's asking for this year. You know, the Minister must know then. There's some more lack of sincerity. We underspent because our program wasn't advanced. You know, you plan, you think it's going to go, and it takes a while, and we've had the same problem as was mentioned in the House last week with the Dental Program. It didn't go, all of a sudden that you can serve the whole province, a province like Manitoba — a province like Manitoba where half the population is in a small area in Winnipeg, and the other half is spread over a very large territory, so it took a while. But now my honourable friend is saying, it's a fait accompli, it's something that is accepted. This is an item we're always underspending. Why is he asking for this money when he tells us later it'll /rs be undependent? Why? Why? Is he hiding money there that he's going to use somewhere else, when he's going to be stuck and flying his balloons and he won't have any money in the Estimates so he'll take that money, or is it to pretend that he's going to do much more in this field?

And Mr. Chairman, any good manager who says, "I underspend. —(Interjection)— I do a helluva lot better than you. I can manage a heck of a lot better than you. You couldn't manage —(Interjection)— Oh, yes, you don't even give the right information and that was proven this afternoon. I can manage anyway. —(Interjection)— You didn't prove it this afternoon, so you'll have your chance. You'll have your chance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order please.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, all anybody, even my honourable friend "Winkie" out there, how can my honourable friend tell me that it is good management to say that we've panelled —(Interjection)— not you, the other one "Smiley" the one that's always smiling, that's always happy, you know the one that's smiling. Mr. Chairman, you know, even Smiley, you can't tell me that it's good management to say that last year we understand because it has reached a plateau but we're going to spend more this year. That also doesn't make any sense. If it has plateaued then you know you don't have to keep on asking for more money. You don't have to. —(Interjection)—

MR. SHERMAN: Did you ever hear of inflation?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, I heard of inflation and that's the point I'm trying to make that you're not even taking consideration of inflation to pay these people because you haven't got that much money. So then you're not going to do more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would once again please remind the honourable members to direct their remarks to the Chair so it can be properly recorded. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: I think this hear, hear should be registered as an important speech by that member there from Roblin. That's one of his major speeches, hear hear.

Mr. Chairman, the minister just finished saying eell, what about inflation. What about inflation?

so then he's admitting that the increase is only to do what he did last year then, not to increase, that he's only taking care of inflation. You know, you can't have it every possible way. We heard that it has plateaued; we heard that he's a good manager, that they are good managers and the minister said what about inflation and that would indicate that that's why there's an increase this year, for inflation. Therefore, when we say that you are not doing as much in this program it is true, because it has plateaued, so you know, you can't just continually use figures to suit yourself and then the next day, turn them around and use them in a different way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just say a few words and get out of the City and in Flin Flon where the men are men and the women are very proud of it. You talk about 19 waiting for extended care facilities, you talk about the long list waiting for care. I have some local problems in the same vein and I'd like permission to read this into the Record, it's very interesting and very true. The minister has got a lot of compliments about what a nice fellow he is, and what a good minister and I buy that, I go along with that. He was also a very good person in opposition, Mr. Chairman, he did a good job in opposition. He did a job that I'd be proud to do in my position in opposition. He didn't mince words. When we used rough tactics he'd accuse us of using jackboots and running over the people of Manitoba which was fair ball. He suggested to our Minister of Labour his only chance for recovery was to see a psychiatrist and this was fair if he used those tactics. Mr. Chairman, I would not go that far.

I would say that the problem in Flin Flon — and he well knows it, I've tried to impress him with the problem and it is my fault, I haven't impressed upon him the importance of an extended care facility. I thought it was high on priorities. And what I'd like to know, Mr. Chairman, is what happens —and the minister I think knows this, he was astute enough to see the necessity of a hospital at Snow Lake and he did put a big effort and got that thing did, and maybe the fault lies with me or maybe with him.

But with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read this into the record by two people who are not political, they're not political people, they're trying to do a job under bad circumstances not only under this government, under any government and it isn't made easy but here is the first one, Mr. Chairman.

Don Nesbitt, of the Provincial Health and Community Services Department is one person who thinks Flin Flon needs and deserves a personal care facility. A 30 bed personal care facility was to be built in the City by the previous NDP government, but the plan was later put on hold following the election the Progressive Conservatives. Mr. Chairman, I don't take any credit for that because we should have did it before the eight years were up. I'm not taking any credit, we were going to do it, we should have done it before the election. But, anyway, Mr. Chairman, small communities such as The Pas have extended care facilities but Flin Flon with a longer and older population, doesn't, Mr. Nesbitt said. The Area Director for the department's Flin Flon District, Mr. Nesbitt cites figures which show 19 people in the city at this time have been certified by a Medical Board as being eligible for extended care treatment. He said in an interview this week that figure does not include those people who have left Flin Flon for communities which have personal care. He said those 19 people who were certified by a panel comprised of himself, a senior nurse and a doctor, no political person involved with this. The certification means that they could move into any Manitoba facility tomorrow provided there is space, he said. If Flin Flon's in limbo personal care facility were opened tomorrow, its 30 bed capacity would be immediately two-thirds full. Figures from the Manitoba Health Services Commission were used to illustrate his view that a facility is required in this city. The statistics show that in The Pas 10.7 per cent of the population —and if more recent figures were available they'd probably show a greater percent of senior citizens.

I don't think they, people in general really realize that Flin Flon is an old community. He noted that many people who have lived in Flin Flon for most or all their lives are forced to leave the city if they require extended care. Often, these people go to St. Paul's residence in The Pas if there's space. Last summer, eight beds at Flin Flon General Hospital were converted for extended care use. These eight beds, Mr. Chairman, were for hospital patients and the demand is so great they're using these beds for these people who should be put in extended care. So people who need hospital beds — I'll go into that a little later — are deprived of a bed in hospital. At that time and since the hospital administrator has said this was in response to the need for personal care in Flin Flon. That is from Don Nesbitt who as I said is the head of social services.

Now this one, Mr. Chairman, is written by Roy Brown, Roy Brown who is the Hospital Administrator and I've said and I'll repeat again, non-political who became so frustrated, he was tired of beating his head against the wall, trying for conditions to be better in Flin Flon, so finally he retired or resigned, and he's gone to another province. —(Interjection)—Mr. Speaker, do I have

to put up with this twittering? And he says this: Elective surgery postponed. Elective surgery at Flin Flon General Hospital has been postponed in recent weeks because of a shortage of acute care beds, said the hospital administrator, Roy Brown. He said the Flin Flon Clinic has been told to limit the request for surgery in cases where it isn't necessary. The postponements are becoming more and more common as time goes on, he said in an interview yesterday. Restating his expressed concern in a December 1st, 1970 interview, Mr. Brown said there's enormous pressure on acute care beds. Part of this pressure on acute beds has resulted because some beds in hospital have been converted for use by extended care patients. A facility for those people was to be built when the previous NDP government was in power but with the election of the Progressive Conservatives in 1977 the bid was put on hold of course.

It is expected that later this month the government will announce whether or not the proposed Flin Flon personal care facility will be allowed to proceed. It isn't, it isn't, Mr. Chairman. In a December interview, Mr. Brown said that in some cases patients have been lying on stretchers waiting for acute beds. In yesterday's interview, Mr. Brown indicated this situation has reduced the hospital to often being a referral hospital. He said he doesn't like the situation. "We have everything here but to do the job. Surgeons at the hospital may decide to pursue their careers elsewhere if the situation persists," he said. A couple have already left.

Mr. Chairman, the minister knows it is difficult to get doctors to go to Flin Flon, Snow Lake, Lynn Lake, those places; it's difficult in the first place. And when this comes up and doctors that we do have there leave, of course this emphasizes that bad situation. As yet no patients have suffered as a result of this general situation. Mr. Chairman, I don't know what I can say that would emphasize the position of these people, more than is said in these two I read.

But, Mr. Chairman, Flin Flon has a stable population. People who have worked hard and made an impact on the north; Flin Flon was the guiding light in the north. Thompson, Lynn Lake, these places are merely suburbs when you come right down to it. And they've paid their fair share of taxes. Now they need assistance so they can spend their last few years with a little dignity and a little comfort.

Not only Flin Flon, Mr. Chairman, Snow Lake is involved in this. People in Snow Lake, they originate from Flin Flon. The young people are sent up there. The junior miners are sent there; the new mill, it'll be junior people who go there and they're young now. They have a new hospital, but about 30 years from now they'll use this facility and it's obvious to me it is needed.

And the future up there, Mr. Chairman, the future up there is good. When the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting Company built 100 houses, and they're going to build 100 more, and they built apartment buildings, invested in a 28 million mill, I mean, it's not a fly-by-night town. It's not something you're going to put a lot of money into, and then people are going to leave the town. Flin Flon is stable. And the population is going to grow. I have impressed I think the Minister that the economy is stable and it is needed. And the senior citizens are using The Pas, and that's 100 miles away from Flin Flon, a little more from Snow Lake and if your Father or Mother are in one of these homes, and they're lonesome people, they want to be visited and you can't afford — these people aren't affluent — so maybe once a week they visit or more than that, which doesn't make for a good relationship or comfort to the people that we owe so much to.

I think the minister realizes the need is there; the economy is stable and the conditions can only become worse if it continues because people do get old. I'd like the minister to take a long, good, hard look and try and impress his colleagues and his leader that this is high on priority. I sincerely mean this. The Flin Flon people were so sure they were getting this that they took \$250,000 of town taxes to use for excavation and moving buildings, to get ready for this facility that never materialized.

Mr. Chairman, I'll conclude by a little story told in the House of Commons by a member, who was trying to impress the opposition of the little his constituency receive from the government. He said his little grandson went to the bathroom to perform a natural function, and he said, "Come in grandpa and see this," he said, "lokk one hand." Good, then he got confident and he said, "Look, grandpa, no hands" and of course it spattered. What we're getting at, Mr. Chairman, is the few spatterings left over from the other places in this Province. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, this isn't the line out of the Estimates, but I would ask your indulgence for 30 seconds just to acknowledge the plea of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, who is certainly to be commended for the tireless manner in which he has campaigned for a new personal care home and better health facilities in Flin Flon. I recognize his efforts and I think that he should be recognized for the dedication that he has brought to that job. I can only tell him that the people in the WIIINNIPEGOSIS AREA SAY THE SAME THING, THE PEOPLE IN THE Interlake area say the same thing. We're trying to move as quickly as we can on needs in a number of areas of the Province. It really came down to looking at the priority between moving on Snow Lake at

this particular time or Flin Flon. I want to assure him that the Flin Flon consideration is, if I may use what he will consider perhaps a tired cliché, is at the top of the priority list. And he will be in this House, he will be in this House when we move forward on that facility.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank the minister for his kind remarks. I realize I stuck this in the Estimates when it shouldn't have been in there. It's at the end of his Estimates. But I am leaving Friday, and my time is, you know . . . I won't be here to discuss this, and I appreciate what you've said. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Point Douglas.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a few points for the minister for clarification. I would like to find out if it will be possible, we are talking now about saving money here and there, but at the same time we are not giving proper service for our senior citizens. The point which I have right now I would like to ask the minister is, what can be done in such circumstances, which I had quite a few of them, when for instance a mother around 70 years of age would like to stay with her children, it might be a son or daughter, but it's quite difficult financially speaking for the daughter or for the children to support her completely?

Then they are making an application to the Health Department for financial assistance and actually they are not getting anything, because they have a special rule — I don't know what kind of rules they are, maybe the minister will be able to explain it to me — but, for instance, if such an elderly person is located in a personal care home, I think we as a taxpayer are paying approximately \$500 or \$600 a month. Now, the same person may get even better care at home with their children — it might be a son or daughter, whatever — for let me see, half of it, but according to the present rules which we have right now, they are not qualified. What can be done in this particular field? Like the minister just mentioned, we have a waiting list in Winnipeg close to 1,000 and almost the same thing in rural Manitoba. What can be done in this area to satisfy, let's put it this way, in two fields. That first of all this person might be a mother or father, can stay at home with the children and at the same time will help a little financially to the family — pay a certain amount of money, and I'm looking for a way, how can it be done? Maybe the Minister will explain or give me some idea how can we solve this problem on a humanitarian field.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, that is supposedly what the home care program is all about. If the honourable member is telling me that he knows of persons who have applied for home care service and have not been able to obtain it, then I would like to obtain those names and those situations from him and I will pursue it directly with him. If he's talking about a different kind of a concept of payment for families for looking after relatives in their homes, that may be ideal and humanitarian to a considerable degree, Mr. Chairman, but I think also there are traps of a social nature and a family responsibility nature built into that kind of a philosophy. I can't assure him that this government is prepared to embrace that kind of philosophy because it opens up the entire moral and ethical question of family responsibility and whether one should then be paid to look after one's young relatives as well as one's elderly relatives. So it's an issue that perhaps we should discuss and I would be interested in the honourable member's views on it, but it's not a philosophy that I think could be responsibly embraced by very many members of this House at this time. Certainly, speaking for members on my side of the House, I think it would be a very difficult philosophy to pursue.

MR. MALINOWSKI: Another point I have, Mr. Chairman, I would like to also find out some more information from the Minister, I have quite a few complaints from the nursing homes, from the personnel. For instance, they have a really difficult time, if they are approaching their shift, let me say they are starting seven o'clock to four o'clock, whatever, and suppose on this certain field five or six persons are scheduled to work and two or three of them will not show up. But the job has to be done and they don't have any substitutes, any help. If he can look into it, that something like that won't happen.

The other point also, I have complaints about the food, that recently we have all kinds of complaints, not only from the residents in nursing homes or personal care homes, but also from the families, that they are not getting fresh food and in many cases they are getting sick because of it. Maybe the Minister will just look into it and check and prevent something like that in the future.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, there is a standards division of the Health Services Commission that monitors the performance of personal care homes and if there are difficulties and problems

of that nature, then I can assure him that it's the responsibility of the Health Services omission to act on them, to move on them and certainly to acquaint me with the situation. If he knows of personal situations of that kind, I wish he'd bring them forward to me. I think we should discuss that under the appropriation for the Health Services Commission. I just want to say for the record though, Mr. Chairman, I have had no such complaints directed to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson, I'd like to get back to the Minister's statistics regarding home care. I'm wondering if those statistics are consistent with the statistics he has on Page 59 of the annual report. The numbers there are somewhat different, the percentages are somewhat different, perhaps he's talking about a different time frame when he's providing the statistics right now.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the honourable member could give me time to investigate that. But at first glance, I don't notice any great discrepancies. If we're looking at that particular page, there's a reference to the fact that there were 7,648 persons admitted to the home care program, and that is correct. Admissions for 1978 were 7,648, the figure given for last year was 8,562. The report goes on to disclose the same statistics that I gave to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface earlier when we were discussing the 26.6 percent, the 32.6 and the 40.8. It refers to the fact that discharges for the 12 months from the home care program totalled 7,880 and that is correct. It jibes with my departmental informational figures as it should, because that is the departmental information. So that I'm not sure that I detect the discrepancies that the honourable member suggests are there.

MR. PARASIUK: You see, one of the difficulties, Mr. Chairperson, that one has is when the Minister reads out a whole set of statistics and doesn't provide them in written form on a sheet — I think he fully realizes that they will be asked — it creates some difficulties. The number that he referred to at one time was 36.9 percent for 1977-78, versus 43.2 percent for the previous year, and I don't see any of those statistics on this page of the annual report that I have before me. And then you get into some of those difficulties of trying to reconcile those types of statements that are being flipped out, and you haven't got a chance to check the written record of them. You have to wait two or three days for Hansard to come out, and we're past that item then.

So I think for things like dental care and home care and for the personal care homes, it would be wise, I think if the Minister would undertake to try and get the updated information on sheets and hand them out to the members so that we could see them in written form and not have to wait for Hansard to get a confirmation of something that we then can't raise again, because we've passed the item. And on that basis, I'd like to ask the Minister if he could undertake to provide to us the comparisons of waiting lists for personal care homes last year and this year. What are the waiting lists for these personal care homes? Again, if that was on a written form, broken down per region, that would be of some use to us. Just as right now we have the Minister indicating verbally some breakdown on a regional basis and then if we look at the Annual Report, which is what we have to look at, we don't have that breakdown on a regional basis. And I think that's unfortunate because what we get, as constituency representatives and not people administering the program, are a continuous set of requests and complaints regarding home care and regarding attempts to get into senior citizens housing, and attempts to get into personal care homes. And we have the specific instances that all of us on this side, and I'm pretty sure members on the other side, run into, where people are phoning them, finding that they aren't being bulletined quickly to determine whether in fact they qualify for home care or not. So we go over and visit them and we find that 87-year-old people, who have difficulty getting around in their homes and one would assume that they do qualify, and ultimately over one or two or a three-month process they qualify, but that is a long process of paneling. And the same thing holds true with personal care homes.

I find it really staggering when the Minister is telling us that somehow the demand for personal care homes has gone down from 2,400 on January 1st of 1978 to some 1,800 for January 1st, 1979, because that flies entirely in the face of the demographic trends we know are taking place. You know, we have an out-migration of 10,000 people but I'm quite certain — and we haven't been able to get the breakdown of that 10,000 people — that those 10,000 people do not include very many of those people who are waiting to get into personal care homes. Most of those people who are leaving are the young. And we know that each year the population is getting older.

We have instances and specific instances of people being kept in Emergency wings of hospital, not being able to get into acute care beds because the doctors don't feel they should go into acute care beds and there aren't personal care spaces available. That's happened to me, or to constituents

of mine who have complained. There have been references to that matter, I think, by Dr. Crust, and we have those types of specifics but it's very difficult for us, as individual members, to get the overall view of what's going on. And I think that really since this is of such serious concern, and since we are receiving so many complaints on this, that it's incumbent upon the department and incumbent upon the Minister to provide far more detailed statistics than are provided in the Annual Report, even, where they are very sketchy and are a page and one-quarter of statistics, which really don't describe the program particularly well and in any depth, and don't break it down on a regional basis to determine whether in fact there is some type of equal access to personal care homes, equal access to home care, to what extent are people in Transcona getting better or less access than people in other areas. And those are things that we, as constituency representatives, I think really have to be on top of. And that's information that we can only get from the Minister, and that's the type of information that I think is best gotten from the Minister in the Estimates process, and we're not getting that type of a breakdown.

Yet one of the reasons why we keep asking questions relating to home care and personal care homes is that we find that there is tremendous pressure at the constituency level. Obviously the need is not being met, because if I had to list the one item that constituents phone me about most, it is the area of admittance to nursing homes. And related to that is the whole question of what type of home care do they get in the interim.

That's why I find some difficulty with the statistics, as my colleague, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, had. When you say 26.6 percent would have been listed for placement in a personal care home, what I find so astounding about that is that when I go to people and try to get them into a personal care home, or when I go to the authorities, they say, "This person has to be paneled." And if that person qualifies through the paneling process for personal care, that person will then, God willing, in a year and a half, or two years, or two and a half years, or three years, get into the personal care home. But that takes place after the paneling, that takes place after the paneling. And without getting ghoulish about it — because these waiting lists do appear to be increasing, these waiting lists do appear to be increasing — when the home care people tell the clients that they are on a two year, or a two and a half, or a three year waiting list, these people then phone us and say, "What am I supposed to do? In three years I won't be here."

That's why this becomes a very, very critical item in the Estimates. Because when you talk about a freeze or a cutback or a holding operation, that type of thing is best passed on to people who possibly can survive it and make up for it in the future. But 87-year-old people, or people of that age and with infirmities, we cannot make up for it in the future.

And you know when I look at something like the list going down from 2,400 to 1,800, if statistics are being kept — and I don't think this is an unfair question or a ghoulish question — how many people on that list died, waiting to get into personal care homes or waiting to get into a hospital? Or did they just get into a hospital for the last week? Because the Minister is trying to indicate that the need for this program is plateauing, yet we, as constituency representatives, are telling him exactly the opposite, from the type of empirical data that we have, which granted is not the overview type of empirical data that the department might have, but if we appear to be suspicious of the sketchy type of empirical data being provided by the department and by the Minister, I hope he understands that we do that in large part because we are receiving this type of pressure from our constituents. And I don't think I am alone in saying this: that that is the area of greatest concern of the constituents of Transcona. That is what I receive most calls about, and, as a constituency representative, I feel most frustrated in not being able to assure these older people that the public or the government can, in fact, provide that type of service for them in the remaining years of their life.

And I think that what's important here is trying to break down this feeling of uncertainty and hopelessness that develops in these older people, because what has been happening is that a number of people do seem to be saying what's the use. And I think that the Minister surely doesn't want people who are eligible for either home care or personal home care placement, nursing home placement, to somehow not get what they are entitled to. I don't think that's the Minister's intention, nor do I think that's the government's intention, and yet this slow response, the increase in length of the waiting lists, is tending to make people give up. So I'm wondering if the Minister has any more detailed statistics on this, if they're broken down on a regional basis, and if they are, could they be tabled, if not now, sometime in the course of the Estimates so that they can be perused a bit so that when we come back to the Minister's Salary we can be in a position, if we do have some objections, to get back at it and get into a bit of a further debate.

What I don't think we want to treat these Estimates as, is some type of a shell game that we go through with figures being sort of shuffled around and commented on, and we pass one item and that's signed, sealed, and can't be opened again. I think we want to look objectively at what type of program is being delivered, so I invite the Minister, if he has those statistics, to table them,

if not today, possibly tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member's been around here for a long time. He was associated with the affairs of the previous government closely, and he has sat in the Legislature, if not in the Chamber, at least in the gallery for many years, and he knows that there is no difference in the presentation of the information in the Annual Report this year than from the presentation in any other year. The exercise we're going through right now is designed precisely to respond to the types of questions that he is asking. I've attempted to do that. I've given, in the view of my honourable friend, the Member for St. Boniface, albeit a confusing number of statistics, I certainly haven't withheld the statistical information that's been asked for.

I've had time while the Honourable Member from Transcona's been speaking to review those two pages in the Annual Report that he's referred to, and I find that every statistic that I have discussed with the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is contained on those two pages with one exception, and every one of them jibes, as it should do — Indeed, I was just a little concerned when the honourable member gave me the impression that they didn't jibe with the figures I'd provided — jibes with the figures that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and I have been discussing. The single exception is that reference to persons on the waiting list for Personal Care Homes and that is not included in that section of the Annual Report because that's dealing specifically with the Home Care Program.

Now, he's asked me about the regional breakdown. That is also contained in the Annual Report. Page 152 of the Annual Report gives him a regional breakdown of the precise 2,233 Manitobass to whom I referred in my exchanges with the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, as to their applications for different levels of care, and I think if the Honourable Member for Transcona cares to examine the Annual Report he will find that that kind of information is contained in the Annual Report, and there's no need for any tabling of any redundant and duplicative material.

He says that he has concerns about the waiting list for Home Care, there is no waiting list for Home Care. There's no panelling for Home Care. I must say that I have not had, to my knowledge, to my recollection, I haven't had a single letter from the Honourable Member for Transcona about persons having difficulty receiving Home Care. If he's having those difficulties, if he's the advocate for his constituents that he claims to be, why does he not write the Minister of Health and the Department of Health and say, "I have two or three cases here who are having difficulty receiving Home Care." He well may have, but to my knowledge, to my recollection, he has not written me to say that. So it's easy to stand up and say that he has all these complaints about people waiting for Home Care, but he hasn't passed them on to the one area that should have the responsibility for responding to him. If I did not respond to him I would be shirking my responsibilities and I don't believe that I should be accused of that. I haven't had that kind of information or request, or difficulty, or anxiety, conveyed to me by him.

There certainly is a waiting list for Personal Care beds. I'm not going to stand up here, as I said before, and argue that we've got enough Personal Care beds in this province. I'm trying to tackle that as quickly and as practically as I can, and we are making a start on it. We have unfrozen some of the projects that my predecessor, the Member for St. Boniface, had given approval to. We have added one or two projects of our own. We hope to be able to do the same thing during the next two or three years so, you know, I'm working with the proprietary owners, operators who were either phased down or closed down, hoping to be able to re-introduce that operation in facilities that meet public health requirements in the very near future, and I'm hoping to overcome that shortage in the two or three years immediately ahead. I don't argue with him when he says we need more Personal Care beds, but we are not in difficulty on Home Care.

MR. PARASIUK: Mr. Chairperson, the difficulties with Home Care do exist. When we receive calls from elderly people, we pass those calls on, not to the Minister, but to the office within our region, and then we monitor whether, in fact, someone goes out there in one day, two days, three days, four days, five days, and we deal with that through that office, and we try and deal with the responses that we get from the office saying, "We don't have the staff to get out there and deal with that quickly and we will deal with it as quickly as possible."

Now, if in fact the Minister is saying, "Well, whenever you run into a problem like that in terms of priorities, call me and I'll deal with that one particular case and that will sort of solve the problem." That won't solve the problem. —(Interjection)— That's right. And, you know, when the Minister says, "Well, I'll deal with this quickly, and give me specifics", there are some easy specifics to give him, and there are some difficult ones.

I know of one particular case in my constituency where a girl, who is a paraplegic, has been

married, and has requested a meeting with the Minister a number of times and the Minister has turned down that request. Now, if you want the specifics they can be brought out but, again, I'm saying that that deals with the symptoms and not the causes. And the causes is that the staff say that they can't deal with it quickly enough because they are short-staffed and they are working as best they can, and from what I gather when they get the opportunity of going out and dealing with the people, that they do do a good job. I think the Home Care staff on the whole work incredibly hard in very difficult conditions, and sometimes there are some expectations that people have of the actual Home Care workers that I don't think can be met, and those are instances where we, as elected representatives, frankly try and defend the program against unfair expectations. Someone's a homemaker, and someone who is older expects that person to come in and virtually, you know, clean the house with a toothbrush right down to the exact last corner, and do it in a way that this person did when he or she was 28 years old, and those are expectations that usually can't be met by this type of program and people have to be told that.

So I don't think it's a matter of just trying to exaggerate claims and exaggerate cases, and if we are supposed to keep this catalogue, you know, I just think that the Minister's taking the wrong approach. It struck me that he took the same approach with Dr. Crust when Dr. Crust complained publicly about the way it was happening in a hospital because acute-care beds were being used by people who didn't need acute-care beds, but should be somewhere else, and the Minister's first response was, "Don't rock the boat. Don't say this publicly. Why didn't you call me privately?" Well, again, that deals with the symptom; it doesn't deal with the cause. I don't know what the Minister is trying to promote. Is he trying to promote this conspiracy of silence, because I think that that is wrong if that is being done. I don't want to cow people who are administrators into saying when they feel technically that they do not have sufficient money to carry out the program as per the objectives of the program.

And you know, that's happened. You know, my colleague, the Member for St. Boniface, reads a letter that he receives from a Conservative MP complaining about cutbacks, and I'm wondering why the staff of the St. Boniface Hospital haven't said more about this. You know, you can go and you can talk privately to people in some positions of authority, and as long as it's off the record they are prepared to talk about it. As soon as you ask if they are willing to put it on the record, they get very nervous and they're afraid of further cutbacks. Now, that puts them in dilemma, and it puts us in dilemma, and unless you can quite easily say well, you know, if they aren't prepared to back up their whisperings with documentation, well, I guess they don't have a leg to stand on and yet, if it didn't happen so frequently, I'd sympathize with them because of that particular position.

But all of us do visit Personal Care Homes, all of us do visit the hospitals, all of us deal directly with the initial contacts for Home Care, because often we are the ones who are called by older people, who often don't know the specifics of Home Care, who find that they are in difficult straits and need some help. Sometimes it's temporary, often, because of their age and because of their declining health, that the help that they require is more permanent. Or relatives call us, or relatives who are visiting in from out of town call us, and it's easy to say, well, the family should look after these people, or take on more responsibility, but the extended kinship network is being broken down somewhat; the families are becoming more nuclear. People do move. Often they have to move for economic reasons. They come back to visit their parents and they find that their parents just aren't able to keep up, and in those periods they contact us.

Now, the strange thing is that the calls have been increasing rather than decreasing, and I guess the frustrations have been increasing rather than decreasing, and the difficulty with the way in which the Estimates are chopped up is that they are indeed all part of an integrated package because, especially with older people, Home Care and Nursing Home Care are so closely related.

In the case of Transcona, we were supposed to be getting, through a sponsored group, Park Manor, an enriched Senior Citizens' Home which was going to be half way between the Nursing Home and the Senior Citizens' Home. We have a waiting list for the Nursing Home. We have a waiting list for the Senior Citizens' Home, and we would have a waiting list for this enriched elderly persons' housing project which was going to be tied in to the Nursing Home complex, which was really very fascinating in concept, had the entire support of the community, had the entire support of the residents in the area who weren't worried about a zoning change. In fact, they all agreed to it unanimously.

What this enriched elderly persons' complex would have provided — it would have provided a system whereby older couples wouldn't have to be broken up. If one person got ill enough to require Personal Care services, that person could have tied in to the services provided by the Personal Care Home but could still stay in a unit that was part of the enriched senior citizens' complex, and that meant that an elderly couple wouldn't have to be broken up because again, that is probably the most traumatic thing that happens to an older couple, who have this incredible

bond of love and experience between themselves and they find that one of them reaches a stage of illness where they require that type of care that the spouse can't provide because the spouse, himself or herself is too frail or too weak to provide the care for the mate, even though that person can get by by themselves.

Those are things that I know my colleague, the Member for STT. Boniface was working out a year and a half ago. Those were things that seemed to be on the drawing boards a year and a half ago, and those are things that are no longer talked about today. I know you can raise that and you can say, well, we're not into that item right now in the Estimates, but in terms of going to a person who is in their late 80s, or a couple, one sicker than the other, and they ask for help and they don't know really, often where to turn to, and they don't know all the intricacies of government or of governmental departments, and you go out and you see those people, and then you try and determine what type of programs they might be eligible for and what the community services office might be able to provide, and you find that often the specific rigid program doesn't deal with their problem, but you find that there are a number of these problems. The pattern is repeating itself to the point where maybe it would be wise to have that in fill program, or maybe it would be wise to make the program sufficiently flexible to take into account those particular circumstances of that individual or that couple, that the whole system seems to be breaking down.

And whereas three, four years ago, there was this attempt, not to duck problems, but to recognize that they exist, to realize that there is flexibility, you should try and build flexibility into programs so that problems can be better be met, that that spirit seems to have very definitely been replaced by an attitude of retrenchment and by an attitude of, in a sense, defining in bureaucratic terms, the problem away, by saying, well, our program doesn't apply, we can't do anything, what are we supposed to do, and you leave it at that. Meanwhile, what is that particular client or citizen supposed to do? And that's something that doesn't seem to be dealt with by this government, and doesn't seem to be dealt with by this department.

And you know when we come to Estimates and the Minister has an opportunity to say what the particular thrust of his department is, one would expect that he would get into some of these things, rather than saying, well, you know, everything's been done. Obviously all those things haven't been done and obviously it's a tremendous cost to society for that elderly couple not to receive care.

I don't know what it costs society in quantitative terms when people are on a waiting list for personal care homes and don't get in. Is there an economic cost? I know the moral cost is incredibly high. And I don't know how we put measurements on that. But again, I'm wondering if we are keeping statistics of that. How many people just don't get a chance to utilize the program, even though they've qualified, because in my estimation the waiting lists are growing longer and the hopelessness is getting greater. And that spirit of problem solving that used to exist within the department, used to exist because some leadership was being provided by the Minister, doesn't seem to exist right now, and the Minister of this present administration seems to be working himself into this shell, and I can appreciate sometimes that he does feel besieged. But I think the way to get out of feeling besieged is to go out and start communicating with the public as to what some of the problems are and how this government will try and deal with them, in a way that the people have some confidence in, rather than saying, well, we're going to go back to volunteerism, we're going to go back to the family looking after these people, that in itself is not the answer because frankly, if it was the answer, if it was the answer, we wouldn't need personal care homes. But the whole patterns of families and families staying together is changing tremendously because of communication improvements, transportation improvements, people are required to be mobile.

You know, we have the First Minister getting up and saying, well, you know, people are leaving Manitoba because there is this tremendous pull in Alberta. There are these jobs there, the resources are being developed. They're not there for the 85 year old people. So the family gets broken up, it's a natural thing. And we don't have the Minister providing any statements on that at all, any positive statements. He isn't giving me anything to take back to my constituents to relieve their feeling of hopelessness in this respect. I hate bringing all the things together like personal care homes or enriched senior citizens' housing, but they are part of the package. They are part of the package of need of older people. And for us to say, well we can't, as a society, afford these types of things, just is not accepted. We have a population that his own staff tells us is getting progressively older in Manitoba, hherefore despite the Minister's statements to the contrary and despite the official lists of the Minister to the contrary, the requirements of home care, the requirements for personal care homes, will be growing in the future, will be growing, not declining.

And therefore since that need is going to be growing it's not an analogous matter to investing in elementary schools when the baby boom has passed us, it's rather a matter of realizing that this is going to be a growing need, and that an investment now, to meet this shortfall for those

1,800 people on the waiting list for personal care homes is a very wise thing, because in five years that 1,800 will be much greater than 1,800. And 30 years from now there will be still that continuing, ongoing requirement for the personal care homes. So that is a wise societal investment that shouldn't be shirked, because then you say, well what's the opposite to that, not building them, and then what is that cost? I guess we come back to that very simple, factual statement that the Minister has yet to provide us. Of those 2,400 people who were on the waiting list last year, how many were not able to take advantage of personal care homes, because they died. Can he provide us with that type of statistics, which I think is a very normal type of statistic for the department to keep.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a few points on this. First of all, I'd like to ask a question, and I'll ask first so the Minister could see if he can get the information. I'd like to have the average monthly cost of the home care per citizen served during the fiscal year 1977-78, if I may.

Then, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make sure that we understand each other. I don't think that I complained because we were getting too much information. In all fairness to the Minister, I must say that he's giving as much information I think that I gave when I was the minister, I think he's trying to provide the information. I don't agree with the way he's using some of the information, but I was probably doing the same thing when I was sitting on the other side, so I have no complaints. But I don't want it said that I complained because he was giving me too much information.

Another point I want to make, I want it known that there was a statement by the Honourable Member for Point Douglas, and that is not necessarily — I don't want this thrown later on in our face to say that this is the policy of this party, of the party, or our policy when we were in office. It's certainly not my policy of paying relatives to take care of their people. I am very much opposed to that. I concede that in certain areas, certain times it is legit, some people feel well, I could take care of my parents a little better but I'd have to go to work, and they feel that they should be paid on that but if you open that up, what are you going to do? You're going to have so much abuse and you're going to have people, everybody's going to want to be paid to take care of their children and their fathers and parents and uncle,, and so on, and that's the last thing I want to do.

I also look back, sometimes on the old days — and I wish we had the old days back, I'd like to see like it was in the old days where every family took care of their own father and mother. But society has changed. We're not going to have that. I'm not waiting for this to come. I regret that part of the change. Some of it cannot be helped because of the society that we're in, because of the high cost of living and people living in a different manner. I recognize that. But certainly that doesn't mean that I can't appreciate that we should not bring any programs that will get the people then being even more mercenary than they are. And believe me, many people are, and if we'll start paying people, pretty soon we would have to pay people to give birth, and so on. I, for one, don't want to see that at all, Mr. Chairman. Although, as I said, in certain areas, there is no doubt that some people, if we could do that, if we could make exceptions, there are some people that could stay at home and take care of an elderly father or mother with some help. But those people, the only way that we can do it, there's some help now, unfortunately it's called Welfare for some of these people. I think that they would be recognized, they would be entitled, beside the pension, it would at least pay for these people, except those that have to go and make a living, if they have children and so on. So I recognize that this exists. But the good that we would do would certainly be more than offset with the abuse that we would have in this area, Mr. Chairman.

Now, I'd like to cover, also, my role, the way I see it, the role of the MLA. I can say to the Minister that since we've changed places, I've never contacted anybody of the staff, even those that I knew quite well, to try to get inside information. I don't think this is right. I might try it in another department but not in a department where I was the minister, where I'd be putting the staff on the spot. I don't believe in that at all, and I told them when I left. I told the staff, in a kind of a farewell get-together that we had, I told them that I wouldn't do it, and I didn't expect them, and they should have the same loyalty to the Minister.

Now, I don't go and seek hospitals, even those in my community, to try and get something on the government. If they invite me, if they want to discuss things with me, I certainly will meet with them, and I think this is a fact, that I've been given information. I suppose because I was the Minister of Health I'm getting that, not only from my constituency but all over the place, and it's true, when I ask them to put it down on paper or could I quote them, they want no part of it because there is that fear that I mentioned to the Minister. There is some fear, there is no doubt about that.

They don't know where they're going and they're afraid that they're going to be hurt. So if constituents get in touch with me, if they tell me that they received a letter, or if I get a copy of a letter they sent to the Minister, I don't really bother. I tell them, if they tell me that all of a sudden that they were told that there was no more home care, I don't intend to go and bother the Minister. This is not my job because the Minister is there to administer, and they were elected. They have a mandate and they can change the programs. There is no point in me trying to get a meeting with the Minister any time that there is something that I don't like. This is the time to do it.

Now, if there is somebody that needs assistance, if they qualify for home care and so on, I call the department or the Minister, or his Executive Assistant, and pass on the information and ask them to get in touch with these people, and this I will continue to do, but I will not accept the Minister telling us there is no abuse, that I'm not a detective. I don't believe in a fascist state and I'm not trying to do that work. I'm going to try to help the people, but I'm not responsible for the programs of this government and the time to argue and to try to convince the government to change and to cajole to do anything; this is the time to do it now.

So I certainly don't intend, as I say, to be a detective or to start arguing with the Minister all year around on a certain program. This is not my role.

There is something that was mentioned that I would like to just spend a very, very short time on, and that is the enriched senior citizen home. I do not claim that we had really started this program; I can't claim that. I am not chastising the Minister or the government, but I would like to appeal for that. I think it is a program. I can say that I would mention it. I discussed it with the Committee during my last year in office, and I had the feeling that I was getting backing from all sides of the House. I can say that this was mentioned with my colleague many times and I can say that the principle was approved by Cabinet shortly — when did we finish the Estimates, I don't remember how many months there were before the election — and it was felt that any more construction of senior citizen homes, although it wasn't constructed by the Department of Health, that that would be taken into consideration. I think, as the Member for Transcona, I think it is an excellent program and I would hope that when they start, if they start — and I haven't paid that much attention to the construction of senior citizens' homes, they have had enough worry in this department — but I would like us to see if something could be done.

Now it is certainly under this item, because I am talking about a form of home care, I said a while ago that there are many components in this field, and I agree, and one of them, the day care for the elderly, is certainly one. It is certainly one that I'm pleased that the government is going in that direction and maybe will increase those, and I think that this is going to save money and certainly help those who are taking care of senior citizens to give them maybe a day out once in a while, and a chance to relax and then to give certain services to the patient that they can't give themselves. Some of them can't manage to give an adult, especially if he is as heavy as I am — granted, there are not that many — but it's pretty difficult to try to give them a shower and abbat and I think that you need that. I certainly agree that this is going in the right direction.

Now the enriched senior citizens homes, sir — I am not talking about personal care homes; I'm talking about exactly that, senior citizens — and most of the people that I know who are living in a senior citizens' home are very, very happy. They are content when they move in. They like the place and you know sometimes they might have a Tea, and so on, in your constituency and in most of ours, I guess, and I'm sure that every single MLA has visited one senior citizens' home. They are proud of their little apartment, and they take you around and the family are so happy, and they say, "Oh, this is great." I saw that a few years ago, because I used to see many of them. But their concern is that all of a sudden their father or their mother can no longer stay in there. It is a worry for those who are managing that home, who are taking care of their home, because they haven't got the staff, and you see these people then, it's worry for the relatives who know that the father or mother will not eat too well because they can no longer take care of themselves, and when they have trouble even making their beds and cleaning the place, and that kind of thing.

So an enriched senior citizens' home would be one, for instance — what's the address — I think 185 Smith Street, where there is a restaurant, and the people can come in — a cafeteria-type restaurant, it might be — where they can come in and eat their meals there. Mind you, you might need some adjustment, some minor changes — and I think they would be minor — in the construction of these homes to accommodate that. —(Interjection)— I beg your pardon? Yes, well, depending, you could have some, for instance, that would cater to the people in that group and as was said, you wouldn't break up the family. I think that's very important, because after all these people have given a lot to their country and their province and in their last years you know how traumatic, how difficult it would be, for them to separate them. Well, how many times do you see in families that if one of them dies the other one will follow fairly closely. I have seen that and

my own father and mother, that was the case, and so on, and there is no way that they would have lived apart. There was no way. I can say that my father, who was 88 when he died, took care of my mother, who had been a cripple for 25 years. There was no home care in those days. She was a cripple, and a very heavy woman, and she could sit in some kind of a make-shift wheelchair and do certain things, with all the arthritis and all the joints certainly distorted, but this was done and, you know, shortly after my mother died, my father had no reason to live. He was so concerned about her, about who was going to take care of her. And I think that if you had that service, you would prolong their stay in that home and you would delay their stay or cancel their stay and their need for a personal care home, which is more costly.

You know, if you had these people, never mind the construction but the cost that you would have to pay, it would be way less to help, maybe have a Public Health nurse or a nurse or even an LPN, to come in once in a while. She might have two such homes, or if there is a really large one — and there are many of them — she could be there on duty during the days or certain hours. They can have their meals brought to them and then you know sometimes you might help in making the beds, which is the last thing you would do. You would not say all of a sudden you don't have to make beds. You would let them try to make their beds, because they should be as active as long as possible, even if it's a mess and you have to start over again.

I don't suggest that you all of a sudden decide we're going to do that for you, we're going to make it easy. I'm not looking at a housekeeper, you know, for somebody, just to make it easier. I'm talking of those people that love their places; it is their home.

You see I think that we all agree that the intent and the aim would be to keep every person at home as long as possible, and certainly the big majority of the people want exactly that, and this is their home. So I think we have done very little. We have done some and we were moving in that direction, and I certainly can't take the credit for that, but this was some of the thinking of the Committee, and there are many of the members — they might have changed sides — but were here in the Committee in those days, and they agreed with that. And I would hope . . . I don't know; they might have been restrained, the question of spending money. But I hope that this would be one of the priorities. Maybe it's being done. I haven't heard of it. I can't complain, but I think that this is something that we should be looking at. If there is construction, in any event, there could be a Nursing Station, a small place, or at least an office for the nurse, and if some of these things were done, I think this would be an improvement.

And you know in many instances the present Minister and the former Ministers agree. You know, we defend our political views, but as human beings I think that we agree on a lot of things. I think that he agrees with what I'm saying now. But the thing is I would hope that he would give the leadership to try to bring these things about so it becomes a fact, it becomes a program.

The Minister has talked about volunteers, and so on, and this is a field where we have had volunteers and I hope that this will continue. I would like to hear it. I don't know if this is the item. Maybe this is not the place where they make grants for that, but there is such a thing as "Meals on Wheels", because I'm talking about the senior citizen and I'm talking about keeping them in their homes as long as possible, and when there is no way that they can stay in their home, of course you need the personal care home.

I'm not saying that this is the only thing, Mr. Chairman. You know, I'm just explaining a little bit of what I mentioned before the dinner hour, that there are components. It's like a jigsaw puzzle, and it seems quite difficult, but you need all the pieces. You could have a very good program but if you haven't got personal care homes, you're in trouble. And you can have personal care homes, unless you want to have one for every person as soon as they request it, if you haven't got home care you're in trouble. And you can have home care and if you haven't got the day care for the elderly — and this might not be the place — but I am also interested in the well elderly, those who are well, to keep them well. I think this is what they are talking about when they are talking about the health of the people. Because how many have we seen, especially where society has copped out, as far as I am concerned, when there is forced retirement at 65, which I think is a real cop-out.

You know, we're spending all kinds of money. There are all kinds of new discoveries to keep the people living longer, and it's still the same age of 65; it doesn't matter if you're as strong as a horse, you're finished. Sometimes you get a watch and a pat on the back and you are told how wonderful you have been, and then you are forgotten, and then you go in a room and you die of loneliness. I can tell you that most of the people would sooner die of starvation than die of loneliness; I certainly would. I think that this is an important thing. But I think that all these areas are all part of the jigsaw puzzle and are all part of letting our people enjoy their life fully, as long as possible, in the best health possible. I believe in prevention also and with the help of their communities and volunteers, you have people that volunteer to make calls. They call on some elderly people every day just to make sure that everything is all right, especially during the winter.

Sometimes they try to visit them. That takes volunteers. That's something that even some older people, can do themselves at home, if they have got a telephone. It doesn't take any more than that. You don't have to spend anything at all. I remember people that had to go on a holiday and they were really concerned about their father, and I got him in touch with these volunteers, and they thought it was fantastic. They thought it was the greatest thing possible.

You know, you can go from there in that field. If you had some area in a personal care home, if we are going to build more personal care homes, if you had extra beds where the patients would switch around, that maybe they could go for a couple of weeks. Why I'm saying that is you have so many people that are afraid to take the responsibility of taking care of their parents — and that is their words — the minute we do that, we're stuck with them and it is a little too much.

Now, if you could say to them, "Well, all right, once a year you can still go on holidays; we will take your father or mother for a couple of weeks." And if you have that . . . I don't remember the name for that; there is a . . . —(Interjection)— Yes, all right, that's not exactly the term that I was looking for but that will do.

It might look like this is fringe, this is extras, and if I'm going to be accused of being a socialist because I think of that, and that's throwing money away, well, I will gladly accept to keep on throwing money away. I think it's false economy not to do these things in the human resources, for one thing, and then in keeping people healthy. I think in actual dollars and cents, also, you will come up on top if you bring in these programs.

Now, maybe there is not too much of that in the country; maybe this is not due yet. But I think I wouldn't be afraid, as a Minister, in fact I tried to promote these things — I was forced in some, and we were going along — it's not going to be done in one year and I would hope that the Minister, who I think believes the same as I do in many of these instances, would keep on going with his leadership, but I'm not going to be satisfied if when I sit down the Minister is going to say, "Well, cost first and need after. This is good, I agree with you, but we haven't got the money."

I think we've got the money. You know, I think we've got the money and why I'm concerned, at times, and why I think the biggest difference between this group and myself, I think they have the impression that in many ways, I agree with them and they're right. But there are certain areas, the Minister said awhile ago, and this is why I'm going to repeat, that he felt that I probably would agree with him that an increase for the doctor of 8.1 percent is all right. And I would agree, and I do agree with him.

But it doesn't stop there, Mr. Chairman. Just because they say that they're going to leave, that we're going to pay them anything, if we do that, we must remember that there are people at the bottom of the ladder that we have to fight for, and they will be leaving the province and maybe nobody will care, or they will just stare, I don't know what they're going to do, they're just going to pass out of the picture. But how many times do we hear about strikes and so on, there's no doubt there are some strikes that leave you puzzled, but most of the time people are also fighting for the same thing, for a fair share, the same as actually what the doctors are doing across Canada now, in some form of a strike, striking against a plan, it's the same thing. It shouldn't be said that I'm against the doctors, if I've got the nerve to say that. This is a fact of life, this is a reality, Mr. Chairman. The Minister, at the same time that he was up said, well, you know there's nothing wrong, the Member for St. Boniface will agree with me that an increase of 8.12 is fair, but then he was so proud that they'd given the people at the bottom of the ladder an increase of 6 percent. Six percent of what? Compared to 8.12 of what?

I don't think that society should be in any position where somebody is going to force because of lack of doctors or something that you're going to be blackmailed. I'm not suggesting this is the case. And I think that, a lot was made last year, or two years ago when my then leader stated that he wanted to bridge the gap between the extreme, the people that were at the top of the ladder as far as revenue, and those at the bottom. I'm not ashamed of that. I don't know if you can say, they're all going to be within \$10,000 or \$15,000, I don't think that's wise, it's very difficult to judge. But I think if we're ready to say, all right, we want to keep the doctors, we're going to pay 8.12, that we have to look at the people at the bottom of the ladder, because they're human beings the same as us. I understand that there is no way that they should be paid the same, but we've got to let these people live.

And I'll repeat again, it doesn't matter how much inflation there is, it doesn't matter what the economic situation is, there are certain people in society that will not, no matter what, they will not deprive themselves of anything at all.

There are many people, you certainly don't have to be a millionaire for that, you'll get your bottle of Crown Royal, you'll get your car, they have all that, if you want a diamond ring, you'll go and buy it, you'll write a check. And that's fine. But there are certain people in society that can't do that. I'm not advocating here that it should be all regimented and everybody will come and get

his pay cheque, I'm not saying that. But I'm saying that we cannot continue to just care about one part of society. And if society has to change, we have to take some drastic measure. And if we have to take drastic measures to keep Medicare here, Mr. Chairman, we have to do it. And if that means that we have to sign people, and if the people want to leave the province, well fine, they should repay the people of Manitoba for their education, \$50,000 or so.

Why should we be ashamed to say that? People will use different methods to get what they want. I'm not advocating that, I don't like to see doctors on wages in certain areas and I've always refuted that, but if that is the only way, fine, it'll have to be something like the army and they'll be drafted and sent in certain places when they start, and as they get more seniority, maybe they'll come in the city. Those are drastic things, it might be that tomorrow I'll read that this is what I'm advocating. I'm not advocating that but I think we have to be ready to defend at all costs, to defend that Medicare plan.

Mr. Chairman, I think I got carried away so I better come back to this thing. I'm on Medicare now, but I think that in a way, I thank you for being lenient with me. I was talking about the senior citizens and their welfare, and I'll get back to the item now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't agree more with the Honourable Member for St. Boniface than I do when he talks about enriched elderly persons housing. I want to assure him that I'm working with my colleague, the Honourable Minister responsible for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, in that area. I believe that enriched elderly persons housing is the answer, as the Member for St. Boniface has suggested, to a number of our challenges in the personal care field. So I want to assure him of my interest and the initiatives that are under study at the present time in that area.

He referred to volunteers in the home care program and that also, in the enriched elderly persons housing program, certainly there continues to be a major component of volunteer input into the home care program and into the enriched elderly persons housing program, such as it is at the present time. In a given month, for example, in the home care program, I might just report for the record, Mr. Chairman, that some 600 volunteers delivered meals, participated in congregate meals, and provide telephone reassurances, daily hellos, friendly visiting, handyman services, transportation, shopping and escort services to some 750 elderly and disabled persons receiving home care throughout the province. So that that volunteer component is there and will be encouraged and will be expanded if our efforts and my efforts in that area are worth anything, and I assure you that I will make every effort to ensure that they are worth something.

The question that the honourable member asked me, I can answer briefly. He asked about the average monthly cost of home care per citizen served. In fiscal 1978-79, that was \$84.00, in fiscal 1977-78, it was \$76.00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I was listening to the comments of the Member for St. Boniface, and I was listening to them with a great deal of interest, because a lot of those comments were some of the comments that I made a couple of years ago when I was on that side of the House. I would like to assure the member that we appear to be on the same side, because my position on the personal care program and the home care program certainly has not changed any from when I was on that side of the House, moving over to this side of the House.

And I would just like to say that I am very pleased that this government saw fit, when they lifted the freeze, that one of the first things that they did was that they re-assessed their position in regard to health care and that the personal care program and the home care program came out as top priority. I must say that I am very pleased to be associated with a government that does care for the elderly and their plight.

Now, I realize that you will probably never meet 100 percent of the demand, but I think that we are moving in directions such as enriched housing, and I think that maybe we also have a responsibility in educating our senior citizens and letting them know well in advance of time to what they would be requiring in the use of a personal care home, that they maybe also have some responsibility and that they should plan for the future, which they seem to be lacking at this particular time. There doesn't seem to be all that much planning for the future, and I would like to see us go into that particular type of program where we could get senior citizens to plan for their future more than what they're doing.

Now, the enriched housing program and everything works into this type of thing. —(Interjection)—

The Member for St. Boniface is asking me, how would you bring this message across to the our senior citizens?

MR. DESJARDINS: No, how would they plan, what would they do?

MR. BROWN: Well, I think that first of all, senior citizens have been led to believe that the old age pension, for instance, should be sufficient to look after their needs for them in their old age, and I think that this never really was intended as such. It was intended to see them through a difficult period of time when they would no longer be earning their own keep, but certainly there should be some sort of planning in which they would be putting away some sort of pension plan to augment the old age pension. I think that much can be done in that particular area.

But all that I was going to really say was that I was going to assure the Member for St. Boniface that I am on his side when he is advocating personal care homes and home care programs. I have not changed my position in any way, shape or form from the time that I was on that side of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the Minister, I don't suppose he has it here tonight, but whether he could give us, for tomorrow, the guidelines and the assessment criteria for panelling of people to go into personal care homes, and also the guidelines with regard to eligibility for home care. I know those did exist at one time and I'm sure they do now, so the field workers have some method of assessing the needs of a person applying for home care. He probably hasn't got it here tonight, but could you get it for us tomorrow?

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Transcona.

MR. PARASIUK: I'd like to ask the Minister if he has any information about the planned enriched senior citizens complex, that's what I was told it was by the people at Park Manor nursing home, personal care home in Transcona. I remember attending meetings with councilloors on this matter about two years ago, a year and a half ago, and I was of the impression it was on board. Can he give us the status of that particular project? If he doesn't have it now, maybe he could take that as notice and come back at some later date with the information.

MR. SHERMAN: I wonder if I can take that as notice, Mr. Chairman. I don't have that information, but I'll get it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I thought I was finished on this item, and I'm pleased to know that the Member for Rhineland is on my side. I didn't hear him at all last year after really promoting the construction of personal care homes, telling us how bad we were two years ago, and now he's saying, "me too." But at least it's something. But there is one thing that I don't want to let pass. I'm not going to associate myself with him in blaming the senior citizen in saying that we have to educate them. I think that maybe we should be educated by them. The people have done an awful lot for this country and for this province and for us.

I don't think that any of them, if the member says they should get ready, what does he mean, apply for a personal care home, some of them are doing that and that confuses them, as long as you're ready. But if they knew, they're afraid, they're saying, I'm all right now, but what's going to happen then, so they apply, and that confuses them because they cannot be panelled. They're not in a situation where we can afford to put them in a personal care home. So I certainly don't think that they should apply at this time. It's not going to help them.

As far as them, I think that we have to remember that the pensions, the way we have it now, most of the people have pensions, it didn't exist for many of these senior citizens. I haven't heard of too many of them that said, the world owes us a living and the pension should do us. Some of them have only that, and what are they going to plan? They haven't got a pension, they're not working and they're making do the best they can with what they've got. I can't see what we can change.

Mr. Chairman I certainly want to disassociate myself from any blame, if it's meant to be blame, even though it's just not too strong, but blame the senior citizens of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)—pass; (2)—pass; (3)—pass; (4)—pass — the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder, could the Minister give us the names, a list of the agencies, the amounts, both this year and last year.

MR. SHERMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the agencies are the Age and Opportunity Centre, 1978-79, the requested vote was \$183,300; in the Estimates before the committee for 1979-80, the requested vote is \$182,300.00. Brandon Civic Senior Citizens Inc., 1978-79, \$20,100; 1979-80, \$20,700.00. The Home Welfare Association, 1978-79, \$28,800; 1979-80, \$30,500.00. Total for 1978-79, \$232,200; for 1979-80, \$233,500.00.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder how the Minister can justify no increase at all, really, it's hundreds of dollars. I'm wondering why there is a slight decrease in Age and Opportunity and a slight increase in Home Welfare Association. But generally it's a pretty flat picture across the board and I'm wondering how the Minister expects these agencies to provide the same services without any increase for the costs that they obviously have, the inflationary costs, of materials, salaries, etc.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Age and Opportunity Centre, although the figure 183,300 was the 1978-79 vote, the final approved figure for that centre was 171,800.00. What they got for 1977-78 was 171,800, and that compares to the appropriation that we're asking to be voted this year. If you'll hold on for one minute, I'll see if I can get the information on the other two. I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, I don't have specific information on the other two, but I can obtain it. But the explanation may well be the same as it is for the Age and Opportunity Centre, that we're looking at a voted amount for 1978-79, where the actual final amount approved was somewhat less than the voted amount.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, again we have a situation where print over print shows no increase, or very little, but the Minister's explanation is, but they didn't spend that much last year, and so really what's requested is more than the previous year, similar to what occurred in the Home Care Assistance, where he claimed it was underspent and therefore the amount being asked for was considerably higher. Mr. Chairman, I really have to ask the same question my colleague did. If in fact it was an underexpenditure last year, why show the equivalent amount, just about, for this year? It seems to me what we're doing here is passing figures, which the Minister, at his discretion, will then either spend or not spend, and that is our concern. Our concern is that the figures we're dealing with don't give us a true picture of the program, and that a year from now the Minister will get up and say, well, it looks like I'm giving a \$1,000 less, but I'm actually giving \$50,000 more because I didn't spend as much as I thought I was going to spend.

You're supposed to be able to tell from these figures the general direction of the department, and as well the expenditures of the department, and through the expenditures get an idea of the level of services that are going to be provided. The Age and Opportunity Services have been in business a long time, their work load is growing, it's not decreasing, they're expanding into various series of operation, services to the elderly, to pre-retirement, a whole gamut of services, and for the Minister to say, well, we gave them \$12,000 less than we asked for last year, what the Estimates showed last year, I wonder how he justifies that. Why did he ask for \$183,000 last year, which I assume is what they had requested' and then why was it cut down to 171.8? Is the agency satisfied? Did they say to the Minister, you're right, we asked for too much money, or you're right, you, the Minister asked the House for too much money, or in fact, did the Minister simply say to them' that's all there is, everybody's restraining. That's the name of the game today, restraint's the name of the game, we have to do that, and simply cut them down.

It's obvious to me that's what's happening throughout these Estimates. The government, as I've indicated before, is undertaking a program of restraint, constraint, and contain. And they are squeezing everywhere and anywhere they can. And they have enough of the community frightened, which is a term used before, and I think it's a valid expression, frightened so that they're not fighting back. They're simply bowing their heads and saying, well if that's all we can get, that's all we can get. We'll try to maintain the services.

But that cannot continue because every agency that has to cut back a little, particularly in a field such as this, is in fact therefore lowering its services, because their costs of operation are increasing, they have salaries to pay, they have various materials that they have to purchase and acquire, and they cannot operate. I'm assuming that when the Age and Opportunity ask for a certain

amount of money, they had a budget to indicate why they would need it and how it was going to be used. And if it was cut unilaterally by the Minister, then to simply to come and ask us for an additional amount of money, which again will maybe lapse so he can use it somewhere else, and then say, gee, am I not being a good manager, I'm efficient, I'm not overspending in my Estimates. I'm coming in within the total amount allocated to my department. But he does it by squeezing little sections here and there and then adding it up to a considerable amount of money.

So I'd like an explanation from the Minister to explain why it is that last year, the year we're in now, that is 1978-79, they only received 171.8, and whether in fact the Age and Opportunity agency was satisfied that this is what they really needed, that in fact 171.8 was exactly what they had in mind and they were quite happy with the grant when they got it.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, the permutations and computations of these final approved amounts are almost endless, as the honourable member knows. What we're looking at here is a preliminary estimate. After the Estimates process is completed in committee, the appropriation, or the recommended appropriation has to go through Treasury Board, it has to go through Cabinet, it has to be enacted in the form of an Order-in-Council, the budget is reviewed by the agency relations branch of the department with that particular agency, there are any number of reasons why the final approved amount might be less than the preliminary Estimate which has to be struck in order to give us a fairly accurate guideline for the Estimates debate in this House. It could be well be that there was a recovery involved, it could well be that there was a refund involved from a previous year. I can't answer that question, but there are 150 external agencies that we deal with and it's perhaps not impossible but certainly difficult to recall, off the top of my head, or even off the top of my department officials heads what computations apply to the final approved amount for each one of those agencies.

But that's the process that is gone through, and there was obviously approval on the part of the agency itself and our agency relations branch that 171,800 was the reasonable and accurate figure. So looking at what is being requested this year, we are looking at an increase that certainly would not represent a huge expansion, but should at least take care of the inflation factor.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, one more question. I notice there's an amount recoverable from Canada under this section. Does it apply to external agencies? It's a line by itself. Is this for a specific program which is being operated within this particular branch, or is part of the cost-sharing arrangements, or part of the block funding assigned to it, which?

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, that's the amount, I think, that's applied to Welfare Services approved under the Canada Assistance Plan, and therefore recoverable from Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (4)—pass; (d)—pass. The proceedings of committees will be reported in the House tomorrow. Committee rise. This committee is adjourned.