

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, June 19, 1989.

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

PRAYERS

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

BILL NO. 30—THE CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services) introduced, by leave, Bill No. 30, The Child and Family Services Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les services à l'enfant et à la famille.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Mr. Speaker: Prior to oral questions, may I direct Honourable Members' attention to the gallery where we have from the Pembina Crest School thirty-three Grade 9 students under the direction of Margo Wilson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans).

* (1335)

Also this afternoon from the Windsor School, we have twenty-eight Grade 9 students under the direction of Betty Halstead. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Vital (Mr. Rose). From the Glenelm School, we have twenty-two Grade 5 students under the direction of Louise Kernetz. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway).

On behalf of all Honourable Members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, do I have leave of the House to revert back to Bills?

Mr. Speaker: Do we have leave to revert back to Introduction of Bills? (Agreed)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS (Cont'd)

BILL NO. 31—THE LABOUR RELATIONS AMENDMENT ACT

Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister of Labour) introduced, by leave, Bill No. 31, The Labour Relations Amendment Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur les relations du travail.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Workplace Safety and Health Regulation Amendments

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question today is to the Minister of

Labour (Mrs. Hammond). The Minister, along with the First Minister (Mr. Filmon), last week defended their decision to reduce standards for cancer-causing materials at the workplace, insisting that the change did not pose any additional risk to the worker. We were pleased to learn on Friday that the First Minister was prepared to soften his position and review the changes to these standards. Does the Minister still support the position she took last week, or is she too concerned that her Government has made a serious error in judgment?

Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister of Labour responsible for Workplace Safety and Health): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable Member for the question. In light of the explosion and fire, I have sent a letter to the chair of the Advisory Council on Workplace Safety and Health and, in concert with the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings) and Labour, we are asking the Advisory Council to participate in this review to examine information in order to assess any existing laws which protect worker and safety.

Advisory Council

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we are somewhat comforted by that statement by the Minister but, considering that she disapproved apparently of the position taken by the Advisory Council before, can she tell the House what guarantees we have that the information this time provided by the Advisory Council will take precedence to the information given by the Chamber of Commerce?

Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister of Labour responsible for Workplace Safety and Health): Mr. Speaker, on that issue, on Friday I had met with the Advisory Council. This had been set up certainly before the fire, because I wanted to meet with them and establish a relationship, as a new Minister, with the Advisory Council. We will work with them. On certain issues where there is a division of opinion, then certainly the Government will take action but, when we have asked the Advisory Council now to look at the regulations to give us some suggestions on how we can work well with the regulations, then we will listen to them.

Regulation Amendments

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, with a supplementary question to the Minister, in this view of co-operation, will she now agree to withdraw the present regulations and reinstate the former standards until this review is completed?

Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister of Labour responsible for Workplace Safety and Health): Mr. Speaker, I would not think that the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) would want me to ask the Safety Council to

give us recommendations and then say, but this is what we are going to do first. I think we would like to listen to them. We are going to ask them what time frames they need and if they have other suggestions that they would like to make.

* (1340)

Amendment Reversal

Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition): Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, but she was able to reverse their decision once before. Why cannot she now reverse her decision and provide the protection right now for the workers of the Province of Manitoba?

Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister of Labour responsible for Workplace Safety and Health): Mr. Speaker, we will wait for the review from the Advisory Council. We do feel that what we have in place with the workplace safety, in all of the regulations, that right now there is no problem with the regulations, but we want to have a further review in light of the explosion, in light of the fire, to let us know where there may be areas that we should change, and we are willing to listen.

Mrs. Carstairs: Mr. Speaker, with a supplementary question to the Minister of Labour, why is she reviewing if she does not believe that there is legitimate reason to accept their first advice? Why does she refuse to accept their advice in the first instance and return those regulations, and then ask for and receive further advice which may in fact ask her to make them even more strict than the original regulations were?

Mrs. Hammond: Mr. Speaker, what we are doing now is responding to questions that have come about and we are looking at the fire and explosion to see what areas we can look at. If we keep moving back and forth, back and forth, the worst place is not going to know where they are at all. We will stay where we are until we get the recommendations from the Workplace Safety Committee, and they will let us know what changes there are.

Mrs. Carstairs: With a final question to the Minister, what other emergency is it going to take for this Minister to finally do what she should have done from the very beginning, which is to ensure the highest possible standards? What next accident are we going to have to take before she acts?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to kindly rephrase her question. Her question, to me, is a hypothetical question. Would you kindly rephrase your question, please?

Mrs. Carstairs: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, but obviously she has no concern about what other accidents may take place. Will the Minister agree today to put her regulations back to where they were prior to her becoming the Minister?

Mrs. Hammond: I repeat, Mr. Speaker, we are sending this to the Worker Safety Committee. We want them

to look at it in relation to the fire and this disaster that happened. There are a number of regulations that everyone agreed on, and what we need to do is take a good hard look at the whole regulation and see how it related, as it related to that explosion and fire.

Workplace Safety and Health Amendment Consensus

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we have been raising this issue since April 10, and people have been going back and forth and back and forth. Manuals have been sent out to employers, withdrawn, changes in positions of the Government.

The Minister on Friday stated, and I quote: "We had with our committee a consensus on practically every regulation we brought in. There was not a consensus on this particular issue."

I would ask the Minister, of all the changes that were made in the regulations that the Government passed, how many of those changes did you have consensus on and which one of the changes, the one specific change that you referred to in Hansard, did you not have consensus on?

Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister of Labour responsible for Workplace Safety and Health): Mr. Speaker, there was not consensus on two or three areas in the regulations. We are now taking it back to the Safety Committee so that they will be able to reassess, in light of the explosion and the fire that happened, to see if there were any areas there that they feel are of concern in light of the accident that happened.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, last week there was a clear indication there was only one regulation that there was no consensus. Now we are hearing it is two or three. Is it three or four, or four or five?

Amendment Process

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, last week the Minister stated on 10 occasions that what the Government has done, and she said so in this House on the record, was in the best interests of workers when clearly it is not. It is important that we have forthright and honest answers in this Chamber on a very important Workplace Safety and Health and environmental issue.

My question to the Minister is, what changes were there that the Government made on its own that it did not even refer to the Workplace Safety and Health Advisory Committee, and in fact went ahead on their own without any referral to the Workplace Safety and Health Advisory Committee, and in fact even the Chamber of Commerce is saying we did not ask the Government to go as far as they did in a couple of the places? How many of those changes did the Government make on its own? Were they only taking advice from one David Newman on these changes?

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

* (1345)

Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister of Labour responsible for Workplace Safety and Health): Mr. Speaker, on the issue that the Minister is talking about, as a new Minister, I recognize that this is a highly technical area and there are some things that I have been learning about as this has come up as well. One of the things I do want to stress is we did send it back to the Advisory Council. They said they chose not to review it again. Whether it was every one of the issues, I cannot tell you right now, but I will come back and give that information to the House.

Mr. Doer: Mr. Speaker, we do not expect a new Minister to know all the technical points. There is no question about that. What we do expect is to get straight answers in this Chamber from any new or old Minister.

Workplace Safety and Health Amendment Reversal

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): My question is to the Premier (Mr. Filmon). In light of the fact we have raised this since April 10, in light of the fact that cancer is clearly identified as one of the most major devastating diseases in our province, in light of the fact that his own Advisory Committee did not approve the original regulations, that there is no consensus to change any of the regulations, would the Premier not agree to reverse the decision that his Government made without input from the Advisory Council and to return to the better standards, the advanced standards that we had in this province, rather than continuing on with the rolling back of the clock in terms of cancer-causing goods both at the workplace and in the environment and in prevention and emergency proceedings.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I will indicate to the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer), as I indicated publicly on Friday, that given the allegations he has made, allegations that indicate that in some way the procedures in the fire and explosion in St. Boniface could have been better handled had there been the old regulation in place, that there were some changes he alleges were made that affected that fire and explosion and the manner in which it was responded to, safety in the workplace and all of those allegations.

Because of the allegations he has made, I have asked and my Ministers have indicated to the Advisory Council that they would like to have the whole matter reviewed to ensure, as we have always said, that the safety of workers, the health of workers is first and foremost in all the legislation that we put forward, all the regulations we put forward. That is what we are doing. I would think that the Leader of the New Democratic Party would be happy with that commitment to ensure that workers are protected by doing a further review.

Mr. Doer: Having seen the Government move back and forth on this a couple of times, we will only be happy when the regulations are actually changed and gazetted back to where they were, not with some little commitment to go back to the committee.

Cancer-Causing Substances

Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition): Mr. Speaker, my question is again to the Premier (Mr. Filmon). Both you and the Minister have not mentioned the issue of the lowest detectable level being a change in those regulations, a specific reference to the Health Advisory Task Force, a specific reference which they said is not prudent to change. Given his commitment to go to the Health Advisory Task Force, would the Premier not agree to change back the regulation to where it is, rather than going to the practicable level which actually came out of a British court decision in 1949, which is actually a reversal of 40 years of dealing with prevention with cancer-causing goods? That issue has been before the Health Advisory Task Force. If the Premier cannot agree to go with their advice right today—

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order please.

Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I repeat, it is our intention to ensure that everything we do protects the safety and health of the workers in Manitoba. Everything we are working towards is to ensure that protection remains as it should be there.

Manitoba Intercultural Council Russell Resignation Request

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson). Over this past week, we in the Liberal Party have repeatedly warned this Government of its inappropriate decision in appointing Grant Russell to the Manitoba Intercultural Council, in that Mr. Russell is well-known for his stand against bilingualism. This weekend, the executive of MIC has had the opportunity to formally renounce this same appointment. Will the Minister today indicate that she respects the advice of the Manitoba Intercultural Council and now finally withdraw this appointment?

* (1350)

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): Mr. Speaker, I want to clearly indicate to the House that there were some comments that were made over the weekend by the MIC elected representative to the council. I do know that the council had a meeting and did provide some advice to Government.

The member of MIC from the Francophone community indicated that he felt it was time to get on with the business of MIC and the positive things that had to happen. He had been sitting on a committee

with Grant Russell and found that he had no problem or no trouble with Grant Russell when he was sitting on that committee with him. He is saying it is time to get over and past and finished with what has happened in the past and get on to some positive new initiatives. That is exactly what we intend to do as Government.

Advisory Role

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): The Minister seems to only take advice from certain people, not from elected council members. Will the Minister tell us, since first she stripped the council of its funding ability and now insults them with an inappropriate appointment, if she ever plans to take the advice of MIC?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): I am pleased to announce to the Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) that I met with MIC last Thursday. It was a very positive meeting. As a matter of fact, they came forward and recommended to me three people who they would like to see appointed as chair. Their first choice was Joe Glasgow, and I informed them on Thursday that it was a very good choice. He had worked very well and very hard as the acting chair of MIC over the last six months. I accepted that recommendation, and we agreed that we are going to get on with the positive job of formulating a multicultural policy together with MIC over the next short period of time.

Funding Responsibilities

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): It was certainly obvious at the Assembly of Manitoba Cultural Communities that they want their funding abilities back. Will the Minister change her mind and give them back their funding capabilities?

Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation): As a result of a needs assessment that was done in this province and as I have clearly indicated to MIC, and I know that they did want to maintain the funding, Mr. Speaker, but MIC was the only umbrella group that had both an advisory role and a funding role to Government. We took that into consideration when the decisions were made.

We have announced a new Multicultural Grants Advisory Council that has been set up by Government. It will have a broad cross section of representatives from throughout the multicultural community. I want to assure this House and Members of the multicultural community that funding will remain in place for those communities with an additional 3 percent increase.

Private Schools Accountability Guidelines

Mrs. Iva Yeo (Sturgeon Creek): Much has been said by the Second Opposition Party regarding funding to independent schools. I find this rather humorous, Mr. Speaker, given that: (1) the concept was implemented during the Schreyer regime; and (2) that many of the same concerns raised by the Member for Flin Flon (Mr.

Storie) were left unaddressed during his tenure as Minister of Education and in fact subsequent Ministers from the same Party.

The current Minister has presented seven guidelines for private schools to follow. I ask the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach), when will the Minister change the status of guidelines from that of proposed to that of actual?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): With regard to the guidelines for independent schools and the issue with regard to accountability, we have been working with MFIS together in a consultative way to ensure that in fact when the guidelines are ready that they will be ones that are practical and are going to be able to be implemented.

With regard to financial accountability, there is an issue with regard to frame accounting that we are working on. Staff and MFIS are working towards a system whereby proper financial accountability can be made to the Government and to the people of Manitoba. As soon as that is ready, we certainly will be announcing it.

Financial Statements

Mrs. Iva Yeo (Sturgeon Creek): Earlier this month, I urged the Minister to include most of these same guidelines plus the availability of individual taxpayers to receive financial statements for the public. Would individual taxpayers with these new guidelines be able to look at financial statements from the independent schools?

* (1355)

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): I am not sure whether the Member is referring to individual taxpayers who have their children in the school or just anybody in Manitoba. I can tell you that the accountability that we will be expecting from the independent school system will be able to be viewed, just as accountability is from the public school system.

Special Needs Children Funding

Mrs. Iva Yeo (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, as of January 1988, Low Incidence I funding is not available to the public school system. Can the Minister explain why private schools can now apply for \$3,300 per pupil for this level of special needs funding?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, Low Incidence I funding is available to all the public school system in this province. As a matter of fact, the way in which the funding is being allocated to the public school system in Manitoba has been changed, so that in fact schools across the province can access more adequately greater amounts of funding for children who have Level I disabilities. So there has not been a change in that regard.

Justice System Sentence Consistency

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, today we learned that a mother of four children, including a nursing baby, has been thrown in jail for three months for driving without a licence. We also note that the Crown appealed the original sentence in this case, which was six months' probation and 75 hours of community work. Mr. Speaker, there is something terribly wrong with our justice system that pursues a driver licence infraction in search of a jail term, when at the same time it refuses to appeal simple fines for some of the ugliest and meanest domestic assaults in this province.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae). I would like to know, my colleagues in the NDP Caucus would like to know, where is the consistency, particularly in the context of cases like one of about a year ago where a man broke a table over his wife's back and smashed her head against the wall, and the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) thought that was good enough. My question to the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), where is the consistency? Why are licence infractions on reserves more important than victims of domestic abuse?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I will disregard the tone of the Honourable Member's question and get right to the point. The point is that I think the policy of this Government regarding domestic assaults has been made relatively clear over the last number of months. Each case has been and will continue to be viewed on its merits, certainly in the case the Honourable Member referred to. The position taken was as she had stated it.

I remind her though about the Tavares case, the case of an accused person using a weapon in the course of an assault against a female person, and that matter was the subject of an instruction from the Crown office that an appeal be launched. An appeal was successfully launched on sentence in that case.

In regard to the case referred to, the most recent one regarding driving without a licence, the Honourable Member says the charge was driving without a licence. As I understand it, on the latest court appearance, there were three separate incidents of driving disqualified, which is a much more serious charge than driving without a licence. I can tell the Honourable Member that the Crown office, as well as the corrections people, my office is in touch with those people today to ensure that the most sensitive and sensible method of dealing with this case is the method that is taken by the department.

Gender Bias

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I wish the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) would take note of the tone of my voice in raising this question, because it reflects the anger and disappointment of women right across this province with respect to our

legal system, which clearly is not acting on behalf of women and their interests.

Mr. Speaker, for every case that the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) can point out, I can remind of him of another, and he can look at the case in Dauphin where a similar domestic assault was—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Member, kindly put her question now.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: My question to the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) is, does he not see that there is an inconsistency in handing down of sentences, that there is a gender bias in that sentencing, and will he do something about it?

* (1400)

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): The Honourable Member referred also to the Dauphin case. I think that was the case in regard to which a judge of the Provincial Court was the subject of a referral by myself to the Judicial Council. I also tell the Honourable Member that sentence, as well as all others regarding offences of that kind, was reviewed thoroughly by the department. Now the Honourable Member should be aware that the Court of Appeal has ruled on numerous occasions in the past that disqualified drivers who repeatedly offend must go to jail. Both the Crown and court, in this case, agreed that the accused should not be arrested until arrangements could be made for the care of her children and that these instructions were communicated to the Sheriff's Department. In fact, the sentence was pronounced on June 5 and the accused was not arrested until June 15, some 10 days later.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, I am doing what I can today to ensure that, as the Honourable Member will know also, this is the subject of a defence appeal and the matter is before the courts. The courts will ultimately decide the appropriateness of the sentence. In the meantime, I am in discussion with the Crown office and with corrections personnel to see that this matter is handled as sensibly and sensitively as is reasonable in the circumstances.

Ms. Wasylycia-Leis: Mr. Speaker, I see that the Minister of Justice likes to be selectively tough when it comes to dealing with the victims in our justice system.

Native Women Bias

Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Leis (St. Johns): My question to the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) is, given the number of studies, particularly the one by the Canadian Bar Association not too long ago, which showed that Treaty Indian women are 131 times more likely to end up in a jail than white women and that this is growing—the gap is widening daily, is the Minister of Justice today prepared to undertake a public review of the disparities that exist with respect to sentencing in this province?

Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we were

doing. I think the Honourable Member was here last week when we ensured the continued existence of the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry. The Inquiry is examining in detail the treatment of Native persons in this province, in our justice system, and that certainly includes Native women.

Handicapped Children Mainstreaming

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): On June 12, I took a question as notice from the Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo) with regard to a transition committee that she referred to between the Department of Education and the Department of Family Services, and whether this committee would be instrumental in the implementation of mainstreaming.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate to the House that there is a transition committee in place, but it has nothing to do with mainstreaming. This committee is made up of personnel from the Department of Health, the Department of Family Services and the Department of Education. The mandate of this committee is to finalize the implementation strategy for planning the transition of students with severe handicapping conditions from school to post-school programming. I do not know how the Member for Sturgeon Creek got her information, but certainly it has nothing to do with the whole area of mainstreaming.

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): I would suggest that the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) takes a look at his department and the definition of mainstreaming, because he really does not know what he is talking about.

Day Programs Space Creation

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson). The Minister sends out news releases to announce funding for community programs. She attempts to leave the impression that her department is responsive and progressive to community needs, but the Minister keeps the bad news to herself.

There are over 100 mentally handicapped individuals in Winnipeg alone, who are awaiting day programs, individuals who have been on waiting lists for years. These individuals sit at home all day and deteriorate. They leave the school system and there is no planning in place for day programs.

My question to the Minister is, can she tell us today why there are no provisions in her departmental budget for new day program spaces?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, my department is doing all we can within our resources to get people into spaces for day programs. I will admit that there is a waiting list. That waiting list has been there for some time. This year we have, in our budgeting process, used as a priority some of the things that were enunciated in the Wiens Report to make sure that people in group homes are safe and well looked after.

Residential Care Space Creation

Mr. Speaker: The Honourable Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray), with a supplementary question.

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the same Minister, over 125 mentally handicapped individuals needing a place to live in over eight rural communities have been identified, and there are many again in Winnipeg who are needing a place to live. Can the Minister tell us why there is no provision in her departmental budget for new residential care spaces?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): Mr. Speaker, as I said, our priority this year was to stabilize the system that has been in place in the last few years, not properly funded and not properly looked after. That is the priority we have placed in that department this year.

Handicapped People Programs Availability

Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice): With a final supplementary to the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson), this Minister with her answers shows her inability to be a manager of her department. Surely she knows that it will cost her more money, because these people sit at home and have no place to live and they deteriorate. Will the Minister commit today to reverse her decision for non-funding of residential care spaces and day programs so at least her department will meet the serious needs of these individuals?

Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services): Did I hear the Member say that these people are not funded? They are funded in group homes. We want to stabilize that group home system, which the Member knows very well has been underfunded in the past. I will be making announcements in the near future as to our funding proposals for those homes, for training of workers with mentally handicapped people.

Is the Member telling me that we should underfund the group homes in order to make more day programs? Some priority has to be given to keeping those people safe in those group homes.

Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Pollution

Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), and it concerns the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting operation in northern Manitoba on Namew Lake. I have been informed that Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting is discharging saline water in Chocolate Lake, even though the Clean Environment Commission only held the hearings two weeks ago and we have not been given the final recommendation of their hearings yet. It is my understanding that no licence for discharge has been given, nor would it be allowed until the recommendations of the commission have been given.

Can the Minister tell us why he is allowing Hudson Bay Mining to pump sludge, which will kill the pike and other organisms in the lake, why he has allowed them to pump this into Chocolate Lake before you get the report of the Clean Environment Commission?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, the instructions and the understanding that I believe the mine was given was that any dewatering activities that they intended to undertake prior to a licence being given, regardless of what was raised during the hearings, was to be diked and held within the tailings area. If what the Member says is correct, I will certainly wish to examine the facts.

Pollution—Saskatchewan

Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas): Namew Lake is connected by a creek to Chocolate Lake. Namew Lake is the drinking water for several communities in Saskatchewan, including Sturgeon Landing and Cumberland House. These communities use this drinking water with chlorination and no other treatment. With this sludge being dumped into the Chocolate Lake, there will be traces of lead, nickel and sulphur. Can the Minister tell me if he will protect these communities' drinking water, or does he think they have to get used to drinking saline water?

Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment): Mr. Speaker, the issue that the Member raises, contrary to what the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) indicates from his seat, has some parallels to Shoal Lake. We ordered the Clean Environment Commission to have hearings in Saskatchewan, in other words, have hearings in another jurisdiction besides our own to examine the downstream effects of anything that might go on in this province. As a matter of fact, I believe we set a precedent in this country by doing so.

We will do everything we can to make sure any licence that might be issued as a result of those hearings does everything possible to protect the drinking water of downstream users.

Mr. Harapiak: Mr. Speaker, I had difficulty hearing some of the answer because the former Minister of Environment is very protective of the area since he was in there.

He raises the question of the Shoal Lake and I think there is a parallel here. In this case, 600,000 people's drinking water is affected in Manitoba, and we are rightfully concerned over it. Now we are in a position that we are being the polluter, so I think that the Minister should take every effort to protect the drinking water of the people of Saskatchewan. Will this Minister protect the drinking water of the people from Saskatchewan?

* (1410)

Mr. Cummings: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Member did not hear my previous answer, which was that we are in fact moving to protect the water of the downstream users from Namew Lake, that we set a precedent by

having hearings in the other jurisdiction, which in fact gives us a very strong position in talking to the Province of Ontario, if he wishes to relate that to the Shoal Lake issue. We will do everything within our power to protect the water of downstream users.

Workers Compensation Board Pension Indexing

Mr. Allan Patterson (Radisson): My question is to the Minister responsible for The Workers' Compensation Act (Mr. Connery). Periodic payments to workers who have been permanently disabled are not indexed and it has been customary every two years to make some adjustments in the light of Consumer Price Index. The last such adjustment was made two years ago to take effect July 1, 1987. Will the Minister inform the House today if some adjustment is under way to take effect July 1 of this year?

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister responsible for The Workers' Compensation Act): I thank the Member for that question. As the Member recognizes and realizes that there is not legislation that requires the indexing of pensions, but he is right in the fact that it has been regularly done every two years. I am in discussions with the Workers Compensation Board at this moment to finalize whatever we are going to do with indexing of pensions, and whatever takes place will be done retroactive to July 1.

King Task Force Recommendations

Mr. Allan Patterson (Radisson): What is commonly known as the King Committee Report on Workers Compensation made some 178 recommendations. The vast majority of these were unanimous on the part of the tripartite committee. In view of this substantial unanimity, one would be hard put to find just cause as to why the committee's recommendations should not be implemented. Will the Minister inform the House when the recommendations of the committee will be implemented?

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister responsible for The Workers' Compensation Act): Once again, the question is a very valid one. As the Member knows, the I Team was in place, an implementation team that gave a package of recommendations and suggestions to us for some legislative change. It was a very broad package.- (Interjection)- I wonder if the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) would rather answer the question or listen?

Mr. Speaker, we gave the package of recommendations back to the Workers Compensation Board, and the Workers Compensation Board is made up of a chairman, of a representative of labour and a representative of management. They are reviewing the recommendations, and also the CEO at Workers Comp is reviewing the recommendations so they can work. When they are satisfied that they have got a recommendation package for me, then we will be prepared to look at it from a legislative point of view.

Appeal Delays

Mr. Allan Patterson (Radisson): The Government has now had a full year to address the horrendous problems at the Workers Compensation Board that it inherited from the previous NDP administration. Will the Minister inform the House what progress has been made in reducing the unacceptably large backlog and lengthy delays in the appeal process system? Will the target of three months or less to the final appeal decision be met this year?

Hon. Edward Connery (Minister responsible for The Workers' Compensation Act): The Member is absolutely right. We inherited a horrendous mess from the previous Government with Workers Compensation. It was obvious their concern of injured workers was not paramount near as mine.

I have stated all the way through that I have not been satisfied with the delay that we inherited. We have worked with the Workers Compensation Board. We put in a second group of appeals people to review appeals, and we would hope by the end of this year that the target of a three-month waiting period, because it is the third time they have had adjudication, the second time to appeal, that it requires that sort of period. The target goal is for three months and, hopefully, by the end of this year we will have achieved that.

Job Training for Tomorrow Statistics

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): I have a question for the Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Derkach). On the day of the Budget and on more than one occasion since, the Minister has claimed that cutting the budget for Job Training for Tomorrow from about \$4.8 million to \$2 million would have no effect on the number of young people who would get jobs in training through this program. Can the Minister explain why his own press release of Friday, June 16 said that only 880 young people will get training this year, compared to 2,000 last year?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, as the Member opposite know well, under the tenure of his Government, the decrease in the funding allowed for Job Training for Tomorrow started to decrease somewhere in 1987, I believe, and has been decreasing since then, because the intent of the Job Training for Tomorrow was to address the needs of people when there was high unemployment in the province. Since the unemployment rate decreased in the province, so did the money that was allocated to Job Training for Tomorrow, and that is not any different than what was happening under his administration.

Mr. Speaker, we announced in the Budget that we would be taking a new approach to job training in this province and, to that effect, a Job Training Advisory Committee has been established to meet the new and challenging needs that are out there. In the interim, we are providing the 880-somewhat job training opportunities for people in Manitoba.

Mr. Leonard Evans: Mr. Speaker, that still is a contradiction. That is not what we were told before. I

find it rather amazing that the Government is going ahead with this, in view of the Premier's (Mr. Filmon) statement. He almost froths at the mouth whenever you mention job training programs, and here the Government is going at least this far.

Some Honourable Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; order, please. Time is extremely scarce.

Job Training Advisory Committee Non-Profit Organizations

Mr. Speaker: Would the Honourable Member for Brandon East kindly put his question now?

Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I gather the conditions and terms of this program were the same as previous. My question to the Minister however is, will this include non-profit organizations as well as business organizations?

Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training): Mr. Speaker, this program is intended to provide the many Manitobans who require the program with an opportunity to get a job that is going to lead toward a career opportunity. That is the intent of the program and that is the way we are going to approach it.

Mr. Speaker: The time for oral questions has expired.

NON-POLITICAL STATEMENT

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave to make a non-political statement.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member for Churchill have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Churchill.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Speaker, you may have noticed that I was a bit slow in rising to my feet today to make this non-political statement. I want to assure you that slowness should not be mistaken for any hesitancy or reluctance on my part, but it is purely the consequence of some, what I am told, temporarily sore muscles resulting out of a very pleasant but a very long run that I shared yesterday with thousands of Manitobans as part of the Manitoba Marathon.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the organizers, the volunteers, and the runners who worked so hard to make the Manitoba Marathon the great success that it was yesterday, and the great success that it has enjoyed over the past number of years.

I am not going to single out any one individual by name because I believe that everyone who was associated with yesterday's marathon deserves credit for their efforts to help mentally handicapped Manitobans to run their own lives.

Every runner, Mr. Speaker, whether they finished first or back in the pack with myself, very close to last, or

even if they did not make the full distance, gave their all and did their best. They all had their personal best yesterday.

The organizers of the event deserve both thanks and credit for the hundreds, indeed the thousands of hours that they collectively spent to make Manitoba's marathon one of the best in the world. They did our province proud yesterday.

Equal thanks and credit should also go to the hundreds of volunteers who gave up a good part, if not all, of their Father's Day, starting in some instances at five o'clock in the morning, to help make the race day itself as successful as it was.

A final thanks should also go out to those hundreds and thousands of spectators who took the time out of their day to cheer, to clap and to encourage on the runners all along the course.

* (1420)

So, Mr. Speaker, I am certain that all Members of the Legislature join in with me today in thanking and congratulating all those who worked so hard to enable the Manitoba marathon to help mentally handicapped Manitobans. I hope that some of my colleagues will join in with me next year as we try to shorten the time a bit and to help make the marathon the success that it is.

Thank you.

Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism): Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to make a non-political statement?

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Minister have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed)

Mr. Ernst: Mr. Speaker, I want to identify Members on this side of the House with the comments just made by the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan). As a matter of fact, I want to compliment the Member for Churchill on his diligence, his willingness and his fortitude in going into—(Interjection)— Mr. Speaker, it was once told to me as I was having a knee repaired after a water-skiing accident by one of the trainers at the Winnipeg Football Club that I should be reading my birth certificate before I participated in these kinds of events. Nonetheless, I again congratulate the Member for Churchill for his interest.

I also, on behalf of my colleagues, want to commend the organizing committee and indeed all of the participants right across the spectrum, from the full marathon right down to the magic super mile. I think all of the people involved in that organization and, of course, the very great cause for which they ran deserves the recognition of everyone in Manitoba. Once again, a congratulatory message on behalf of the House is certainly in order.

Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert): Mr. Speaker, I also rise not necessarily—

An Honourable Member: You have to have leave.

Mr. Angus: I am sorry. May I have leave?

Mr. Speaker: Does the Honourable Member for St. Norbert have leave to make a non-political statement? (Agreed)

Mr. Angus: Mr. Speaker, I also rise to compliment the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan), a constituent of mine, for his participation in the annual Fathers' Day celebration of families in the Marathon. I remember very well when John Robertson and Sam Favreau started organizing this many years ago and the dream that they had. It certainly has been fulfilled and it is just a classic example of the co-operation, the attitudes and the efforts that people can put forward to work together to raise money for an excellent cause.

The organizers should be commended. All the participants should be commended. Everybody who had anything to do with it in any way, shape or form should feel very, very proud. So I rise with my colleagues to salute all of those people who organized and participated in a very, very worthwhile exercise.

Thank you.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader): Mr. Speaker, prior to embarking on the Estimates today, would you be so kind as to call Bill No. 3.

DEBATE ON SECOND READING

BILL NO. 3—THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger), The Highway Traffic Amendment Act; Loi modifiant le Code de la route, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman).

Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to speak on Bill No. 3 today and to offer some advice to the Government on this important Bill. My colleague, the Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill) will also be speaking as the official critic on this issue, as well as perhaps some of my other colleagues on this important issue.

We want to raise some concerns and some suggestions at this time. Of course, we are anxious to have public input to this Bill so that the public will have an opportunity to scrutinize it and to offer suggestions and advice to the Government on an area that is so important and that touches everyone's life in this province.

At some point in time, through some relative or friend or personally insofar as victims of drinking and driving, or perhaps even being involved in that practice—and it is a practice that has to be changed in terms of the attitudes of the public in this province, across the country and in many other countries of the world because so many people have died needlessly, have

been injured and maimed needlessly, have suffered needlessly because of this practice, which has been perhaps socially acceptable in our province, in our country over the years when in fact it should not have been.

In recognizing that, Mr. Speaker, our Government had taken a number of steps to tighten up penalties and to work towards greater education in this very important area.

Over the number of years that we were in Government, we had taken steps to greater educate the public about the tremendous toll that drinking and driving takes and to encourage them to change their habits with regard to drinking and driving. The ALIVE Program, many will remember, sponsored by the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, was geared towards public education. That was an important initiative that we undertook to reduce the incidence of drinking and driving.

The ministerial committee on drinking and driving which was set up with members of various organizations concerned about drinking and driving, reporting to the Minister of Highways and Transportation, the Attorney General, the Minister responsible for the Public Insurance Corporation and the Minister of Health, was another initiative that we took to develop programs to utilize the public, to develop programs to reduce the incidence of drinking and driving.

As well, we had implemented the First and Second Offenders' Program which was in conjunction with the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba. It was designed to assist in rehabilitation, not just cancellation of licences or suspension of licences and fines, but also the other side of it which is so important and which seems to be missing to a great extent in this Government's program on drinking and driving as outlined in Bill 3. In other words, the Government is taking a very strong position on deterrence through punishment by cancellation of the licence on the spot or impounding of the vehicle, but there does not seem to be the other side of it being emphasized to the extent it should be, and that is the rehabilitation of people who are habitual offenders in this area. That, to me, as much as changing attitudes is the key, and tougher penalties, I should say, is the key to success of any Government's efforts to reduce the incidence of drinking and driving and the carnage that it causes throughout our province, the cost to society and to our health care system, the costs in suffering and pain to individuals and their families. In order to reduce that, we must take concrete steps, constructive steps, to rehabilitate those people who are practising this activity to the danger of so many others in society.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker, William Chornopyski, in the Chair.)

I think that the First and Second Offenders' Program that we had established with the AFM were good steps forward. However, I have to point out that the Government now seems to be taking a step backwards in this area because they do not seem to be putting much more emphasis on the AFM and rehabilitation. As a matter of fact, they seem to be putting less,

because in fact they are cutting back on the budget of the AFM in many areas. That is regrettable because it seems that the Government does not understand the importance of the rehabilitation factor in ensuring that the incidence of drinking and driving is reduced in this province.

I would implore the Government to take the necessary steps in that aspect of drinking and driving, of the drinking drivers, in order to truly make a difference. The penalties, the punitive aspects can only go so far. We have to reduce the incidence and the practice through education and through rehabilitation of the people who are involved in this practice and on a habitual basis.

* (1430)

I mentioned the ALIVE Program, I mentioned the ministerial committee that was established, I mentioned the First and Second Offenders' Program. As well we had undertaken some legislative changes to tighten up the penalties, increase the fines and to ensure that there was provision for compulsory blood tests for people who were unconscious when an accident occurred and were taken to the hospital. Without getting their permission, we made it possible to get a blood sample so that we would ensure that an accurate reading would be obtained, rather than waiting until an individual may become conscious again in the hospital, following the scene of an accident.

We also had, Mr. Deputy Speaker, put in place the Alertmobile in the City of Winnipeg, which was another important step to increase the number of tests that were taken on the road. That was, I think, quite successful over the last number of years in the City of Winnipeg in apprehending drinking drivers, particularly around Christmastime, when this practice was most prevalent but slowly expanding to throughout the year. So that was an important development we had undertaken.

We had taken a number of steps as a Government to tighten up on drinking and driving in this province. We were pleased, along with the measures that were taken by the federal Government with the Criminal Code changes, to see some positive developments. However, there has not been enough time elapsed, I do not believe, to accurately measure how effective those steps were. In the meantime of course, the Government has come forward with some tighter measures again and this process continues of tightening and tightening and tightening. I think, obviously, it is necessary because of the tremendous number of accidents that are caused by drinking drivers.

As a matter of fact, I think the statistics are quite clear that well over 50 percent of all fatal accidents in this province are caused by drinking and driving, or at least there was drinking involved in the accident in some way by some of the people involved in that accident. So truly there is a monumental problem that has to be addressed.

Our Party feels, Mr. Deputy Speaker, quite positive that the Government is taking this initiative. However, we do have some of the concerns that were expressed

by the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) when he spoke on this last week with regard to some aspects of the Bill, particularly as it reflects the rights of individuals. It clearly shows that the Government is prepared to take rather dramatic steps.

I know the Minister, in his outline, expressed some reservations or he said that he had some reservations initially when the components of this Bill were brought forward that, in fact, they may contravene the Charter of Rights. He said he was subsequently assured that would not be the case to the extent that he could be assured. You can never be 100 percent positive with these things until indeed there are challenges made and then the courts decide. However, it is best if we do not have to go to the courts with these challenges and that the law is in itself solid, and the integrity of the provisions are protected as much as possible when they are devised.

So we will be watching with a great deal of interest when this Bill comes to the committee, which we would like to see happen after my colleagues who feel this is an important issue, as to all of us in this Chamber, but those who want to express those feelings have had an opportunity to do so in the second reading process here.

We will want to hear what the public has to say and what professional witnesses have to say and others have to say about the provisions of this Bill insofar as its impact on the rights of people. Of course, we are of concern that the people's rights who are impacted by drunken drivers are balanced against this.

All of us realize that the person guilty of offences has some rights, but at times I believe personally, and I think many of the public share that feeling, that laws go too far to protect the person who has been guilty of an offence or is charged with an offence, and not enough with the victim. There has to be that balance that society is concerned with the victims of the offence to the extent that they are willing, through their Governments, to take strong action to ensure that the incidence of those particular happenings is reduced. I believe the actions that this Government are taking will to a certain extent reduce the incidence further from what it has been in the past.

The two major provisions then are the taking possession or seizing of the licence on the spot and the impounding of the vehicle. The concerns that I would have with regard to the impounding of the vehicle, other than the fact that there is perhaps some question as to its validity under the Charter of Rights, is the fact that it does impact on the whole family, everyone else who might need that vehicle. Sometimes that is the best deterrent.

I know that in some jurisdictions, for example, a person who has been convicted of drinking and driving has to have a different colour licence plate on his or her vehicle and the whole family has to drive with that mark, like a stamp on their forehead which tells everyone that there goes a drunken driver, or previously a drunken driver. That can be a very big deterrent.

On the other hand, it is embarrassing for a lot of people as well who are innocent under those

circumstances, the people who are members of the family of the individual who was guilty of the offence. It is a question then of balancing those two aspects and it is a very sensitive matter. Impounding the vehicle is one area that we have to here get further clarification on and the surrender of the person's licence.

I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that overall we believe that it is necessary to take as strong measures as possible, within limits, to protect those people who have been in the past injured and killed indiscriminately in this province, I would say, to a great extent. In many countries, there have been very harsh measures put in place, in some cases even the death penalty for offences of drinking and driving.- (Interjection)- My colleague asks where that was. I cannot exactly name the country, but there are a number of countries where that is the case and a number of other degrees of severity of penalties. Of course in those cases where there are those severe penalties, I would dare say that the incidence of drinking and driving is very low. However, again the balance of the sensitivity of the state insofar as taking those harsh measures with the severity of the crime has to be made in all cases.

I want to indicate to the Minister of Highways who is here today that he must also consider many other aspects of highway safety as well when he is attempting to reduce the incidence of death and injury. I point out, for example, that his Party has had many mixed feelings on the use of seat belts while in Opposition and helmets which were introduced by our Government to decrease the incidence of injury and suffering and death on our highways. His Government spoke loudly, individuals of his Government, against that legislation at various times. I think now that he is in the position of responsibility, as Minister, he has seen the wisdom of those particular pieces of legislation to a greater degree perhaps than he did at the time that they were introduced in this House.

Of course, that happens from time to time with Ministers of all political stripes as they get into the situation of not being able to just criticize, but have the responsibility of carrying out measures that are in the best interests of the public.

I will be looking forward to all the measures that the Minister will be taking on highway safety, and we have an opportunity of discussing some of those in the Estimates procedure that is going on at the present time.

I will also be interested in hearing more about the workshop and information session that will be held tomorrow morning, I believe, on the experience in other jurisdictions with regard to some of the measures that are contained in this Bill, because it will also provide us with a better understanding of how effective it is and how the rights of everyone are protected when undertaking these rather substantial matters, with regard to drinking and driving.

* (1440)

With those comments, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would indicate that we look forward to further discussion of this Bill in the committee stage. I am only one speaker

on our side of the House and I know a number of my colleagues also have some comments on this very important area in Manitoba, and of course in all jurisdictions across this country and many other countries. It is truly a serious problem that we all have a great deal of concern about and we want to see addressed.

Ms. Maureen Hemphill (Logan): I, like my previous colleague who spoke, and a number of my other colleagues want to put some points on the record about not only this very important Bill but about the issue of not just drinking and driving, but the issue of drinking, the issue of alcoholism, and the issue of lifestyle, of education, of death and accidents that take place as a result of it.

Clearly, the issue of public safety is one of our No. 1 issues, and clearly the public does not feel very safe these days when they get in their car and go out on the highway. There is a belief, quite understandably, that there are people in their cars who are driving who are way beyond the limits and who are not able to be in control and who end up having accidents that not just affect themselves, but affect the lives and the livelihood of other people through the large number of deaths and accidents that take place as a result of drinking and driving.

This is a matter of public concern. The public does want a toughening up, I think, of the laws dealing with drinking and dealing particularly with drinking and driving.

When we look at the statistics and we know that there are over 3,000 Canadians who are killed every year and 11,000 more who are maimed in some way as a result of drunk driving accidents, and we further recognize that most of the deaths, certainly a large number of the deaths of young people are caused by drinking and driving, then we know that we have a very serious problem and we have to deal with the drinking driver, that is, those people who drink to excess.

I guess one of our concerns is the narrowness of the Government's attention to this very important issue, and the fact that they are concentrating really largely on drinking and driving. To our mind, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they are not dealing with the issue as it should be dealt with. They are dealing in isolation with it and the issues other than safety, of prevention, of education, of treatment, are not being dealt with at all.

You have a situation where the Government is saying very clearly, as they do when the Justice Minister (Mr. McCrae) is on television, in his commercials, saying, "Don't do it," by the way, often just followed, either before or after, by the beer commercials that they are allowing to be shown during the day and during the dinner hour when families are watching it.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

You often have this peculiar situation of a beer commercial, which they are allowing, followed by a commercial with the Justice Minister saying, "Don't do it." The contradiction that you have there is one of the many contradictions that we see by this Government.

Mr. Speaker, what we would like to have seen is that the Government came out with a comprehensive package, and that part of that package was dealing with the drunk driver, and that they said, we are not going to tolerate this, there are going to be tougher laws and we are going to deal in a very tough way with drinking drivers.

I think, as mentioned by my colleague, we are supporting of the principle of cracking down on drunk drivers. We do, as we indicated before, want to look a little further at the legal positions that are coming out dealing with how they apply to the rights of the individual in the Charter but, having said that we will be continuing to look at that issue, we do support cracking down on drunk drivers.

However, we also support doing more in prevention. We also support doing more in education. So why is this Government cutting back, for instance, on the Budget for the AFM by about \$200,000, and saying that is not really a problem because it is not cutting back on services? It is just cutting back on administration. We are just cutting back on administration but we are not really cutting back on the services that are being provided by the AFM.

I think that is nonsense. If they do think the administrative costs are too high and they may, then they should say that \$200,000 should not be spent on administration but it should be spent on increased consultation support and follow-up for the people who need the help. Do not take it out of the budget and say this is not important. Leave it in the budget and say that it should be redirected into services for people who are having a problem with alcoholism.

I think it is clear there is not enough follow-up, that even though they go to the AFM and they may have some guidance and some consultation, that once they have gone through that initial period, there is no follow-up for them to continue to receive the support and the help they need. We all know this is not a problem that is eliminated overnight or just because you have a series of meetings with resources and with support.

One of the major concerns other than the treatment—and by the way, I think it is also of concern that we do not have any residential treatment. I think this Government found itself in the envious position of having large amounts of revenue they did not expect to have, in the amount of a couple of hundred million, and that there are priorities areas where some of that money should have gone.

I think that to have to send people to Saskatchewan for residential treatment because we have no residential treatment program here and that they hold a couple of beds for us—and not dealing with the issue of the increased consumption of alcohol and its incredible financial cost to society, its cost to the productivity in terms of the performance of many people in the workplace when they are alcoholics and they are not able to do their job. Most importantly, the tremendous cost to the society through the breakdown of the family and through the increases of child and wife abuse, of abuses of all kinds, large numbers of which are coming about as a result of alcoholism and overdrinking. So,

to find that they are prepared to come out with this grand policy that just deals with the drunk driver and not deal with any of these other issues is really disappointing.

One of the areas of course that they should be moving on the most, I think, is the question of the education of young people. When you allow the lifestyle to be shown, as I said before, through the dinner hour, and they show young people, these gorgeous young people with a drink in their hand, that suggests to them you cannot have fun and that you are not attractive unless you have a drink in your hand, I think, is one of the contradictions and, as my colleague said, one of the hypocrisies of the policies of this Government.

So we need to teach our young people, not only if they are going to drink they do not drive, because they are going to learn that with the crackdown and the enforcement of drinking drivers, not just if you are going to drink, do not drive. That surely is not the only message that we want to give to our young people but what about, if you drink, drink moderately. There is a way to drink and an amount to drink that is acceptable where you do not cause damage to yourself and more importantly, and most importantly, as a group you do not cause damage to society and to other members of your family and to the community. So, I think it is a big disappointment to see that they are saying this is a very important issue for them, is the question of overdrinking, and yet they are totally ignoring all of those other areas that they have a responsibility to deal with.

What they are dealing with is, apart from cracking down on drunk drivers, surprisingly enough, the promotion of liquor in a number of ways and the promotion is a way that can have only one purpose, and that is to increase the sale and use of liquor, which is also another contradiction.

An Honourable Member: And more money.

* (1450)

Ms. Hemphill: They make \$10 million now, the Liquor Commission. It seems to us that some of that money coming in revenue should be redirected directly into the issue of alcoholism and the education of our young people and not just trying to promote and encourage the increased sale of liquor through a number of recommendations that came from the Manitoba Liquor Control Commission in their strategic plan for 1989 to 1991, one of which is to allow credit card use, to allow cheque cashing, gift certificates and credit cards.

Now there can only be one purpose for that, I think, and that is to make the buying of liquor easier. Furthermore, since we know what credit cards do to families, we can assume that this is a product just like any other product where they will be encouraged and will buy liquor when they do not have the money. It is very hard to falsify a cheque and it is very hard to buy liquor if you do not have money in your pocket, but if you have a credit card many people in many families today are getting caught in something that is very dangerous to them and that many of them are struggling

with and that is that they are overbuying. They are going into debt. They are buying things for which they cannot afford and for which they have no money. Why we should expand that, which is already a problem in society, to allow the credit-card buying of liquor, I have no idea why they would want to go that route.

One of the other suggestions that they have made is that you can go into a liquor store and you can get samples. They call it tasting. You can have a taste. I think it is a three-ounce taste. You can have a sample to see if you like it. In the Safeway and SuperValu stores, I know people who eat their lunch by going back two, three or four times and getting the sample of the pizza or the sausages, whatever it is they are promoting. They are pushing that product and they are trying to get people to buy a product that they would not ordinarily buy. There is nothing in the strategic plan that suggests that you are only going to get one sample.

I think, in some of the press response to the concern we raised, they said, well, does anybody think three ounces is really going to send anybody over the limit? But there is not anything that says there are not going to be two or three samples available. It could be two or three samples or four samples of three-ounce samples. The first stage is to allow the sampling of wine and liqueur, but the second stage of their plan is to go to spirits, which means you can drop in and get a three-ounce shot of whiskey or rye or rum or - (Interjection)- one-third of an ounce, yes.- (Interjection)- Right.

So I think it is the combination of all of these things that are giving very contradictory messages to the public by a Government who is saying, do not drink and drive. We are going to take away your car. We are going to take away your licence if you do, even if you do not have a breathalyzer. We are going to have very tough requirements—and we do not disagree with toughening up—but at the same time promoting the sale and encouraging the increased sale through credit cards, through lifestyle ads, through sampling, as two examples.

We believe that the Manitoba Liquor Commission's strategic plan, it seems to have been developed in a vacuum, one where they were not paying very much attention to what the Government was saying, what their philosophy was and what their policies were, because so many of the things in here are contradictory to this Government's stated policy thrusts.

I think they should be saying to the Manitoba Liquor Commission, you should be coming out, No. 1, with a strategic plan that does not just deal with, as this one does, administration, public relations, promotion, reporting, accountability, but you should come in with a comprehensive overall plan that deals with some of these other areas that we have talked about, but most importantly, remove those things that are in contradiction with this Government's stated policies. One of them is the closure of rural liquor stores, where the plan is—the recommendation is that they would like to close 11 rural liquor stores.

Now what does this do to this Government's plan for rural decentralization when they do that, and what

kind of discussion have they had with the Government and with those communities which have already been selected, by the way, where they are prepared to close them, and what kind of impact is that going to have, and what kind of contradictory message is that going to be to the rural communities and to others? Here they want to strengthen their rural communities and they have a Crown corporation that is coming out with recommendations that are the opposite, that will do the opposite.

They also have suggested that they move towards promoting imported beer. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we know that in jurisdictions where this has been done that there is a potential loss of 30 percent of the domestic market, and that this is something that should be looked at very seriously, given Manitoba's rising unemployment, given the layoffs that have resulted from the Molson-Carling merger and, as I said previously, the experience that shows that American beer producers have taken as much as 30 percent of the market in other provinces as a result of vendor sales.

I think we have another area where this Government should be giving a very clear message to their Crown corporations that they want to protect and save an industry that is already being threatened. When they do promote and encourage the selling of American beer, they are giving them an unfair advantage or many people believe they have an unfair advantage because the Liquor Commission takes the responsibility for warehousing and gives them free distribution. So that is a fairly significant hand that our Liquor Commission is giving American beer companies to compete with our beer industry in the market. They get warehousing and free distribution.

There have been cases documented where the U.S. brewers are actually selling their beer for less than they are selling wholesale, and that is in order to break into the market and to draw some of the market away. I do not think we should be encouraging or allowing that kind of activity.

They want to look at reviewing Sunday opening of cocktail lounges, of beverage rooms and of cabarets. I think that we take the same position on this as we did on Sunday working, that we are opposed to opening this up for drinking on Sunday, as we are to workers not having the day of rest. So I think they should make a very clear statement that this should be really almost withdrawn until they take another look at it, come up with a comprehensive package.

There are other areas that they are not dealing with too where they are talking about expanding for Sunday opening. There is one other area. They are talking about letting people buy liquor on Sundays, and they are talking about promoting it and expanding it and selling it and encouraging it. But what are they doing with a recognized problem, and that is the overselling of liquor on Main Street? We know that there is overselling of liquor on Main Street and that it contradicts their existing laws, that those laws are not being held up, and that everybody knows those laws are not being withheld, and that is a very serious area. If they are going to be dealing with the opening up of some of these areas, they had better make sure that the laws

that presently exist are being followed and that there is not an abuse as there is on the overselling of liquor on Main Street.

It is my understanding that this has been brought to the Liquor Commission's attention by Main Street businesses who are very concerned about it and who have been told by the Manitoba Liquor Commission that there is no overselling of liquor on Main Street. That is absolute nonsense. All you have to do is drive through Main Street at any hour of the day, at any time, and you can clearly see that there is overselling of liquor through the outlets on Main Street, and they are not even thinking about dealing with issues like that.

Mr. Speaker, this report was done by their board. I think there was a suggestion when I raised the questions in the House that this was our document and, of course, it is not our document. It is dated April 4 and it has been brought in by their board and their chair. So this is a document that they have to take responsibility for and start having some discussions with the Liquor Control Commission so they are going in the right direction.

* (1500)

I think those are the major points I want to make. Just to sum up, we do not disagree with the direction the Government is taking to crack down on drunk drivers but they should be dealing with the issue of alcoholism, of prevention, of education of our young people, of treatment, and of support for families and the family abuse situation that is arising as a result of it.

We are going to be very anxious to not only speak on this issue today but to see what it is that is going to be said by the professionals in this area and by the public. We are prepared, when all my colleagues who are interested in speaking on this subject have had an opportunity to do so, to have this go on to committee so we can hear what additional information will be brought forward on this issue.

It is one of great importance and I just ask the Government to reconsider and to come in with a comprehensive package, please, that deals with all of these issues, and not just try to get increased revenue and increase the promotion and the selling of liquor on the one hand and then crack down on people who are drunk drivers on the other.

Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill): I rise to speak on this Bill to join in with the comments made by, I think, all Members of the House with respect to their support of the intent of this very important legislation. In that regard, I want to give limited congratulations to the Government for bringing forward this particular Bill.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

The Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) has indicated in his opening comments on that Bill that if this works we should see about a 25 percent reduction in the number of alcohol-related fatalities arising out of drinking and driving. We certainly want to do

everything in our power to support that sort of reduction in those offences and the tragedies that accompany them, but even if we are able to reduce alcohol-related driving fatalities by 25 percent, that still means there are 75 percent too many alcohol-related driving fatalities out there.

That is the context in which I want to place my own comments today, so when I say we are rising to give limited congratulations to this particular Bill, it is within that framework. There are a number of questions, as has been indicated by my colleagues, the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) and the Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill), with respect to the contradictions that are inherent within the Government's actions and activities on drinking and driving.

One cannot look at this Bill in isolation and be able to, in that way, develop an awareness and develop an understanding of where the Government wants to take us with respect to this very serious problem. One has to look at not what is only contained in the legislation, but also has to take a look at the Government's comments, the Government's activities, the Government's actions with respect to other drinking-related areas.

We are certainly supportive of this legislation from the perspective of what it hopes to accomplish. There are some questions on the legality of it. I think those questions have to be more thoroughly reviewed, Mr. Deputy Speaker, but I do believe that it is important legislation.

I take the Government at their word for the time being when they say that they have legal opinions which indicate that it would survive any test of constitutionality. Now we all know that legal opinions are usually drafted in such a manner so they can make a point but also leave open certain doors. That is the standard type of legal opinion one gets, so one cannot rely entirely upon legal opinions. This legislation most likely will be tested in the courts, as well it should if there are concerns about the constitutionality of it. In essence, we are basing our response to it now on the Minister's assurances that he does have those legal opinions which indicate that it will be ruled constitutional.

I want to direct my comments not so much to the Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) right now, as to the Attorney General (Mr. McCrae). While the Bill we are discussing here today comes in under the responsibility of the Minister of Highways and Transportation, I believe a lot of the things that the Attorney General has done over the past number of months and some of the things that the Attorney General has not done, which he and his Government should have done, in some way undermine the effectiveness of this Bill.

Certainly, one wants to get drunk drivers off the street. The Minister of Highways in his comments said that and I quote, "I am sure that reducing the number of impaired drivers is a goal that every Member of this Assembly supports." Yes, indeed, every Member of this Assembly does support that goal.

Just preceding that statement in his comments, the Minister of Highways and Transportation said and I

quote again, "It is this change in attitude which is fundamental to produce any significant reduction in the number of drivers who get behind the wheel when they are impaired, and they say that change in attitude will save the lives of hundreds of Manitobans and greatly reduce, as well, the number of people who are injured in such car accidents." If what we are talking about is a change in attitude, then certainly deterrence is a part of being able to change people's attitudes, but it does not change everyone's attitude.

I want to quote from an article from the *Globe and Mail* just a little while ago, May 22, 1989, under the headline of: "Incidence of impaired driving at lowest level in 15 years." It is a relatively positive article from the perspective of the statistics being down. I have to indicate though, my other reading in this area has shown there are some who question these statistics so that we just cannot take the raw numbers at face value. We have to again put them in some appropriate context. Notwithstanding that, let us assume that the incidence was being reduced, which we would hope it would be.

There is also a portion of the article, I think, which bears repeating. It says, and I quote, "The Health and Welfare survey"—and this is a survey that was done last summer, I believe—"The Health and Welfare survey found that more than half of all drinking and driving incidents were accounted for by less than 3 percent of adults." Now let me repeat that because I think it is an important statistic, more than half of the drinking-related accidents are accounted for by less than 3 percent of adults. There is a quote in it by Mr. Donaldson.

Mr. Donaldson says, following that paragraph, and I quote, "I think we are seeing a very gradual shift in attitudes and behaviour," Mr. Donaldson said. "But the real problem is that the people who are least likely to be a problem are the ones who are most likely to change their behaviour. We are being left with a harder core of drinking drivers for whom deterrence is not effective." So deterrence alone is not the answer. Deterrence alone, and if one accepts those figures, would be a very limited part of the answer in 50 percent of the alcohol-related drinking problems or accidents. While this increases deterrence, and it does, this Bill intends to increase deterrence and it does in a number of ways. I do not believe that it can overcome some of the other activities and programs and policies of the Government.

I am going to reiterate some of the things that my colleague, the Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill), said because I think they are important contradictions that have to be addressed by this Government. It says on the one hand it wants to reduce drinking- and driving-related offences, accidents and fatalities. One of the ways to do that, I believe, is to reduce drinking.

I may be a bit more harsh than some and a bit less harsh than others with respect to my attitudes about drinking, but I think that there is room for an honest analysis of every activity which the Government undertakes with respect to dealing with drinking-related issues. When the Government last year brought in a Bill which—and it was supported by the Liberals, I have to say, and I found that somewhat disturbing but I assume they made that decision to support that Bill

on the basis of their research and their own perceptions of drinking-related problems, a Bill that allowed for expanded advertising for alcohol products.

* (1510)

The New Democratic Party spoke against that Bill at that time. We did so, I can tell you, after a very lengthy caucus meeting on it where a large number of different and diverse opinions and attitudes and suggestions on the way to go were thoroughly aired. We came to the conclusion that increasing advertising for alcohol-related products, particularly where that advertising would affect young people, was the wrong direction to go if you wanted to reduce alcohol-related problems. Among those problems of course is, foremost, drinking and driving.

We spoke out very strongly in this Chamber against that increased advertising earlier in the day, that we felt would affect young people more so than others, because the restriction on advertising at that particular time of the day was intended in the first instance to ensure that young Manitobans were not subjected to a heavy barrage of alcohol advertising during their prime viewing time.

We all know that TV is a very powerful medium, we all know that advertising is a very powerful medium, and we all know that advertising is designed to encourage people to take on certain actions and attitudes. If it were not for that, there would be no advertising or there would be really no need for advertising.

We have heard the suggestion by those who promote increased advertising for alcohol products during the earlier hours of television viewing that, well, Manitobans were being subjected to advertising from cable stations in any event, so let us have some of the revenue accrue to the province with respect to that advertising. That argument does have some appealing aspects to it and one has to consider very carefully. We also heard those who are involved in alcohol advertising say that, well, alcohol-related advertising is not really designed to encourage people to drink, but is more so designed to encourage people to switch brands back and forth.

Quite frankly, I think if that were the case then we probably could have kept that advertising off the air in the early hours, because those people who are already drinking are the ones who are going to be switching back and forth and not the ones who are going to be subjected to that advertising as much as would young people.

I really believe that, notwithstanding that suggestion that the advertising would not have the effect of encouraging people to drink, I accept it as a valid suggestion. I reject the notion, however, that it will encourage younger people to drink. Younger people who are at the same time in their life taking on new responsibilities, including that of driving, can find themselves in a situation because of that advertising where they are encouraged to drink, and find themselves driving and find themselves in a problem situation.

As the Honourable Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill) said, that advertising is very clearly directed towards

younger people. If you look at the people in the advertising—and then people who put together advertising are fairly astute. They know how to shape an advertisement, how to develop an advertisement, how to use images in a very manipulative way. They use images to make people think that certain things are the way in which they should do things, that certain actions are the actions they should undertake, that certain products are products that will enhance them in the minds of their peers and in their own self-image, so we have these very attractive images of people drinking that have to have an effect of encouraging people to at least try alcohol and, having tried the alcohol, most likely to continue drinking, because what is that advertising saying to them?

It is saying that drinking is a very, very socially acceptable habit they should partake in. That advertising is saying if they drink they will be a part of social functions that they may not be a part of. It holds that promise out to them. It holds a promise out to them that they will be more attractive, more fun to be around, more socially motivated and, for that reason, they should be drinking.

I think that is the wrong direction to go. The New Democratic Party was not alone in their criticism of that particular action on the part of the Government, which I think is contrary and contradictory to what they are trying to do with this particular Bill.

The Attorney General (Mr. McCrae) is probably familiar with a letter that was sent to a large number of Members of the Legislature on all sides, including some Government Ministers, from a group of graduate nursing students of community health at the University of Manitoba. I believe it is important to read some of that letter into the record, because I think the comments that the nurses make in this particular letter in opposition to those changes in advertising are appropriate comments to be made within the context of this debate. I am reading from a letter which was sent to one of my colleagues but was carbon copied to a large number of us.

"On December 20, 1988, Bill 47, Section 10 of The Manitoba Liquor Control Act, was amended which removed the time restriction on alcohol advertising originating in Manitoba. Now these ads can be broadcasted at any time of the day or night. We believe the Government made a grave error."

That is this group of graduate nurses speaking. Now why do they believe that they made a grave error? They believe that they made a grave error based on the research which they had undertaken to determine the impact of changes in the alcohol-advertising curfew which was undertaken by the Government. They prepared a brief to the Manitoba Government. I want to read just a couple of comments from that brief. "Television viewers, especially in Winnipeg, were generally unaware of the former curfew because we are inundated with cable American TV commercials which have no time regulations." According to Hansard, local private broadcasters believe that this was discriminatory and resulted in lost advertising revenue. Those comments I have made earlier. "The amendment

was introduced to the House by the PCs and supported by the Liberals. The NDP and one citizen spoke against the change."

Now they make an important point in their comments when they say that during the debate it was noted that the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba advocated that the status quo be maintained, no advertising prior to 10 p.m. The fact is, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba made that comment during the review of the Minister of Health's (Mr. Orchard) Estimates in this House in response to a question from myself. The Minister of Health was present as were a number of other Government Members, as were a number of Liberal Members, when the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba said that they would not want to see that curfew removed because they would be concerned about the impact that removal would have on encouraging younger people to drink. The Government was fully aware, at the time when it was reviewing this legislation that there was at least one very prominent and expert body out there that would be opposed to what they were doing. That prominent and expert body was a body that was designed to reduce alcohol-related problems in the province.

They say that the legislation which was introduced by the Conservatives is a regressive piece of legislation. They say it is regressive because they believe, and they have scientific studies to the effect, that "current thinking is that alcohol consumption is determined by the mutual interaction and environmental factors." They list those factors as price, availability, culture, family and advertising. Then they note that it is also determined by individual consumer differences.

I quote again from their document: "In the whole issue of alcohol consumption, there is not any one thing that has been proven to cause people to drink alcohol, including advertising." So they are trying to present a balanced picture but they say, however, it is an associated factor. They quote a study made in 1986 by Smart and Osborne that "the frequency with which alcohol commercials appear on TV and radio has caused concern that these contribute indirectly to alcohol consumption. Alcohol advertising is one of the many factors which contribute to a general environment which promotes overly casual attitudes regarding alcoholic beverages."

* (1520)

That is the point we are trying to make. On the one hand we are trying to discourage alcohol consumption, at least in the specific instance of where a person might drive knowing that in our society, particularly in our province with the climate and the distances that we travel, that driving is a very key part of all of our lives, and we all drive quite frequently, and at the same time we should be trying to discourage alcohol consumption rather than encourage it.

Alcohol commercials are inherently misleading in that they fail to warn people about the potential negative affects of alcohol consumption. These lifestyle ads promote a view that alcohol use is not only problem-

free but fun, sexy and desirable. They normalize alcohol consumption. This view is particularly dangerous when promoting a chemical which is addictive to one in 10 users. It is for these reasons that those who research alcohol favour a conservative—that is their word, no pun intended—approach to promotion. Now that is the one type of advertising which we have opened up in this province under the Conservatives.

At the same time as we have done that, we have another contradiction when we have the Minister of Justice, the Attorney General (Mr. McCrae), appearing in other advertising, decrying the problems associated with drinking and driving. We do not discourage him from doing that but I read from a press release that is dated March 1989 when it says, the Broadcasters' Association of Manitoba is pleased to announce that private broadcasters, both radio and television, will launch a strong campaign against alcohol abuse.

The campaign, in the form of 30-second public service announcements, will concentrate on various areas of public concern. The first stage of the campaign will begin in April 1989, and the focus will be on the legal problems associated with drinking and driving. The theme of this part of the campaign will be, it is wrong to drink and drive. Each message will also feature a 10-second insert by Manitoba's Attorney General, Jim McCrae, asking Manitobans not to drink and drive. Other themes relating to alcohol education and moderation will be touched on during the course of the campaign.

So here on the one hand we have the Minister of Justice, himself, going on TV, telling people not to drink and drive, in other words, trying to get them to reduce their alcohol consumption, when at the same time the Minister of Justice or the Attorney General has brought forward a Bill in this House that will encourage more drinking, particularly among young people in this Legislature and, as the Member for the Interlake (Mr. Uruski) says, supported by the Liberals. Now that is a contradiction.

This campaign of the Broadcasters' Association to discourage drinking and driving is a \$350,000 campaign. That money may be put to good use but I would think that money is not one-tenth of what the alcohol and wine and beer producers are spending on their increased advertising over a period of time. In other words, whatever the Attorney General is doing in that 10-second clip is being wiped out by a barrage of alcohol-related advertising promoting lifestyle changes which would increase the use of alcohol in this province, which is being put on at earlier hours in a day and, therefore, being seen by more young people, more people who are susceptible to advertising of that sort, lifestyle-related advertising, more people who build their own self-image around advertising and what society says they should be through mediums such as TV and radio.

So, it is good that the Attorney General is doing that, but I think his time would have been better spent in not having brought forward the legislation which he brought forward last year which has increased advertising.

In their brief, the nurses also make the point about young people and advertising, and I quote again from

their brief. They say: "We believe it is timely to bring to your attention recent information. Those who testified for the National Commission against drunk driving in Washington D.C., December 1988"—very recent testimony—"expressed dismay about the quantity and the content of advertisements for beer. The youths themselves testified that advertising encourages adolescents to drink. There are effects, therefore, that cannot be ignored."

The American Automobile Association Foundation for Traffic Safety has released a study by media communication researchers entitled "Myths, Beer, and Men" in 1987, which suggests that beer TV commercials play a significant role in the involvement of young males in drunk driving. It is not just the NDP that was critical of that approach by the Conservatives and the Liberals, but it is people in other jurisdictions who have conducted original research, and very well-documented research, into the area that say their opening up of the advertising is going to have exactly the opposite effect of what they are trying to do with this legislation. That is wrong; that is contradictory. That is stupid. If they think that by opening up the advertising so that more young people will be subjected to advertising for beer and wine, they are not going to have an impact on those young people in their driving and drinking habits, then they better go back and read some of this research to more fully acquaint themselves with what has happened in other jurisdictions.

I said earlier that I was making those remarks more for the benefit of the Attorney General (Mr. McCrae) than for the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger). I want the Minister of Highways and Transportation to listen and consider those comments carefully as well, because I believe he is being undercut in what he is trying to do by one of his colleagues, by his Government as a whole. I think that is wrong.

That is not the only area that this Government has taken recent action that will have the opposite effect of what this legislation is intended to do. They have also taken a serious look at credit cards for the purchase of alcohol, or they are taking a serious look at it. They have cheque cashing—I believe the cheque cashing provisions are in place or contemplated at the present time—and gift certificates. I call that the Government's frequent drinker program, so that if you are a frequent drinker you do not even have to stop off at the ATM anymore on the way home to make your purchase at the Liquor Control Commission when these changes take place. I believe these changes will take place under this Government. I think that will encourage more drinking and driving as a result.- (Interjection)-

As the Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) says and as have other colleagues of mine, we also see their program where they are considering free samples at the Liquor Control Commissions. Maybe that will not result in people drinking and driving as a result of partaking in free samples—a third of an ounce at the Liquor Control Commission—but it is designed to get people to drink. It is designed to make people want to purchase more liquor. That is the only reason they have it there. It is not to get people to change their

brands. It is not a brand preference motivator. It is to get people to buy more alcohol. Again, the more people buy alcohol, the more you have the potential for drinking and driving problems.

They have instituted a program of 24-hour drinking at the airport. I missed the vote the other day here because I was in Thompson at the airport and the plane was supposed to leave at 9:20 in the morning, and unfortunately, there was a five-hour delay in the plane, which is not unusual with some of the service we are getting up North now. I make that point directly to the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger), and as an aside look for his support in trying to improve services in the North. Since we have had this deregulation brought forward first by a Liberal federal Government and reinforced by Conservative federal and provincial Governments, we have seen a deterioration in service, but that is a speech for another time.

I make the point that in waiting the five hours for that plane in the Thompson airport, for the first time I noticed they were serving liquor in the airport. It was the first time I noticed it, so I wanted to check and make certain if that was a new policy or a policy I just had not noted, because I had not sat and waited in that airport for five hours at any given time previously. In fact, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when I spoke to individuals there, they told me that was a new policy. Well, that is part of the Government's opening up of the restrictions on drinking in this province. So we have people who, not in Thompson because the airport is not open 24 hours, but certainly here in the city have access to 24-hour drinking and I think that is the wrong direction in which to be going.

* (1530)

It is conceivable, and I look to the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger), that someone coming in off of a rough flight, maybe having waited for several hours or missed a connection or their luggage is not there, deciding that before they hop in their car and drive from the airport, because most people drive from the airport when they return, to have a couple of drinks at the airport because they know that may be the only place that is open and available for them to have a couple of drinks until they get home.- (Interjection)- That may not happen a lot, but the fact is it will happen. No, you do not have to have a boarding pass out going to drink at the airport, you do not have to. You have to have something to eat, but you do not have to have a boarding pass to drink at the airport. So if it does not happen a lot, how much is an acceptable level of occurrence of that sort of an event? I would say there is not an acceptable level and, therefore, by opening up the restrictions, one is opening up the opportunities for more drinking- and driving-related fatalities and accidents rather than restricting them.

Now we are going to see as well a Government consider seriously the purchasing of liquor on Sunday. When that comment was made earlier, the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) said from his seat, well, people can drink on Sundays now if they go to a

restaurant. Yes, people can drink on Sundays now if they go to a restaurant, and people can drink at home on Sundays if they wish to drink at home on Sundays. The fact is that if you start to open up the ability and the opportunity to drink on Sundays, you are only doing so for one reason, and that is to have more drinking on Sundays. If there is enough opportunity now for people to drink on Sundays, there is no reason to have relaxed provisions and relaxed legislation in that area. The only reason to do that is you believe that some people out there now want to drink on Sundays who cannot drink on Sundays, and you want to make it easier for them to drink on Sundays. I think that is wrong.

We are talking now about the closure of rural liquor stores, the Government is talking about that, another area that there is inconsistency in what they say, in what they do, as a Government. The fact that there is no residential treatment centre in this province for people who have a large drinking problem or a serious drinking problem, who need help, cannot go to a facility in this province. Remember the statistic which I quoted earlier from the Globe and Mail article, Mr. Deputy Speaker, when it said that "the problem is that about 3 percent of adults account for more than half of all drinking and driving incidents."

Those 3 percent of adults are very seriously ill people when it comes to their problem with alcohol, and they should have access to the same sort of residential centres and treatments that other seriously ill people have. They should not have to travel out of province to get the help that they need. They are the ones who are going to be causing most of the problem or at least almost half of the problem. They are the ones that we should be directing a lot of our attention towards. Instead of making it easier for them to drink, we should be making it harder for them to drink, and we should be making it easier for them to get treatment. I believe that very strongly.

I am also very concerned, Mr. Deputy Speaker, about the cuts in the budget to the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba to the tune of \$200,000 this year. Now, that is the same Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba that is quoted as saying that they are opposed to the changes in the advertising for beer and wine commercials during the earlier hours of the week. I am not going to suggest that this Government punished the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba for taking a stand that was contradictory to what they were going to do, but I will tell you that this Government has not encouraged the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba through that cut to take strong stands on issues which they feel extremely concerned about. I think it is the wrong direction again in which to be going if one wants to get results and reduce drinking and driving in this province.

I was reading while preparing for this speech, Mr. Deputy Speaker, an article from Canadian Speeches, March, 1989, and it is by Dee Nicholson, Executive Director of Sandy Golden's Campaign Against Drunk Driving in Canada. I just want to read the small precis that precedes the article.

The headline is, "Someone you love will be hurt or killed by a drunk driver." "One out of every 14 drivers

on the road is impaired by alcohol. Between 11 p.m. and 3 a.m., that ratio is one out of four. This year, drunk drivers will kill 3,000 Canadians and injure another half million. The chance of avoiding a drunk-related auto crash during your lifetime is no better than 50-50. The chance that someone close to you will be killed or injured is virtually 100 percent, but we can stamp out this tragedy." Those are Mr. Nicholson's comments. "We can stamp out this tragedy."

Well, I would commend and congratulate the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger) for bringing forward a Bill that is intended to stamp out this tragedy. But I condemn the Attorney-General (Mr. McCrae) and I condemn the Premier (Mr. Filmon) and I condemn the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger) as a Member of the Cabinet of a Government that brought forward all sorts of legislation and programs and policies and actions which will have exactly the opposite effect.

That condemnation does not stop in the front benches, because I believe that backbenchers in the Conservative caucus also have to share some of the responsibility for opening up advertising that will have the effect of encouraging younger people to drink more. I think they have to assume some of the responsibility for the review of the different programs by the Manitoba Liquor Commission which will increase, I believe, access to alcohol and, therefore, alcohol consumption and, therefore, drinking- and driving-related accidents and fatalities. I think they have to condemn the cuts to the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba. I think they have to assume some responsibility for that as well. I think that they cannot sit back and take lightly what their Cabinet is doing that is going to work against what I know they believe to be the right direction for this province to proceed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, this Bill is tainted by the Government's actions. This Bill is undercut by the Government's actions. This Bill is made less effective by the Government's actions. This Bill would be a much better Bill if it was brought forward in an environment of trying to reduce alcohol consumption instead of trying to find every way possible to increase alcohol consumption.

That is why we spoke out against some of those other pieces of legislation and programs, and that is why we will continue to speak out against those inappropriate increases in access and inappropriate actions and policies which increase consumption rather than reduce it. We will speak out against those cuts in the Alcoholism Foundation in Manitoba, when it comes time to review the Estimates, as being contrary to good policy with respect to controlling drinking and driving and reducing alcohol consumption, and giving people the opportunity to seek treatment in their own province.

In his opening comments, the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger) said "the debate between the Parties is the most effective means of achieving this goal while respecting the rights of Canadians." He talked about the debate in this House, I believe. "There can be and should be vigorous debate as to whether our program properly balanced is the

right of the public at large to be protected from impaired driving with individual rights guaranteed to us all. There can also be questions whether other measures might be more effective, and I want to conclude my remarks on that point."

* (1540)

The Minister said there are questions as to whether or not other measures can be effective. I want to tell him, I believe that other measures can be more effective. While we support this Bill going to committee where we will listen carefully to the comments of other Parties and Manitobans who are interested in this issue and we will work with the other Parties to try to make this Bill a better Bill, in the meantime, we believe these other measures should also be implemented.

Rethink your lessening and loosening up of the restrictions on beer- and wine-related advertising during the earlier hours of the evening. It is the wrong direction in which to go. Rethink your cuts to the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba. It is the wrong direction to go. Rethink the review which is going on internally now about credit cards, cheque cashing and gift certificates for frequent drinkers. Rethink the 24-hour drinking at the airport. Rethink the Sunday purchasing of liquor.

Rethink all of those actions that you are taking as a Government which impede your goal and our goal, the goal of all legislators, as the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger) said in his speech, to reduce drinking and driving accidents and fatalities in this province, because if you proceed with those other initiatives, if you proceed with that other legislation, if you proceed with those other policies, you are going to put more people, particularly young people, at risk in this province. That is not what any of us want to do.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member's time has expired.

Mr. Cowan: While we give you limited support on this particular Bill and limited congratulations, we also want you to put this Bill in the appropriate context to reduce alcohol consumption among all Manitobans in this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) has the floor.

Mr. Jim Maloway (Elmwood): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am very pleased to follow the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) and a couple of my other colleagues in this debate on this very important Bill.

Alcohol in its various forms has been available throughout history. Throughout that long period of time, of course, one could question how much damage it has done to the users and abusers of that substance in the area of liver damage, heart disease and other such things, but it has only been since the industrial age and the advent of the automobile that you have had the type of carnage that we see on today's roads.

A hundred years ago, I suppose the worst that would happen to you was you might fall off your horse and

perhaps get hurt. Before gun powder was invented, you might get stabbed with a blunt knife or hit over the head with a stick of wood, but after gunpowder of course there were incidents of people being shot. In today's world with the availability of weapons and automatic weapons in this society, we are seeing increasing incidents all over of violence caused in part and contributed to by the abuse of alcohol.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the 1950s, I believe that is the time when the men's-only beer halls were established in Manitoba. The Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) and I spoke recently about the role of our previous Mayor, Mayor Juba, in bringing in the new attitudes in a way towards drinking in this province. When it was told to me that Mayor Juba, not the mayor at that time in the early '50s in the protest against the Government's policies on liquor, appeared at one of the local bars with nothing on but an empty keg, he was using this method to try to bring the Government to bring in freer laws regarding alcohol consumption.

It is at that time that perhaps the Bracken Commission in the late '50s, early '60s came out as a result of Steve Juba's actions. The Government at that time developed the policies that stayed with us for many, many years, the Bracken Commission of that day. Perhaps that is where the original mistake may have been made, Mr. Deputy Speaker, because in fact out of that came the bars as we know them today, large bars and fairly well spaced, as opposed to, say, a local pub concept that you have in England where you have a local bar on the corner and a person walks down and has a couple of beers and walks home. The infrastructure that we set up for bars in this province tended to be Taj Mahal-type operations, very large operations that people had to drive to, involving large parking lots and large taxes.

So one of the problems that the Government will face, if it ever tries to embrace a system of neighbourhood pubs, will be those very hotel owners, the very members of the MMA, coming to the Government and lobbying against these small local bars because they will argue that they in fact contribute tremendous amounts of tax dollars on their buildings and that in fact, if you dissipate too much more of their revenue, they will be broke. That of course is the argument that they have used with the Government with the recent changes to the drunk-driving laws in Canada and in this province. They have argued that people are now much more fearful of getting in their car and going to the local bars. As a result, they are buying beer at the vendor, going home and drinking there, and as a result their revenues in these bars are suffering, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

In the 1960s with the muscle cars and the increased speed limits on the roads, we saw the carnage increasing with a greater number of people, particularly young people, dying in car accidents, and it was not until the 1970s that Governments proceeded to try to combat that. With the advent of seatbelts and reduced speed limits because of the oil crunch after 1973, I believe there was a bit of a reduction in the carnage on the road.

In the 1970s, the previous NDP Government attempted to come up with a new attitude towards

drinking in this province, where they tried and attempted to, at one point, take the Liquor Commission and move it from the Attorney-General's Department over to the Tourism Department. The idea behind that was to make drinking a little more socially acceptable and, hopefully, people would develop the attitudes of the Europeans and consume in moderation. Moderation was the key. At that time we were probably, it could be argued, promoting drinking in that we opened up the system a lot more than it was at that time but, nevertheless, that was the theory behind what we did.

So I believe that there is a relationship between availability of alcohol and abuse of alcohol. It is a fact that if you have to, if it is not so available, you may pass on that drink. If the alcohol is readily available, there is a tendency to have that extra drink or to have that drink. I think we all recognize that in the sort of area of involvement in the occupation that we are all in. When you are in Government and going from reception to reception, you know it is very hard to avoid the alcohol that is ever present at our socials.—(Interjection)— The Minister reminds me that there is always ginger ale and that is true but, nevertheless, it is still hard to avoid it. When you do get away from that social circle, the circle that involves the constant cocktail circuit, what you find is that you tend to drink less, that is my feeling.

So I think that availability of alcohol does have some effect certainly on some people. Certainly the Liquor Commission's new policy designed to offer people samples in Liquor Commission stores, I do not believe is a good move, because what you are doing is you are encouraging people to have a sample in the liquor store, maybe one or two samples here, and then perhaps the individual will drive or walk down to the next liquor store and have another one or two. There are a number of people who in fact will do that.

* (1550)

As the Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill) had mentioned earlier that people often do go to the supermarkets and try out all the samples of pizza and whatnot that are being offered. This in fact may be quite the thing for people who do not have a lot of money in their pockets to spend the odd morning or afternoon doing. I remember back in 1970 in Amsterdam, when we were young kids hitchhiking around at the age of 17, going to the Heineken Breweries every day—to the Member for Gladstone (Mrs. Oleson). We paid our one gulden and we took our obligatory tour of the brewery, which after the third or fourth time was not too exciting, and we got to have all the beer we could drink in three hours and pretzels and whatnot and that was our food for the day.

If you are confined in what you have in terms of money to spend and so on, you will try to follow the easiest route possible in obtaining what you wish. I suppose free wine samples in a liquor store will certainly be a real boon to those people who are a little short on money at that particular time. I mean, after all, people who are short of money drink all sorts of things, vanilla extract and all sorts of other drinks that maybe the Member for Gladstone would not be caught with, but people in our society manage to drink them.

I think that as we move into the 1990s, the car industry has mandated that it has safer cars, to a certain extent, in that air bags will become mandatory in the cars. Once again, if you get to the point where we are all driving around in rubber cars and people are perfectly safe, that is still not an argument for in any way tolerating drinking and driving.

There was a reference made earlier to the conviction rate, and this is a very interesting point. The Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns), the Minister of Natural Resources, was making reference to the number of convictions in rural Manitoba relative to the number of convictions in the City of Winnipeg. Looking at these statistics, one would think that nobody in Winnipeg drinks and drives. I was shocked when he told us that out of 8,000 convictions for drinking and driving in Manitoba—I do not know whether these figures were from last year—but of the 8,000 convictions, 7,000 were in rural Manitoba. That is rather shocking. I suppose when you think about it, it makes some sense. In rural Manitoba, it is very easy for the police cruiser to park outside the hotel, and there is only one road leading away, and waits until the unsuspecting imbibers scurry forth at closing time and just picks him up and gets his quota for the week, and that is it.

Can you imagine if that were the case if the ALERT were parked outside of the stadium after a Jets game or after a Bombers game, what would happen there?—(Interjection)— Well, you know, the Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) asks whether they drink there. Evidently not. The statistics do not bear that out. I am certain if the Alertmobile was set up there and if they were to catch people rather than direct traffic coming out of the arena, that in fact these numbers would even out a little bit more, that the Minister would have more even numbers, perhaps 7,000 in the country and 7,000 in the city.

The Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) made reference to the frequent drinkers program and of course that was a reference to the new plan to the Liquor Commission to provide the samples. I think that the Government, given the criticism that has been levelled at them as a result of this program, if they have any sense at all, will get on top of this and either put a stop to it or put some very heavy restrictions on this program because it certainly seems to me like a recipe for disaster.

Reference was also made, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the reduction in fatalities. The Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) made that reference, I believe, since the new laws have been in effect. He had made the point that the 75 percent that are still dying in these fatalities are far too many. As I had indicated, the more safe, the more air bags we put in, the more seat belts we make people wear and the safer the cars, the fact of the matter is that the level of carnage on the road is still too high.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) had made a suggestion that the NDP had tightened up penalties a few years ago to educate the public, had spoken at great length about the ALIVE Program by the MPIC and how good a program it was, how effective it was. He made reference to the fact

that the NDP, rather than just worrying about punishing the offenders, had done something in the area of rehabilitation and education.

The Member for Logan (Ms. Hemphill), as well, made reference to that. We believe that is a big area for development. You may get some results in cracking the whip and cracking down on people. That is probably necessary in this instance, but we believe in the long term that education is important and rehabilitation is important.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of the previous speakers made reference to the fact that 50 percent of all fatal accidents were contributed to by drinking. This program that the Government is covering by this Bill, it is bringing in by this Bill, has been evidently operating in more than 20 states. There are evidently 6,000 Manitobans charged with impaired driving annually. Now that is at variance to the figures I was given by the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) but, once again, we are not certain what year he was using in his statistics. In the U.S. experience, there was a 25 percent reduction in the number of fatal injuries.

Once again, if seizing people's licences and impounding the vehicles produces a 25 percent reduction, I think it is probably a worthwhile exercise, but to just leave it at that is probably short-sighted. We should look at education, because that really is the key in rehabilitation. In fact, I do not know how many people have been rehabilitated as smokers by seeing the movies of the lungs that are coated with tar and smoke. I am too scared to watch the movie. I have not gotten around to seeing it but I have managed to more or less quit on my own for other reasons. I think there are a lot of tools in the war that we can be using, and that perhaps is just one of them to explain to people, and try to rehabilitate and convince them they should not drink and drive, or should not drink at all.

It has been pointed out by the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) that the right to drive is a privilege which certainly can be cancelled by the Government of the Day. The Minister has suggested we would have a Session tomorrow morning and there would be people there to describe what is happening in other jurisdictions. We, on this side of the House, certainly commend him for setting up that program. I think there will be a number of Members from this side of the House who will be attending that Session.

Lifestyle really is the issue here, and it has been brought home over and over again by speakers who have spoken about the ads. I was on the other side of the argument with my colleague those many times in caucus when we discussed this on the advertising question. The fact of the matter is that the advertising that one sees on TV right now, more specifically American TV but now Canadian TV as well, that lifestyle image that they are promoting really has a long-term detrimental effect to our population. My child is two-and-a-half years old now, and I know that whenever these beer ads come on the TV and so on, he perks up and pays attention to these things. I think they spend more money on the beer ads than they do on the television programs because some of them are actually fairly good.

* (1600)

There is a tremendous amount of waste in money spent on advertising the product. They are advertising the product, to tell me what? Tell me that I should drink beer? I already drink beer. I do not have to be told that I like a certain brand of beer. I know which brand it is, and I will buy it on my own. I do not need the advertising to tell me that. So the advertising obviously is not there for me. It is there to hook new drinkers into the system, to get new people to try the brands and to drink more.

This lifestyle advertising is a problem. I do not know how you really solve it because Manitoba is not an island unto itself. That is the problem that we faced with the advertising last year. We were basically cutting off our local advertisers when we were not able to do anything about all that advertising coming in from the United States. It was for that reason that I supported the view that it was pointless to try and do that. The fact of the matter is that if it were possible to correct the lifestyle advertising, to eliminate the lifestyle advertising, I would be in favour of that. I think it would be a good idea.-(Interjection)- The Minister is talking about dissension in the NDP.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

Another big problem, Mr. Deputy Speaker—no, Mr. Speaker. I am sort of halfway in between Mr. Deputy Speaker and Mr. Speaker. Now it looks like it is Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker is back in the Chair.

There is a real problem, I think, with people driving while suspended. Last year, the CBC did what I thought was an excellent program, showing people walking out of the police station, jumping in a car and driving away. They had gone to the police station, I guess, to have their licence suspended. I do not know how else you can deal with these people other than to take their cars away from them and not give them a licence back for a long time.

I know that in the Autopac business, we see a lot of, as the Minister said, flaunting of the law where people walk in and deliberately want to know how they can do this, that or the other thing to avoid this or that. We had a couple of people in last week who were obviously drunk who wanted to transfer a plate. I do not think we had any other choice but when they left to notify the police that in fact they were driving in a drunken state. I believe we have a moral responsibility to let the police know, because they could have killed somebody or got into an accident. Perhaps they should have been restrained in the office before they got out the door, but that was not the case.

In any event, it is a big problem and we do commend the Minister for attempting to take action here and do more. We had done a fair amount while we were in Government, but do a bit more to solve this problem of people driving while suspended and drunk driving. Winnipeg last year had more than 2,000 charges of driving while suspended or disqualified. Now, that is an incredible amount of people who were charged while driving suspended. I mean, think of how many people there are out there who are driving while suspended

who are not caught. That is the amazing thing. I do not know what the ratio would be, but if the police could catch 2,000 people driving while suspended, how many thousands and thousands more are out there doing exactly that? -(Interjection)- The Member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery) said something, I know not what. I would prefer to leave it that way for the moment.

Mr. Speaker, reference was also made to the cutbacks of the AFM budget by a total of \$200,000.00. Once again, we do not feel that is a very productive cut, given the Government's thrust to get the drunk drivers off the roads. The AFM in my opinion does a good job and we should be promoting its efforts, not rewarding it with cuts to its budget.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have?

Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources): Unlimited.

Mr. Maloway: Unlimited time? The Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) tells me I have unlimited time.- (Interjection)- The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) has just reminded me of a very important function that I have neglected for the last 35 minutes, and I apologize for that.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know exactly where this Government is headed. I know that with a majority Government they probably would be privatizing most of the liquor commissions in this province. I would think we would be seeing beer sold in grocery stores and other such things. If it comes to that, I think they would be working at cross purposes. I guess only time will tell. If they had a majority Government, I think they would do these things, but that of course is not likely, given the current situation in Manitoba.

Reference was made to child and wife abuse and spousal abuse. Certainly these are contributed to by alcohol, the very unfortunate happening in St. Boniface last week certainly contributed to—I believe if the reports are right—by alcohol abuse, just another example of how the costs—the Government may make money on revenues selling alcohol, but no one really knows the true costs that society suffers as a result of the abuse of that alcohol. Through the medical system, how much of your medical budget is really attributable to the abuse of alcohol?

An Honourable Member: A horrendous amount.

Mr. Maloway: That is right. I do not imagine that we are making anywhere near the money on the revenue side on taxes on alcohol that we are spending out in the area of health care.

The fact of the matter is too that bars on Main Street, and the Minister knows this, are open at nine or ten o'clock in the morning. It is an incredibly early hour to get started, and I am sure they are fairly full at that hour. I was a liquor inspector a number of years ago, back in 1976, and I had the Main Street section of town for a bit of time. That is when I first became aware that bars were open at that hour. Those bars closed

a little earlier, but in this city right now one can start drinking legally in bars as early as nine or ten o'clock in the morning and continue through to three or four o'clock in the morning at least, and then go to the airport where the bar is open all night long.

* (1610)

We do not disagree with the direction the Government is taking with this Bill. In fact we, by and large, applaud this Bill and support this Bill. We just wanted to take a bit of time to explain to the Members opposite why we support this Bill, why we are so enthusiastic about this Bill, and why we would support sending it on to the committee stage. With that, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to participate in the debate on Bill No. 3 that has been presented by the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger), dealing with the enforcement of impaired driving in this province.

Before I go into my remarks on this Bill, I would want and I would hope that either the Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) or the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation (Mr. Cummings) or the Attorney General (Mr. McCrae), one of those three Ministers, would kindly tell myself and Members on this side what has occurred to the ministerial committee, co-ordinating committee, that our Government set up of which I headed as Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation in 1987-88.

We were so determined to bring about a co-ordinated approach dealing with the question of impairment and co-ordinating, both from the health point of view, from the educational point of view, or the rehabilitative point of view, through the Alcoholism Foundation, from the enforcement point of view, and from the highway, traffic and insurance point of view that we wanted to put a committee of officials together, and in fact began the process of setting up this committee to, at least, determine over the next number of months what the actual public expenditures from a governmental point of view were going into the area of impaired driving.

If this committee has been disbanded by the present administration, I believe that it will be a hollow move by the gesture that they are putting forward. As good as this gesture may be and the need that is there, clearly the Government cannot go around and tell Manitobans that they want to be tough on impaired drivers, because people have to perceive that there are going to be some severe penalties before I think the mental click occurs that I could be, or whoever is concerned about this matter or who is involved in this matter, before that individual says, I could be part of that problem.

So the Government has to decide as to what its priorities are and whether or not they are going to take a look at it from, I guess one could say, a total viewpoint of expenditures and measures that are taken both on the educational, on the enforcement, on their rehabilitative areas, and to be able to determine how

much is being spent, what is being spent, and how best to make better use of available resources in this area. I would be interested to know from the Government what has occurred in that ministerial committee.

Mr. Speaker, one of the interesting, not statistics, but actually studies was undertaken jointly between the federal Government, the Department of Transport, and the Province of Manitoba in 1986. The result of that study just became known in the spring of 1988, and I would like to highlight some of the key points that came out of the study of the Manitoba Roadside Survey of Nighttime Driving Behaviour. These were drivers who were stopped at random, were told that they would not be charged, but they wanted their viewpoint. This was a stop, not by the police, these were checks made—I guess the police did them, but there were not going to be any charges laid, and the survey was conducted by Department of Transport and provincial officials.

Mr. Speaker, the results are, to say the least, in some areas are startling. I will go through some of them. Almost one of out every five drivers surveyed had at least a measurable level of alcohol in their system. In other words, 20 percent of the drivers had been drinking. Here is the other one. One out of 20 was legally impaired, just on a survey.

Quite frankly, the statistics, especially in and around the urban centres and around Winnipeg, should be startling to the Attorney General (Mr. McCrae), to the Winnipeg police and to those in enforcement agencies, because when you read the statistics from the Liquor Control Commission, the RCMP, in terms of convictions for impaired driving, it is something like 7 to 1 outside of Winnipeg versus Winnipeg, and more than half the population of the province is here in the City of Winnipeg.

It has to basically point out either (a) nobody or very few people in Winnipeg drink and drive, or (b) the level of enforcement outside of Winnipeg is substantially greater than that within the City of Winnipeg where more than half of our population resides. I believe it is the latter. I believe that the level of enforcement is far lower in the City of Winnipeg than it is anywhere else in the province.

Mr. Speaker, additional survey results pointed out that legally impaired drivers were more common on weekends. In other words, the weekends were the time that people let loose, did their drinking and were out on the road. Additionally, most impaired drivers were from the age group of 25 to 39 —(Interjection)— Yes, I am over that age now so I can say it to those younger guys, those younger people. I am trying to look at my age and say, gee, am I a part of this group? No, I guess I am a little bit over that, but 63 percent of those in Winnipeg and 53 percent in the rest of Manitoba, followed in frequency by the 16- to 24-year-old group. In other words, our younger people were not the highest frequency drinkers from this survey. It is what would be considered the middle-age group, as one would say, those who are the highest frequency drinkers in and around, from the survey done in Manitoba.

As well, some additional facts of the roadside survey indicated that the potential outcome of driving while

impaired was acknowledged by the motorists surveyed. Nearly two-thirds of them perceived driver impairment to be the major cause of serious accidents.

Pretty interesting, but the next one is even much more revealing, Mr. Speaker. The risk of being detected by police for impaired driving was seen as minimal, like, I am not going to get caught. That was the attitude. Nobody is going to catch me. I am impaired and the consequences are great, but no one is going to catch me. Over two-thirds of the drivers surveyed estimated the odds as 10 to one against an impaired driver being stopped by the police.

* (1620)

Mr. Speaker, they were prepared to take their chances. They are basically saying hey—and especially, I am certain, by the statistics of enforcement in and around the City of Winnipeg, that is borne out very clearly, where 1,000 out of 7,000 convictions are in a populated area, that is more than half of our population. Obviously, it is probably even less than one in 10 who in terms believe that the police may catch them, so they were reasonably confident to say, yes, I will take a few drinks. I do not consider myself a problem, but I know I will get away with it because the police will not stop me.

That is, in essence, what the roadside survey came out with, Mr. Speaker. Drivers were not afraid. They basically said, yes, I can lose my licence but nobody in this area is going to stop me, and they admit to it to the surveying people. As well, most of the drivers surveyed were males, 76 percent. In the two youngest age groups, 16 to 24, 35 percent; and 25 to 39 years, 39 percent, so that the majority of the drivers were male drivers.

There was a higher proportion of nighttime drivers in the 16- to 24-year age group in areas outside of Winnipeg, 41 percent, as compared to within Winnipeg of 34 percent, which meant there were more young people on the road, essentially, rurally and on weekends of course than there were in and around Winnipeg.

The survey did conclude one thing that was positive for the seat-belt law in that three-quarters of the drivers who were surveyed were wearing their seat belts, which is very, very good in terms of Manitoba drivers, that most Manitobans are obeying or intent on obeying the law.

Additionally, over 3,800 motorists took part in the voluntary survey conducted at 96 survey sites throughout the province over a five-week period. Less than 3 percent of those stopped refused. In other words, most people were very co-operative. This survey was and is not a small survey, when you stop 3,800 drivers. Maybe the Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) will say, what is that, close to 1 percent of our driving public? We have probably 600,000 licences, maybe half of 1 percent, so that just about half of 1 percent of our motoring public were surveyed. The survey is fairly widespread. Clearly, in passing some of the laws that we have passed over the last year or so dealing with alcohol and driving, the Government should have been mindful of some of the statistics from this nighttime

driving behaviour survey that was conducted in our province.

I specifically point out to last year's Session where both the Opposition and the Government had agreed on passing legislation to allow advertising on television to go beyond the ten o'clock period that was originally there. Quite frankly, that is a contradiction. It is a serious contradiction to us here now proclaiming to Manitobans, saying we are concerned about impaired driving and we want to do something about it, while on the other hand we are saying to young Manitobans—and because all of the advertising, just look at it—is geared at basically having a great time, having a great time if you have this kind of a beer or that kind of a beer. It is lifestyle advertising that says you cannot have a good time unless you have a beer or an alcoholic beverage.

We are contradicting, sending out mixed messages to Manitobans by what we are doing. We should be prepared to rescind that legislation and wipe out, and take a bold step in this country and say that our advertising is cut out of alcoholic beverages. Those that want to drink, let them go to the Liquor Commission, let them go wherever they want, they will buy it anyway. They will find what they need. We do not have to say, everybody is doing it so we are going to fall into place. I believe that it is a sop, a sop to the media industry in this province. I do not blame the media industry for saying, look, treat us fairly. We are zooming in commercials from south of the border, or whatever. We should be able to say, cut out that advertising and quit sending out mixed messages.

I have received numerous letters from Manitoba nurses and professionals in the field who were doing studies on the question of impaired driving and the effect of advertising. All those professionals continue to say it is a backward step that we are taking when we are increasing the amount of advertising in this province.

So, while I want to say to the Government we are moving in the right direction, I urge you to rethink the advertising policy of liquor advertising in this province, the availability is there. I am not suggesting we go backward and go to prohibition, but clearly we should discontinue the whole area of advertising of alcoholic beverages, because it is geared to the youth of our country and, quite frankly, most of us do not consider alcohol as a drug.

I believe the vast majority of us take alcohol, take it and leave it, in a very nonchalant way and that is fine. We have to recognize that alcohol is a drug and that addiction to that drug brings about and has brought about some very, very serious consequences for thousands of families in our own province and across this country and across the world.

I wanted to, and I hope I have time, put on the record part of a speech that was given by a gentleman who I admire very, very much. He has been involved in the whole area of drinking and driving and impaired driving in this province for a number of decades. He has been the provincial pathologist who has seen the carnage that has resulted from drinking and driving. The gentleman of whom I am speaking about is Dr. Penner,

who is the citizen co-chairperson of the Drinking and Driving Citizen Committee of this province, who I had the privilege of being associated with when we were kicking off the community group discussions on drinking and driving and trying to set up community groups to fight impaired driving in this province.

* (1630)

Dr. Penner spoke at the conference on drinking and driving on April 13 at the Marlborough Inn, along with myself, when we kicked off this conference and he made some very, I believe, startling revelations as to education, as to rehabilitative work and enforcement. I would like to quote from some of his remarks, because I believe that they are noteworthy for all Members of this House.

"A review of history records that the excessive consumption of alcohol has been a social problem for a long time. It has also been recognized that alcohol impairs one's ability to drive. One hundred and sixteen years ago, in 1872, England enacted the first of a series of laws to control drunk drivers of horse- or cattle-drawn carriages, coaches and steam engines. In North America, in 1904, the scientific literature documented 25 fatal automobile wagon accidents, noting that in 19 of these, the drivers were known to have been drinking alcohol, back in 1904. Now, some 84 years later, a great deal of knowledge is available about the nature of traffic accidents, injuries, and deaths."

We know a great deal about the effect of alcohol on the functioning of our brain and our body. Alcohol is a drug, which with increasing consumption increasingly impairs mental and physical functions with a consequent increased risk of accident when driving a motor vehicle. To better understand the drinking driver problems, we must understand the very complex interface of two prevalent social activities, which are an integral part of most people's lives. I refer to the use of alcohol and the use of motor vehicles in our society. The manufacture, supply, and maintenance support of both have become multibillion dollar industries. Not only are the use of motor vehicles and alcohol very much a part of our social structure, but they are often at great variance or open conflict in the areas of economy, justice, health and safety.

The use of alcoholic beverages plays an important role in social behaviour. Alcohol is only "recreational," is the only recreational drug both socially and legally acceptable. About 80 percent of Canadians over the age of 14 years drink alcohol at least occasionally. The total sales in Canada suggest that the apparent consumption is approximately 11.27 litres, or 2.5 gallons of absolute alcohol per person 15 years of age or over—2.5 gallons per person. So you know that if you drink less than that somebody is consuming a heck of a lot more.

A recent survey reported by the Manitoba Health Promotion Branch suggests that in our province in Manitoba, 40 percent of 25- to 34-year-olds admit to drinking and driving. The alcohol addicted population in Canada is well over half a million, about one per 20 adult drinkers. The alcohol industry also provides large

tax revenues to Governments at all levels, but also results in extensive medical and social problems, the costs of which probably greatly exceed income revenues. That, in essence, is what I am hoping that one of the Ministers will tell me that they are continuing in that whole area of discussion and research.

I know of no comprehensive studies which provide information on the total costs of drinking drivers to society. These costs include law enforcement, the legal system, rehabilitation, property damage, medical costs, loss of lives and the costs of trying to bring about social changes related to drinking and driving.

Insurance companies and/or corporations are very much aware of the costs which are reflected in increased insurance rates, as are the monies expended to lessen the drinking-driver costs, such as the involvement of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, which participates in educational programs, driver training programs and public awareness programs.

In our society, motorized vehicles also play an important and essential role. Most motor vehicles are no longer a luxury. They are essential for the transportation of a large section of our society and essential to our various transport systems. Moreover, they contribute greatly to our economy when one considers the manufacturers, suppliers, maintenance servicing, oil and gas industries, road construction and maintenance, etc. The operation of motor vehicles carry with them a risk of injury and death, even under the best of operational conditions for experienced drivers.

These risks have been reduced by safer car construction, the use of seat belts, safer roads and better driver training and licensing. The risk of injury, death and property damage are greatly increased when the driver consumes alcohol, and this risk relates not only to the drinking driver and the other occupants of the car, but also to the non-drinking drivers sharing the roads. The simple solution to eliminate the problem relating to drinking and driving is either not to drive after drinking, or not to drink prior to driving. It sounds like a simple solution, does it not?

Now the logical approach by which we can separate the drinking activities from the driving activities is through education, by which we inform the drivers of the consequences of drinking and driving. For the few who cannot be educated, the legal process will take over. This simple solution has not been too effective to date. For one who has participated in this whole area for several decades, I am sorry to say that he has admitted this solution of education has not worked well.

The people who drink and drive occasionally get involved in accidents which may be fatal are you and me, all of us. Every day, thousands of people in Manitoba drink and drive their cars, not just once in a lifetime but often many times. Most believe their chance of having a serious accident or being arrested is very slight, and they are correct in this perception. The study alone that I quoted from bore that perception out very accurately.

Dr. Penner became involved in this whole area almost 50 years ago.- (Interjection)- A very good doctor. "It

was then, as a resident in pathology at the then Winnipeg General Hospital, that I assisted with an autopsy of a six-year-old girl who was killed by a driver who had been drinking. The driver, a businessman, while admitting to have had some alcohol during a business luncheon, with the help of a lawyer, was acquitted of any offence. The only witness to the accident were two business companions who were passengers in the car. For me, this was the first of an increasing number of autopsies and court involvements in drinking and driving fatalities." Dr. Penner says it became evident that many people, including police, lawyers, judges and the ordinary citizen had little knowledge, or indeed had much misinformation about the effects of alcohol, especially in relation to driving impairment.

"During the late '40s through to the '60s and into the '70s, I and many others believed that education would convince many people not to drink and drive. We spent many innumerable hours lecturing to many target groups, as well as the public at large. As the years went by, the only enthusiastic people coming to the lectures were the small groups of the already converted believers who were well informed, often teetotalers, and often academics. But there were also others who we had hoped did benefit, including those in the legal process, school children and their teachers."

On the whole however, education, as it was being applied by individuals, Governmental agencies, police, was not really an effective deterrent to drinking and driving. Many then turned their attention increasingly to the criminal justice system but always recognizing that education must remain one of the components of a total program. Laws existed which made it illegal to drive while impaired or intoxicated. Those were however difficult to enforce, and the penalties were generally perceived to be very lenient with a wide spectrum of application, depending on the judge. The objectives, therefore, were to help bring about changes to the criminal legal system which would enhance its effectiveness as a deterrent.

* (1640)

By the mid-'30s, chemical tests for alcohol had been developed. More scientific studies to accurately define how and to what extent alcohol impaired driving skills were now possible. Chemical testing by police to identify impaired drivers increasingly became used in the criminal courts, but only as scientific evidence to substantiate the observations of police and witnesses as to the presence and degree of alcoholic intoxication.

A number of actual car driving experiments under controlled-driving conditions had been done in other countries to demonstrate the effects of alcohol on driving. In Canada, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police conducted a good study in 1955, and it was Dr. Penner's privilege to actively participate in the study. The RCMP driving-while-impaired demonstrations and the introduction of per se statutes in other countries, which made it illegal to drive with a blood alcohol above the defined level, resulted in increasing pressure on the federal Government to enact similar legislation in Canada.

Finally, 13 years later in 1968, Section 236 of the Criminal Code was passed and proclaimed as law December 1, 1969. The maximum legal limit for blood alcohol was set at .08 percent or 80 milligrams per 100 millilitres of blood alcohol content. Above that level, you are automatically considered impaired.

The great expectation that this type of legislation would solve a number of the driving-while-impaired problems was only partially realized. The conviction rate for those charged was greatly increased, but drinking and driving patterns with their problems were not significantly altered. It was not taken into consideration by many who had great expectations from the .08 legislation, was the great complexity of the societal involvement with drinking on the one hand and the use of cars on the other. Even more important was and is the general attitude relating to alcohol-related driving offences.

Quoting from the Department of Justice document prepared by the Traffic Injury Research Foundation of Canada on driving while impaired and published in 1985: "There exists a substantial gap between the crime of alcohol impaired driving as symbolized in the Criminal Code and the actual beliefs and attitudes in practice of the general public. People are just not taking it seriously. The obvious reluctance of people to consider alcohol impaired driving a criminal behaviour stems from their own willingness to engage in this behaviour. Moreover, offenders tend to represent a more complete cross section of the population than people who commit 'real crimes.'" It is not considered a real crime.

"The apparent discrepancy between present criminal law and widespread acceptance of drinking and driving, as socially normative behaviour, has strong implications for how to deal with people convicted of alcohol-related driving offences." From the report, "Failure to consider the above attitudes in our problem-solving activities can only lessen the effectiveness of our efforts." There is no doubt we have to—I guess the real question is—get tough.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Penner, after 50 years of involvement in this whole area, has basically come to the conclusion, and I want to go on and quote from his address further:

"One further very important change is taking place not only in Manitoba but all across North America. Over the last decade, there have been increasing outcries against the irresponsible drinking driver. The right to drive is an earned privilege which carries with it a significant social responsibility, in which each of us should, as part of our driving responsibilities, do unto others as we would have them do unto us. An increasing number of people are not only decrying the serious social impact of the drinking driver but demanding that something be done about it.

"One also senses a changing of personal attitude which involves a willingness to change, at least in part, their own drinking driving patterns. Activist groups have increasingly demanded tougher laws, including increased severity of the penalties and to apply uniformity to all people regardless of their social status. In 1987, the

federal Government responded and new tougher laws are in place across the country."

A summary of these legal changes, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Penner has attached to his address.

"Manitoba incorporated within the legal system provisions for evaluation of the drinking driver offenders, and providing education and rehabilitation. In addition, the federal and provincial Governments have agreed to a joint long-term effort to bring about changes with the emphasis on the grass-roots community approach to be directly involved in bringing about attitudinal changes.

"Given the nature of drinking and driving problems, I do not have great hope that our present tools, education, with recent changes in the Criminal Code mandating severe penalties, will in themselves have a significant beneficial impact on drinking and driving habits. Effective laws must have a significant deterrent component. The key point, severity of punishment is less of a deterrent than the perception of a high probability of arrest. History documents that inappropriate harsh penalties may even be counterproductive. Hanging for stealing a loaf of bread was not a deterrent for the starving. Only when the basic problem was corrected by providing food for the people who were starving was it that people stopped stealing.

"Increased policing would of course increase the risk of arrest. It will also substantially increase the cost, not only of policing but the cost of the courts. Increasingly, many concerned with the drinking driver problem are looking at community oriented programs as the most likely approach to bring about societal attitudinal changes where drinking and driving is no longer acceptable social behaviour. The problem drinking driver is likely to remain a problem until the underlying causes giving rise to their drinking habits are corrected. This issue must also be addressed."

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the executive—is it the executive director?—of the Manitoba Alcoholism Foundation has recently announced his resignation. I wonder and I question what difficulties is he coming forward with in announcing that resignation. I just heard about it. I have not read about it. I gather there has been some media attention drawn to this whole area.

Mr. Speaker, the whole area of rehabilitation—and my colleague from Churchill (Mr. Cowan) pointed out the need for residential rehabilitation for the drinkers—has to be a priority to go hand-in-hand with the tougher legislation that we are about to implement.

Reduce the advertising because it is hitting at our young people. They will be the future recipients of the difficulty of the drinking problem. We hit at the driver but we need the rehabilitation that is so necessary to get at the root of some of the problems that individuals are experiencing, and of course the whole perception by society as a whole to say, oh well, if I take a few drinks, I will not get caught and the consequences are not that great, that is our perception.

I will not finish some of the comments about Dr. Penner's statements looking at the future. I hope that some of my colleagues will take this and review it and put it on the record here.

I support the move by the Government. I am sure that most Members in this House support that move but I say to the Government, rethink the provisions that we passed last year dealing with advertising. Let us not send out the mixed message we are sending out by what we have done this last year, trying to send out a message that we are getting tough, because really we are not. What we are doing is catering and allowing our next generation to be subjected to the kind of advertising which our laws are saying we are going to get tough with, and really they do not. They do not and are not compatible. Thank you very much.

* (1650)

Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand and make a few comments on Bill No. 3. As previous speakers have said, it is probably one of the most important pieces of legislation that we will be dealing with in this Session of the Legislature.

I think it is extremely important that we deal with this subject because of the fact that it is affecting so many people and so many of our citizens in today's society. It is quite clear when you read some of the statistics that are available, there are a lot of people who are still drinking and driving. I think, as the Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) mentioned in his comments, that there has to be a change in attitude. I think that change in attitude is coming among a good portion of the young people in our society, when you see some of the education that has been given to our citizens and the effect that it has had.

I think that a Safe Grad is an example we can point to where they have had some very positive results with that program. Just in recent days, we have seen some advertising on television where high school students are getting up and encouraging other students to have a Safe Grad and not to make alcohol a part of their celebration when they are celebrating their graduation.

I too am concerned about the mixed message that is coming forward from this Government. Their advertising that the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) has been involved in, I think, is a move in the right direction, but I think the way they are doing it—when he takes part in that program which is fine, but then when they do their advertising with the alcohol-related programs that are in place, I think there is a mixed message out there.

When we were in Government, there was a lot of lobbying going on for us to allow extended hours of advertising, and I guess I am of the group that was always opposed to the amount of advertising that is going on at the present time. I am not in favour of extending the hours, so I have to admit that there was always a lot of strong debate within our caucus when this subject was brought up. I guess as long as there are different people who look at the subject in a different way, there is always bound to be some strong debate.

That debate took place within our caucus, just as it will take place in this House. Just because the people are of different Parties does not mean they think alike when it comes to addressing an important subject of drinking and driving.

In looking at the Bill, there are some very important portions to it which I think deserve to be mentioned, but I guess we are prohibited in this portion of the debate to be addressing directly to the Bill, so I will refrain from addressing that directly.

The previous speaker from the Interlake (Mr. Uruski) spoke about some of the points that Dr. Penner made when he was giving the address dealing with alcohol and how that subject should be treated. That was the first opportunity I had had to hear the words of Dr. Penner and I wish I had had more of an opportunity to study it so I could have used some of his comments, but they certainly were meaningful when the Member for the Interlake used the words of Dr. Penner.

One of the areas I have concern about the changes that the Government is in the process of making is the availability of purchasing liquor at the commissions. I know that it is going to be following a process much the same as you use your Safeway card. You have to be a preferred customer before you can use that cheque or a cheque to purchase liquor, but I still think that in some cases it is going to make it much more available for people when they are not in a position to be able to afford it. I have spoken to people in Ontario who have had that privilege for several years and they said it has led to increased drinking, so when you look at it I think it has to be addressed in a way that we should be restricting the use of it, rather than making alcohol more readily available for people when they are going out on their social events.

I would also like to deal very briefly with the cuts with AFM. At this time, when we see there are still a lot of difficulties in society with people who are drinking and driving, even beyond drinking and driving, just drinking, there have been cuts at AFM of \$200,000.00. I wonder why at this time, when we know as big a problem as it is, why we would not be increasing the funding for a program like AFM rather than cutting. I think that this is having a very negative effect on the whole AFM program.

I know that the director, Ian Puchlik, has resigned and you wonder what the reason for that is. The director has resigned effective in July and I wonder if that is because of the decrease in funding or is there some other difficulties that are going on in that organization which have frustrated the current director and caused him to hand in his resignation to be effective in July. I would hope that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) would take a hands-on approach, as he has done in many other issues, and just have a look and see what is happening at AFM to cause the director to be resigning.

Previous speakers have spoken about the importance of having a rehabilitation centre, treatment centres, in the communities. I am fortunate to say that there is one of those treatment centres in one of the communities that I represent in The Pas. The Rosaire

House has been there for many years. I know there are many success stories in the Town of The Pas because of that program. They have very dedicated people who are working there and it is very successful because of the number of dedicated people who are on staff. In addition to that, I think that the credit has to go to the organization of Alcoholics Anonymous.

I know several of my friends who have been involved in that program, and although they did experience some difficult times in their lives, when they have recovered after their treatment, I think they have really taken their responsibilities very seriously. They have gone on to help many other citizens in our community. There are several success stories that you can point to where people were struggling with alcohol. Once they have gone through the treatment in the Rosaire House, they have turned around and become very productive citizens. I think a lot of the credit has to go to the AA members who have supplied the assistance that is required.

I know that in speaking to many of the members who have gone through that program, it is a very spiritual program. I guess I can relate to that. I recently had the opportunity to attend a charismatic conference in Winnipeg that was held a few weeks ago, and there were a few people from that organization who also attended the charismatic conference. That too is a spiritual program which helps people to cope with some of the difficulties they may be experiencing in life.

I think quite often people are pushed to the brink and it is not within their capacity to handle some of the difficulties they are facing in life, but as they can call on some spiritual assistance, then quite often they can pull themselves up and survive and become very leading citizens in the community. There are several examples that we have seen in the last little while.

The Member for Elmwood (Mr. Maloway) went through the history of alcohol and how they first came about the pieces of legislation. I believe the Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski) mentioned that the first piece of legislation was passed during the days of the horse and buggy. It was not quite as dangerous in those days because the horses usually knew where they came from, so if the owner or the operator of the vehicle was impaired, quite often the horses could make their way home. Nowadays there is a lot of carnage in the streets. There are a lot of people getting needlessly hurt because of impaired drivers on the highway. Besides getting needlessly hurt, there are a lot of people who are losing their lives. I do not think there is a week that goes by where there is not somebody who has been destroyed by the fact somebody who was impaired was operating a vehicle.

* (1700)

It appears on the weekends is when most of the drinking is being done. Although there are some people who are claiming there is a great reduction in the number of fatal accidents that are taking place, I think that there are still too many accidents that are occurring.

I think we have to be looking at ways we can be reducing the number of people who are driving impaired

and I think this legislation addresses that. There are some pieces of the legislation that impounds the car and allows the people to retain their car until such time as the person comes up with the funding to pay for the damages that were done. I think that is something that is moving in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker: I am interrupting the Honourable Member. When this matter is again before the House, the Honourable Member will have 29 minutes remaining.

The hour being 5 p.m., time for Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS

RES. NO. 1—FARM INCOME STABILIZATION PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker: On the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans), Resolution No. 1, Farm Income Stabilization Program.

Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles), that

WHEREAS agriculture is one of Manitoba's most important industries, with one in every five jobs based on it; and

WHEREAS farming and ranching are essential for Manitoba's long-term prosperity; and

WHEREAS it is the duty of the Government of Manitoba to promote the stability, profitability and long-term health of family farm operations; and

WHEREAS a healthy agricultural sector also promotes the well-being of rural communities and the province as a whole.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba recommend that the Minister of Agriculture seriously consider reviewing the feasibility of establishing a Farm Income Stabilization Program; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Minister consider calling public hearings to receive commentary from the agricultural community on program objectives, technical considerations, co-ordination with other income subsidy programs and any other such matter that may be relevant; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the basic concepts of the Farm Income Stabilization Program could be:

- (a) to minimize revenue fluctuations for farmers;
- (b) that there be no distortion between commodities and no encouragement of production not wanted by the market;
- (c) that there be no unfair subsidization, nor distortion of natural competitive advantages between provinces;
- (d) acceptance by farmers, Government and the public;

- (e) provision of effective financial planning and management reflecting fundamental farm business viability; and
- (f) creation of a positive rural economic and social climate.

MOTION presented.

Mr. Laurie Evans: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in support of this resolution. I think it is fair to say that ever since farming became an industry in western Canada that perhaps one of the greatest problems that farmers have had is the uncertainty of income from year to year. If we go back to the beginning of agriculture in this province, frequently they were faced with varieties that were late maturing and ended up with serious frosts. Then it became the rust problem which decimated crops. Frequently it was drought. If all of those things were not a problem, then they were faced with prices that they had no control over because of the fact that our agriculture was dependent on export markets and the vagaries of the marketplace.

So farmers took a lot of action in those early days and I think it is fair to say that such things as the co-operative movement, the development of the Pool and United Grain Grower system of grain handling, the Canadian Wheat Board, consumer co-operatives and a whole range of initiatives were taken with one of the primary objects being to attempt to stabilize and provide uniformity of income over the years.

Now, in the years that have passed, there have been a multitude of Government programs brought into being, both from the federal and the provincial levels. These have ranged from such things such as supply and management, marketing boards and a whole range of individual commodity stabilization programs. Many of these are currently in place, but I think it is fair to say that while all of them have had some success, none of them have been totally successful in terms of providing the level of stability that farmers need in order to be able to make the financial decisions that are essential in order to carry out an effective operation.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

We have also had many cost-shared programs. Some of those we are still looking at. They include such things as the Western Grain Stabilization Program, which has been relatively effective, but we all know that this has run into problems in terms of the necessity of \$750 million debt write-off recently. We have had crop insurance which is successful for the most part, but it has had a lot of growing pains. We are now looking at tripartite stabilization programs which have been relatively successful. The supply management, many of us feel, is under pressure with the Free Trade Agreement. While all of these have proven partially successful, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it is fair to say that they have not been totally satisfactory.

In recent years, we have been faced with things that are again out of control. This is the price war that we have been faced with between the U.S. and the European Economic Community. We had a couple of years when yields were reasonably respectable but the

market price was down, so in 1986 and '87 we have had to have special grains payments to compensate for the fact that we were faced with the price war between the two major players, the United States and the European Economic Community.

This past year we have been faced with a drought situation, and once again it was necessary to come up with a special grains payment. We have been faced with a certain element of ad hocery in recent years, many of these being programs that were brought in at the last moment. If we look at some of the more recent ones, particularly the \$850 million Drought Aid Program, I think we would all have to admit that there were shortcomings to it. Some producers still have not received the benefits from that program, and I refer specifically to those who were in the moderate or less drought-stricken areas and those who were canola producers.

I think it is fair to say that while these programs have had some success, they have not been the total answer. The result of this, of course, has been the decline in farm numbers and a problem as far as the whole question of rural economic and social infrastructure is concerned.

I am not naive enough to think that an Income Stabilization Program is going to solve all of that, but I do think there are opportunities through an Income Stabilization Program where you could look at farmers, whether they are large-scale or relatively small-scale operators, who would have an opportunity to have a system in place that would guarantee them that from one year to the next they would have a good idea of what level of income they could anticipate.

* (1710)

I think this is brought further to a head with the recent implementation of the Free Trade Agreement. While I am sure Members opposite know that I have reservations about the long-term success of the Free Trade Agreement, nonetheless it is a fact, it is with us and I think we have to look at it in terms of trying to make the best of a situation with the presence of free trade.

I think the example we are already faced with of the countervail on pork and hogs is indicative, to me at least, that be it this is just one of the many test cases we can anticipate over the upcoming number of years as we move to the so-called harmonization of trade practices on both sides of the border, and you could couple this with the attempt that is being made through GATT to remove the subsidies and the need within the next few years, through the Free Trade Agreement, to decide exactly what is a subsidy. I think we are obviously moving in a direction where this ad hoc multitude of programs is going to lead us into a situation where they are going to be looked upon as potential countervailable issues.

I think it is time that we started to think in terms of an overall program that would permit us to have income stability and get rid of some of these small programs, and perhaps look at this in terms of a program to stabilize income, as opposed to programs to stabilize

income from specific commodities. I am pleased to say that there has been some indication that the federal Government is interested in looking at this type of thing. There is also some evidence through the recent Throne Speech that the provincial Government is thinking in these terms as well.

I do not know how long ago it is that this concept first came to be, but I do know that one of the earlier ones was generated from a committee of the Canada Grains Council. This was initiated in 1981 and the complete report was published in 1983. While it was primarily looking at stabilizing income for grains, it was identified as a proposal that could be used for the stabilization of all commodities on an overall broad scale.

Since the release of that particular report in 1983, there have been several others that have been considered, and probably the one that has received the most publicity is the one that is sometimes referred to as Grains 2000, although that is a misnomer because it comes from the support that was provided to that program. It is a proposal that was devised by people who many of us know personally and that was Bob Hopley and Sid Gordon, two Manitobans who are well-known producers in Manitoba and another farmer, who I do not recall his name, but a farmer from Saskatchewan. The three of those developed this program. Since that time, there has been at least three and possibly four others that are modifications of this particular program that have been brought forward. It certainly is not my intent this afternoon to zero in on the specifics of any one of these.

My concern is that the Governments at both levels take a look at this as a general thrust with the idea of coming up with a proposal that would provide that sort of income stability. I just want to read some of the particulars as they relate to the Grains 2000 because I think that the principles that are here are the ones that we are most interested in. This particular proposal would replace existing crop and livestock stabilization, including tripartite programs with one voluntary plan that covers all commodities.

Under the plan, each farmer would have his own stabilization account. He would contribute 5 percent of the sales of all the commodities produced on the farm, less the original cost of buying those commodities. The Government would match the farmer's contribution of 5 percent of eligible sales, but Government contributions would stop as soon as the farmer's account reached \$200,000.00. The farmer could voluntarily top up his contribution by up to 20 percent annually until the fund reached the \$200,000 limit. The contributions would not be taxed until they were withdrawn, and they would gain interest at the same rate as Canada Savings Bonds. Every year, the farmer would file a form along with his income tax return outlining his eligible sales minus the farm cash costs. The cash costs allowed are similar to those used for income tax with the exceptions of capital cost allowance, interest and labour costs. A payout would be triggered if the current year's margin is lower than the previous five-year average or if the farmer has no taxable income. The fundamental difference between this program and

other stabilization programs is that farmers can be eligible for a payment but choose to leave their fund intact for even a rainier day.

Now this is just one of the programs that has been proposed. The thing that I like about it most is, first of all, it is on an individual basis. In other words, farmers would have their own account system. They could also identify the level of income stabilization that they wanted to be insured for and they would have the option of deciding whether they were going to take a payout or not. This way, they are in control of their own destiny to that extent.

The other thing about it is the money would be identified as being in an account with their name on it and, if they so chose, it could be used as an RRSP at the time of their retirement and in fact may lead to greater accommodation of the transfer of property from one generation to another if they were not dependent on selling the land or their equipment, whatever it is, in order to come up with the money that is necessary for their pension plan. So it has some merit in that respect.- (Interjection)- This was the Grains 2000, Mr. Minister.

As I said earlier, I am not advocating this one as preferable to any of the others, but I do think that it is necessary to look at all of these. The reason I say that is it may be necessary to look at several of them, perhaps take bits and pieces out of them and put them together. I am sure that the bureaucracy in Ottawa along with that, that occurs in each of the other provinces, is capable of looking at the pros and cons.

The other thing that I think we should be looking at, and this is a concept that I find attractive myself, is whether or not a program of this nature should be one where the Government participates as an equal partner or whether the Government is there simply as a guarantor for the program. The reason I say that is I am suspicious that when we come down to the nitty-gritty in terms of defining exactly what is a subsidy that any of these programs where you have equal participation by the Government are going to be subject to some skepticism as far as the Americans are concerned as to whether it is or is not a subsidy.

The original program that was devised and reported on by the Canada Grains Council is one that the Government did not participate in, in terms of sharing a premium. The premium was entirely paid by the farmer. The Government supported it to the extent that if you had a series of bad years they would guarantee it. The intent was that it would be actuarially sound, if you were looking at say over a 10-year to 20-year period that, hopefully, would take in the cycles the farmers are faced with in terms of the different commodities, and that their premium would be adequate to provide that insurance over the long term, and the Government would only have to participate in terms of a guarantor to it.

The more recent program that was put forward was the Grains 2000. One does talk in terms of a 5 percent premium where the Government and the producer both put in the 5 percent. Obviously, that is the one that would be more attractive to the producers. It would

certainly be more attractive to me if I were a producer to know that the Government was supporting the program through 50 percent cost of the premiums that were required.

I think one has to look at this in terms of whether it can be actuarially sound without Government participation at that level. I personally am satisfied, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that if it is possible to come up with a program where the Government does not have to participate in the premium payment that this probably should be more acceptable from a trade standpoint, whether it be GATT or whether it be the Free Trade Agreement. I think deep down most farmers would prefer a program where Government participation was not necessary.

I think we can all, on either side of the House, who are familiar with the agriculture scene come up with a rationale as to why we would perhaps like to see Government participation. Part of that, I suppose, can be attributed to the fact we have been faced with a cheap food policy for years and years. Maybe it is time we thought in terms of moving a little bit away from that, to the point where farmers were actually paid a decent return on the commodity that they produce. If that were to happen, then we would not be faced with a situation where there is a level of subsidization. So I am hoping, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we can get positive support from both sides of the House on this. I would very much like to see the intent of this resolution move forward. Thank you.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

* (1720)

Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to have an opportunity to stand and respond to the resolution. Very clearly, the Member has said many a things that I will just echo in my comments here this afternoon. Certainly, the farm economy has experienced its ups and downs over the years, and 20 years, 30 years, 40 years ago the ability to ride out a drought or low grain prices was out there in the farm community, because there was not the high risk of high input cost we face in this present day of agriculture.

Clearly we do have in place in Canada a cheap food policy that the consumers of food in Canada believe is their right. The farm community has done an excellent job of producing high quality, lowest cost in the world food. I think the Canadian consumer spends about 15 percent of their disposable income on food, which ranks right with the United States as being the lowest in the world. I dare say, we have the highest quality product on the market.

An Honourable Member: Especially vegetables.

Mr. Findlay: Especially vegetables. It is in the mix of all high quality products.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say what the Member has proposed in this resolution is precisely the program we have been on as Government since we took office.

It was our campaign policy in 1986 and 1988 that we believed farmers must have an ability to protect themselves from the risk of rising prices, the risk of drought, the risk of Government policy in other countries, and we believed in good risk protection mechanism. We believe they must be voluntary. We do not believe we should put in place ad hoc programs in order to offset problems that, hopefully, we can foresee a little bit better than we have in the past, and have the kind of programs in place that will do the job.

He touched on really the kind of programs that are there, where there is supply and management which is present for some commodities in Manitoba and across Canada. Just to refresh his memory, we have eggs and milk which have both quota control and price setting. We have turkeys and chickens which have quotas and negotiate price. We have the Hog Producers Marketing Board, now called Manitoba Pork Inc., who are a marketing mechanism for their producers. So they have some ability to stabilize their income from the actions of their boards.

We also have in place, of course, the Crop Insurance Program which has done an excellent job of attempting to put in place a program that is a stop-loss for farmers. It covers their crops at about 70 percent of long-term average yield, which many farmers say is not a high enough return. There have been some criticisms of the program that we spent a lot of effort in the past number of months attempting to address.

He says in his resolution "public hearings." I suppose he means public meetings, and certainly Crop Insurance staff have conducted a number of those in the past months, both the corporation staff and the new board. Really what we put in place for Crop Insurance is in response to the farmers' request that they must have a higher dollar-per-acre coverage. We have that this year. Previous years like, say, 1988, the cost per acre, or the value per acre that the farmer could cover in crop insurance was around \$65 on average, and this year it is up around \$100 to \$110 which, by and large, covers most producers operating costs of putting a crop in. That is one of the things they wanted and we have put it in place.

For this year, the enhanced coverage has triggered for many producers in eight out of the 15 risk areas south of the 53rd Parallel, and that is where the indemnities paid are twice the premium paid in a particular year, that next year there is an enhanced coverage where the level goes from 70 percent of the long-term yield up to 80 percent. Crop Insurance has responded in that fashion.

We also have ongoing right now a national review of crop insurance which has conducted meetings with farmers across Manitoba. We just finished three public meetings on June 13, 14 and 15 last week where approximately 40 to 50 producers came to each meeting and had their input on the proposals of changes of the program for the future. They were very positive meetings, some different concerns brought forward and that will eventually result in a proposal coming from the corporation here in Manitoba to the national level and there will be other provinces doing the same. Hopefully, we will end up putting in place a more effective program for the future years.

Certainly one thing that producers want is the higher bushels-per-acre coverage. I said, right now we have 70 percent, many producers would like to see it up 80 percent, 85 percent, 90 percent and we have even had the odd producer suggest it should be 100 percent. When you start getting up around 90 percent to 100 percent, you start to get into the abuse area.

So there are some major things happening in Crop Insurance and I think major advancements, in terms of improving the program. Just for the Member's information, Crop Insurance paid out \$130 million in liabilities last year, a record payout. The previous record had been \$55 million in 1980, and we paid out 35,000 claims last year and only had five appeals. So I think the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation is doing an excellent job of delivering their program in the eyes of farmers.

I can also tell Members that as a result of their track record, their ability to sell a good program, they have increased the enrollment this year by some 2,000 members, 2,000 clients, and the indemnity that is covered this year is \$700 million, whereas last year the indemnity covered was \$375 million. So I think there is some good news coming out on our ability to deliver crop insurance in the Province of Manitoba.

The other program that the Member mentioned is the Western Grain Stabilization. Clearly, the Western Grain Stabilization was a setup to offset the low grain return for farmers and it operated for about 10 years without very significant payout and farmers say it is not working because it is not paying out. Then, all of a sudden, around about 1984, all things turned right around and there were substantial payouts under Western Grain Stabilization. In fact, people who are presently in the plan, if I remember my figures off the top of my head, should have received about \$10 of payment for every dollar they paid in, so the program has paid out fairly well from that point of view.

But, clearly, the premium has risen substantially now to obviously pay off a deficit that exists in that plan. But when that plan was put together, it was perceived that it would handle all the emergencies of the future. We came along with low grain prices and because of some problems between Europe and the United States in the 1986 crop year and again in the 1987 crop year, then clearly the Western Grain Stabilization did not trigger enough money going into the farm community to keep the farm community alive, so a Special Grains Program—we are on a Special Grains Programs too—had to be triggered and they paid an additional billion dollars a year into the farm community.

I can tell the Member, and all Members of the House, that the farmers do not want to be recipients of Government handouts. They want to be able to control their own destiny and receive a fair return from the marketplace, and I think that is probably the desire of all Members in this House too.

Other programs that are in place, certainly the tripartite programs of which we now have six in existence here in the Province of Manitoba, and I have signed four of them since I became Minister a little over a year ago. We have signed the plans for beans,

for cattle, for land and for honey, and we are presently negotiating yet another one.

Farmers want that kind of protection because the sign-up in beans, the sign-up in sugar beets that the former Minister signed, is pretty well 100 percent. Honey, we expect the sign-up to be quite high, certainly in terms of the commercial producers. In the cattle plan, about 4,000 contract holders, pretty much the same as the previous Beef Commission. In the hogs, my understanding is with the new opportunity to enter, the previous Minister had signed it in 1986 when the tripartite first became available, the participation is over 90 percent from the hog producers, so existing programs are attracting good sign-up in a voluntary sense.

Now we have this number of programs. They have supply management, we have the Western Grain Stabilization, we have Crop Insurance, we have Tripartite. Clearly, one of the reasons that Tripartite was entered into, we figured that maybe the national plan would not be as countervailable as individual provincial plans. Clearly, I do not think that really exists. I think that any stabilization plan that is in existence here, some country somewhere is going to look at it and say, let us attempt to get countervail either through FTA or through GATT, and that is clearly a disconcerting thing because we do want to have in place risk protection programs for our grain producers.

* (1730)

How we are going to deal with the countervail question remains to be seen. The Grains 2000 proposal clearly is in front of us, and it is going to be on the next Ministers of Agriculture meeting on June 26 of this year, and it is certainly going to be on the agenda of the national meeting on the 1st of August. We expect to see some proposals put in front of us as to how this could be implemented, but I guess going from the Member for Fort Garry's (Mr. Laurie Evans) comments, he would like to see it funded entirely with producers' money. If that is one of the ways to offset countervail, it is a reasonable proposal to consider. But I think there is going to be a lot of pressure on us to put in at least 50 percent Government money to make the program run.

I think, in principle, I like the idea of Grains 2000; it has a lot of attractive features. It has been devised by farmers, as the Member mentioned, two Manitoba farmers and one Saskatchewan farmer have been instrumental in putting it together. They have gone around this past winter to, gosh, I bet you, 20, 30, maybe 40 meetings amongst them, maybe even more, where they would ask to come and present their proposal. There has been a lot of discussion on it, discussion on the general principle of whether we should go in that direction. I think there is a very high level of desire to continue to analyze it to see if we can put together this kind of a one stabilization program where each producer has his individual count, where he contributes money that goes into reserve and he can draw up on when the tough years come along.

The idea is that the plan will never go into deficit for each individual farmer. I would love to believe that could

happen, but I think the only way it could ever happen is if we had four or five or six good years where producers are paying into the account to build it up to offset the bad years. Well, really, that is the way Western Grain Stabilization was initially put together. They did build up a big account, but the people started to yell because the account is building up and they are not getting any payout. Then all of a sudden, along came payouts and, whoops, enter deficit. Clearly all the good intentions sometimes can go awry.

But there is no question that we all believe in the process of trying to put this together, and I can assure the Member that it has been my desire to have risk-protecting mechanisms for farmers, have them voluntary to avoid ad hoc and to continue to be able to work in that direction. I think it is safe to say that all Ministers of Agriculture across the country seem to be on the same agenda. They all believe in it. I know the former Minister, the Member for Interlake (Mr. Uruski), had made a proposal that he may talk about when he gets his chance to put his comments forward.

The general principles in the proposed resolution, I have no difficulty with at all. Agriculture is Manitoba's most important industry. Farming and ranching are essential to Manitoba, that it is the duty of the Government to promote the stability, profitability and long-term health to the Manitoba family farm operations, and clearly we have been doing that.

In the interests of what is going on and the programs we have in place and the format that we have in front of us, to put in place really what the Member for Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans) is proposing, I think I would like to propose a small amendment to the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Penner), that the motion be amended:

- (1) By inserting in the second resolve clause immediately after the word "Minister" in line one the following: "continue on his present course of action;" and
- (2) in the final resolve clause, (a) delete "and" at the end of paragraph (e); (b) add "and" at the end of paragraph (f); and (c) add the following new paragraph, which will be (g) "non-trade distorting so as not to contravene the trading principles of GATT."

MOTION presented.

Mr. Speaker: I am satisfied that the amendment falls within the normal practices of this House respecting the relevancy of amendments in Private Members' Hour and complies with the commonly referred to Beauchesne citation respecting amendments.

Mr. Bill Uruski (Interlake): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take part in this debate on this resolution proposed by the Agriculture Critic of the Liberal Party. I am certainly quite supportive of the move, at least the recognition that there should be a general Income Stabilization Program for all farmers. I guess in my mind the first objective, and I think there is general

agreement by all Parties, in terms of the objective of Governments and of society, in general, is of course to provide a stable food supply for our own citizens and along with that, as noted in the resolution, to stabilize the long-term health of family farm operations.

What really will occur in this debate is how best to approach this whole question, how best can we as Governments and a society provide that income stability. I am a bit amused and I say amused, by the amendment of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) dealing with the question, especially the last amendment to the resolved about "any program non-trade distorting so as not to contravene the trading principles of GATT."

Mr. Speaker, as I understand GATT, GATT does allow supply management, so one of the prerequisites of any income support plan generally acceptable to Canadian Governments and Canadian farmers should be that orderly marketing and supply management should not be impeded, that Governments should be promoting and assisting the farm community to set up supply management schemes.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is well and good by my saying it, but quite frankly when we sign trade deals as we are doing now, bilateral trade deals with the United States, and try to enhance trading patterns, one of the stumbling blocks that we will continually have, do not put up any barriers, because supply management is a barrier. Basically the tenets of supply management are that we will provide production to meet our own domestic needs and not flood or overproduce and dump on someone else's market. That essentially is the tenet of supply management. While recognizing the historic importations into the country, as we have done in the commodities that are supply managed, of eggs and poultry and the like, the historical imports into Canada were and continue to be allowed. In fact, under the Free Trade Agreement, they are going to be somewhat increased by, I guess it would be 10 to 15 percent of what they were -(Interjection)- of the five-year average.

* (1740)

What I am saying is that a 1 percent increase on a 6 percent importation is about one-sixth, is about—what?—11 percent, 12 percent in terms of the increase in allowance of imports. That is what it really amounts to, that we are going to increase from 6 percent to 7 percent the allowable importations, which will amount to about a between 10 percent and 15 percent increase in -(Interjection)- Yes, of course, no, no, but it is an increase and I am not knocking that. That is part of the deal.

The question remains as to how do we get around the fundamental question of providing support to farmers without governmental infusion of money. I think, quite frankly, that is pie in the sky. I do not think that we as a society should totally remove ourselves away from agriculture.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are I believe thousands of farm families across this country—there may even be thousands in Manitoba—who live far below the

poverty line, who produce whatever commodities, but if you saw some of those income tax returns, it would make you cry. If you see a family of four or five showing a net income of \$9,000 or \$10,000, you say to yourself, my God, how can this family survive?

This kind of a program is desperately needed, but the fact of the matter is it will be clearly perceived as a welfare program. I, for one, do not believe that those in a farm community who, from whatever production, receive a good return should be able to tap into a program which provides public support. I mean, there has been enough criticism, whether it is in this country or south of the border, and it has been fairly well documented that some of the support programs that we have had have paid out thousands and even millions of dollars to people who have had fairly decent incomes as it is. Money has been funnelled into production units or operations, whether they be family farm or corporate, in a way that can only be stated as providing more to those than they require, than they need for basic income. That is going to be a very difficult sell to many in the farm community, and I recognize that. That is the stumbling block.

Our family operation happens to be in supply management with some guarantees, not fully, but some guarantees. I do not believe that our operation, when considering all the other, the grain side and what other seed side that we may be involved in, when you take the total income, if we go beyond the threshold for three families, I do not believe that we should tap into any Government subsidy programs. That has been, I guess, the fault or the difficulty of agricultural programs in general, and that is a criticism of even myself as being a former Minister and whoever is going to be there, because to bring about a major change in the program requires major restructuring and major rethinking.

If we bring about the kind of program that has been suggested by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry (Mr. Laurie Evans), just that farmers put into a fund and the Government administers it and maybe saves them on tax dollars, that can now occur. I mean, RRSPs and the tax deduction on RRSPs today allow a fair bit of flexibility to most, including the farm community. I would say that most farmers will say, well, I am not so sure that I want the Government looking after my funds if there is nothing in it for me. I will do my own investing. That will be the attitude of the majority. We will be missing that group in society that has and will continue to struggle and will survive on the farm from generation to generation on a very minimal income.

Whatever kind of programming we bring about in terms of change, it really has to try and remove subsidy or funding of farm operations, and whether they be family farm or other kinds, away from receiving subsidies when their average income over a number of years far exceeds what is needed to provide stability for family income. I guess that will be the difficult one and will require a lot of discussion across not only this province but across this country.

If we just go ahead and say, well, for a premium we will provide an income, a stabilized income, and remove some of the areas of speculation that farmers can

involve in like capital cost allowance and other areas, we will not deal with the fundamental question of income stability to farm families. If we want to enhance it, so let us do it, but let us not build what I would call an elitist program for those who are already well-off and can afford to finance a stabilization plan in which Government will put in money and say this is a great program, because we will miss the real question and we will miss the people in the greatest need.

Now, I guess it can be argued that the welfare system should take over. The fact of the matter is the way we have structured our welfare system today excludes, in the main, farm families because of what is known as additional assets. The moment you have an additional piece of land over and above the home quarters, you are excluded. You had better sell it, you had better do something with it before you can qualify for any assistance, and that is the fundamental question we have to grapple with.

The principle, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have no difficulty with at all. In fact, as the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) pointed out, several years ago—I think it was '86—I put forward a paper recognizing what was occurring worldwide, put forward a paper to the Ministers of Agriculture, saying it was time to start rethinking our entire support program. If those of us in the areas of power believe then, clearly, the way to do it is to go the way I have suggested, because obviously the bureaucracy will be built up by the multitude of administrative mechanisms that are necessary in the stabilization programs that are in place today.

* (1750)

That is fine if we want to do it that way, but clearly the more fundamental way we will have to recognize is the family and what kind of support can we provide a family, and do we value agriculture, the farm family on the farm. Many will argue, let them make it or break it in the business, farming is as business as anything else. I am not sure, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that is the way we want to go in terms of how we want to see rural Canada and rural Manitoba evolve.

I think we ought to work together. This is one that, I believe, crosses all political lines, this whole question. It is not one that will be accepted in many quarters in the farm community. The fundamental question will not be if you want to get at the root of poverty on the farm, because there is much of that, especially during these difficult times that farm families are going through. Any move that we, as a Legislature, can make to broaden the discussion, to go out to the farm community and talk with the farm community as to what might be acceptable and at least throw out some ideas, discussion papers—and this discussion that has been put out by the farmers has been fairly radical, but clearly the one that has to be tackled, and farmers may not want to tackle that question, and that is, should those who have substantial incomes, from whatever sources, be eligible, be continued to be eligible—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Honourable Member's time has expired.

Mr. Uruski: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker—to receive governmental funds in the form of continued subsidies?

Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk): I certainly am not going to try to speak on the same level that the three experts before me have spoken on the need for farm stabilization, as to the programming. I would like to speak on the need for farm stabilization income in the way I see it as a typical Canadian, who relies upon a farming community for our food and relies upon a farming community for economic support and livelihood in all of Canada.

I, like many Canadians, was born in a farming community and indeed I grew up pretty well my whole life at my uncle's farm and have plowed fields and driven trucks and hauled feed and moved chickens and milked cows, the typical calling that a farmer does in various degrees.

An Honourable Member: You did not have to pull the plow.

Mrs. Charles: I did not have to pull the plow, as my fellow Member is saying, I am not that old. I did take almost 20 years of my married life to convince my husband that my uncle did have an eight-foot-long pig at one time, but we finally proved that I was right on that.

It is a serious problem because farmers are our livelihood, they are the backbone of our country. I have spoken many times in this House about whether we are going to see farming as a way of life or as an industry, and I think that a decision has to be made. I suppose if I were voting on that today I would come down on a way of life because, I think, if we make it into truly a cutthroat industry, as many industries are, that we as consumers in the long run will suffer for it. Indeed, it can be industrialized but not for the pure sense of it.

I think a farmer farms because of the love of farming, and if you take that away you are losing something of the Canadian mosaic that we have. I also hear at various conferences I go to, people talking about how farmers are looked upon by other Canadians and that we see year by year by year, in particular, in the last years that going from a drought year into a flood year and back into a drought year, and then maybe into disease or whatever, it seems as if farmers are always being subsidized in some way or the other. I have heard women in the farming community, in particular, worried at what their image is being portrayed as, that soon the people may say, this is enough, we cannot support them any longer, they have to be self-supporting.

I think, because they are aware of it, we have to be aware of it. But some people are saying, well, how can this be. Last year, we were giving them money because their fields flooded and this year we are giving them money because there was a drought. People do not understand farming because more and more, as generations go by, we are being removed from the farm lands. People are not understanding why this is necessary that you can have your crops destroyed one year by floods and pretty well the next year turn around

and not be able to grow anything because of drought, maybe not that drastically but in the minds of the payment process, it comes across like that.

So I think we have to look at how people are going to perceive our farming community. Even more deeply, I look at the farming communities and the towns. We all have recognized here in this House how many rural towns and villages are disappearing in our landscapes. Many of these very small towns depended upon small farming units that were around them. As farming units grow, there are fewer people to support the towns, but even still as we come into the small- and middle-range towns, farming communities still depend upon the farming community itself for support. If we have a few years of downturn, we are going to have the community themselves struggling to survive, and again more money will be pumped into the community one way or the other to help these people survive. Of course, most importantly of all, and I think all of us will recognize here and have spoken on it, is the crisis that the farmers and their families have to suffer through when they are just barely scraping through.

I support what others have said before me, the Member for the Interlake (Mr. Uruski), and in the early '80s I did a farm survey for Statistics Canada and realized how little income many, many farmers have and do not know how they survive on it. When they come into a very drastic situation after having perhaps not a viable farming lifestyle to begin with, but are still managing to survive and not asking for any more, but when that is pushed to the limits and families have to suffer, then we all again are suffering. I think in the community we speak about that we want everyone to do the best in their lifestyle and not have to go through sufferings. Certainly in today's world, we are seeing where both spouses are working off the farm unit. The farms will, therefore, be perhaps not as well controlled and managed as could possibly be if this were a full-time farming operation.

Many farm workers are not able to take advantage of up-to-date farming methods. I think in the long run we may suffer for not keeping up in competition of the world marketing if we do not keep up with the methods and methodology of farming, because it is being an industrialized business and if we have to keep up, we must keep up. If they cannot computerize, if that is the need, because of lack of funds from year-to-year, then we are all going to suffer as we do not keep up in the market.

Not too long ago, we were world leaders in many of the markets and we very kindly shared our business sense, our farming sense with the world. Others now have come to be in complete competition with us, if not surpassing us in some instances of some grains. That shows that we just cannot sit back and let others learn while we do not.

So I think we have to look at what we can do to keep farmers being active farmers. In order to stabilize their income, whatever it may take, it will have to be a long process figuring this out. I am not sure it will be an overnight decision that we can come to, but we have to have them looking and being assured that they can, from year to year, be supported on a given basis.

There are other businesses such as salespeople who from time to time their business and income may vary, but they are not having to output into their lifestyle the same amount that the farmers have to. They have to maintain. You have livestock out there that has to be fed whether or not you have an income. You have fertilizers and pesticides from time to time that have to be applied, whether or not you have an income this year, because you always have to hope tomorrow or the next year will be the year you make your income back.

Other lifestyles and business styles, I do not think have that same sense to the degree from hand-to-mouth which the farming business is. I do not mean that in a derogatory sense. I mean it in a sense that businesswise it is hand-to-mouth. They have to take the chance every year, and what they do every year will maybe not work, but they have to do it all again next year, or else they will give up farming and move off the land and then we are all the sadder for it.

I think there are very many reasons we have to look at stabilization of incomes for farmers. Certainly, I was very interested in hearing the backgrounds of many of the stabilization programs going on now, but they are complex. I do not see how we are going to bring new farmers into farming when they look at the complexity and the risk they have to take for farming. As we all know, it is getting more difficult all the time to have children, the next generation, staying on farms because

the risk and the lifestyle that is there is not that attractive when put up to others, unless it is a calling.

I believe sincerely, just as ministers, preachers and so forth is a calling, and perhaps they say even politicians is a calling, I think farming is definitely a calling because, when you lay it all out, you have to believe that you are doing the best thing for the land and producing a good crop, whether it is in livestock, grains or whatever. You have to believe tomorrow is a better day. That type of attitude, I think, is what we want to support in Canada because Canada believes in the better day and works for it every day, gets up the next morning and does it again to make things better.

If that is all we can do to support our farmers, to keep that type of characteristic going in Canada, then it will be well worth it. I look forward to further discussion on this resolution, as I think that it is very important we talk out how we are going to support the farmers. In particular, I would like to hear more comments on the cost of food in Canada, as it is underpriced.

Thank you very much, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hour being six o'clock, in accordance with the rules, I am leaving the Chair and shall return at eight o'clock.

When we return to the House, the Honourable Member will have five minutes remaining.