

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Wednesday, 17 April, 1985.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

**OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.**

**MR. SPEAKER, Hon. J. Walding:** Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** I have a Ministerial Statement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, today is Law Day - a day in which the significance of the law in our society is celebrated. Law Day, sponsored nationally by the Canadian Bar Association and provincially by the Manitoba Branch of the Association, specifically marks the anniversary of the proclamation of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms which came into force on April 17, 1982.

The significance of Law Day this year is that it coincides with the coming into force of Section 15, the equality of rights section of the Charter. Section 15 of the Charter will impact on every facet of our lives.

Mr. Speaker, Section 15 reads as follows: 15.(1) Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability.

(2) Subsection (1) does not preclude any law, program or activity that has as its object the amelioration of conditions of disadvantaged individuals or groups including those that are disadvantaged because of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability.

Members will note, Mr. Speaker, that Section 15(2), the one I just read, protects affirmative action programs and I am pleased to note as, I am sure, will most members of this House, that in Manitoba we are developing a very significant affirmative action program in connection with the Limestone Project.

Earlier today, Sir, I signed a proclamation encouraging every Manitoban to take part in support of Law Day activities. At the same time I issued the new and updated edition of the government pamphlet on family law entitled, "Family Law in Manitoba, 1985." I am distributing this pamphlet together with a copy of the proclamation and this statement to all members of the House this afternoon.

In a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, I will be introducing The Equality Rights Statutory Amendment Act for First Reading. I expect to have this bill ready for Second Reading in a few weeks time. It is my hope that this and other Charter-related bills to be introduced in this Session will make a significant contribution in the long and difficult process of amending our laws to meet the standards set by the Charter. I know, Sir, all members in this House will assist in this task.

We have today, Sir, crossed the threshold into a new legal and constitutional era, one which places on the shoulders of legislators particularly the formidable task of furthering equality in life by guaranteeing equality in law. I sincerely hope that we, all of us, can measure up to that responsibility.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Attorney-General for his statement. I note, firstly, Mr. Speaker, in the last paragraph of the Minister's statement a reference to guaranteeing equality in law.

I want to point out, firstly, Mr. Speaker, that I think there is a real danger that elected members in governments will tend to rely on the law in the courts to determine these matters of equality. I think what is required, more than a junction by courts to elected persons to amend laws, to guarantee laws, is a will to act on the part of governments to protect minorities and to provide equality.

Mr. Speaker, when I had the privilege of introducing Handi Transit in the City of Winnipeg, while a member of City Council, which provided for equality in public transportation services to physically handicapped people, there was no Charter of Rights in existence. That was done, Mr. Speaker, because there was a will at the City Council level, and I say at the provincial level at that particular time, to fund such a program to provide equality in public transportation services for handicapped people.

Mr. Speaker, when we introduced and legislated what is being regarded as the best family law legislation in Canada - the best enforcement system, maintenance orders and custody orders - that was not required by the Charter; that was because there was a will to act and provide that type of legislative protection.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say to you, Sir, and to members of the House, that the government's record in complying with the Charter of Rights is, at best, average. If you compare it with the government's record, it is a dismal failure.

I also want to point out, Mr. Speaker, what I believe is a further failure on the part of this government. As the essential purpose of the Charter is the protection of the rights of individuals, I would suggest to the Attorney-General and to the government that individual Manitobans have an important contribution to make in the process of ensuring that all laws protect their rights and that the public interest be protected.

I, therefore, suggest to the Attorney-General and to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, that — (Interjection) — If the Minister of the Environment is finished, Mr. Speaker, I will continue.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Continue saying nothingness.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.  
The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I would, therefore, suggest that individuals and groups and Manitobans

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Posturing as ever.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of the Environment has enough problems with breaking the law with respect to The Workers Compensation Board Act, and he should try to solve that problem before he tries to comment on any other subject.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please. Would the Honourable Member for St. Norbert restrict his remarks to the statement and not make accusations against another member of committing a criminal act.

The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I, therefore, suggest to the Attorney-General and to the Premier that individual Manitobans and groups of Manitobans be invited, perhaps through a discussion paper on these issues, to comment on proposed changes or suggest other changes, and that we not simply rely, with all due respect to him, to a report by Mr. Gibson. We must also remember, Mr. Speaker, that in dealing with human rights one person's rights affect other person's rights, and the question of mandatory retirement, as an example, without deciding one way or the other is such an example. There have certainly been concerns being expressed by people who are affected by doing away with mandatory retirement because they are, for example, not able to bring in new teachers at the University of Manitoba.

We should remember, Mr. Speaker, also, that along with rights go responsibilities, and the term "right" must not be interpreted in a vacuum. Section I of the Charter, Mr. Speaker, I think refers particularly to that aspect of interpreting rights.

We should also remember, Mr. Speaker, and note, Section 33 of the Charter, the notwithstanding provision. We should be prepared to use it where compelling circumstances require it to be used in the public interest, and not take the position of this Attorney-General and this New Democratic Party government who say, no matter what non-elected appointed judges say they're not going to disagree with court decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to an example that was cited often in the Constitutional discussions by former Premier Blakeney of Saskatchewan with respect to The Lord's Day Act. That matter is presently before the Supreme Court of Canada. This government and this Attorney-General chose not to intervene and argue in that case, although the Attorney-General did say that he thought the arguments were being made by other representatives of other provinces. But, if The Lord's Day Act is struck down, I ask this government would the public of Manitoba accept such a decision, opening up Sunday completely for business; and I say specifically to them, to the New Democratic Party, would the labour movement support treating Sunday as an ordinary working day? Mr. Speaker, I submit to the government that they have to thoroughly review their position as to whether or not they will at least leave open the subject of using Section 33.

Also, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this section of the Charter, Section 15, will not affect in any way or protect citizens of Manitoba from discriminatory actions by this NDP Government against Manitobans, on the basis, for example, having a Progressive Conservative representative in their constituency. It's not going to help the Member for Portage la Prairie with the School of Psychiatric Nursing in Portage; Mr. Speaker, it's not going to help the Member for Turtle Mountain with the closing of the Land Titles Office in Boissevain; it's not going to help the Member for Emerson with the action the government is taking with respect to the RCMP contract in that situation.

Mr. Speaker, also unfortunately, this government decided 19 months ago that it would defer all controversial subjects until after the next election unless the proposed action related to a key constituency group, Mr. Speaker. And they have the nerve, Mr. Speaker, to stand up and talk in this House about discrimination.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Water Services Board ending March 31, 1984; and the Report of the Department of Agriculture for the year ending March 31, 1984.

Thank you.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**HON. V. SCHROEDER:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Public Accounts for 1983-84. Members have received copies already.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Notices of Motion . . .

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

**HON. R. PENNER** introduced, by leave, Bill No. 31, The Equal Rights Statute Amendment Act.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**MR. SPEAKER:** Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of members to the gallery. We have 54 students of Grade 9 standing from the Westgate Mennonite Collegiate. They are under the direction of Mr. Pankratz and Mr. Hummilt. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

There are 20 students of Grade 11 standing from the Shaftesbury High School under the direction of Mr. Altomare. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Tuxedo.

There are 33 students of Grade 9 standing from the River Heights Collegiate under the direction of Mr. Bergeron. The school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for River Heights.

On behalf of all of the members, I welcome you here this afternoon.

## ORAL QUESTIONS

### Proposed election - advertising literature

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Premier and it follows upon news reports that today the New Democratic Party is entering into a pre-election advertising campaign on billboards and radio. Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is: I wonder if he could inform the House if this is a firm indication that there will be an election in the near future.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, we're all, I'm sure, quite impatient for that grand day. Some time within the next number of months, we'll all be able to celebrate together the calling of the election and be able to engage in the democratic process with I'm sure, enthusiasm and excitement and anticipation that we will all share in this Chamber.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, the Premier has no idea how enthusiastically that decision will be greeted.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Question.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is: will any portion of the costs of this advertising campaign be borne by the taxpayer?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I was going to say we'd be consistent with the Conservative Government when they were in power insofar as relationship between them and the Conservative Party in the province, but I don't think I had better say that because I'm not all that sure.

This advertising is paid by the New Democratic Party of Manitoba 100 percent. I would like to say that was the case in 1977-81. Maybe the Honourable Leader of the Opposition could confirm, that indeed that was the case.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that government advertising is now three times what it was in 1981, I know why the Premier wanted to try and clarify that.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if he could indicate if these expenditures on this advertising campaign will be governed under the new Election Finances Act that his government has passed.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I know the Leader of the Opposition hasn't had the opportunity to peruse The Election Finances Act, but I would suggest that he might have somebody research The Election Finances Act, and he would find that it's not applicable to that legislation.

### Amendments to Day Care Legislation - re lack of jurisdiction

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable Minister of Community Services and Corrections, and I wonder if she could indicate whether or not her government will be bringing in amendments to the province's day care legislation so that it will correct the problem of lack of jurisdiction that occurred with respect to the Early Childhood Education Centre in Charleswood this year?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, the legislative program is announced in the usual way. At that time, I'll be prepared to comment.

**MR. G. FILMON:** Mr. Speaker, I might indicate that many people in the day care community are concerned about this problem and the lack of jurisdiction, and I wonder if she wouldn't consider bringing that information early so that people would know.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, that legislation will appear in due course.

### Grenada Demonstration - Cost of inquiry

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the Attorney-General with respect to the costs of the Grenada Demonstration Inquiry Report. I had asked the Attorney-General for the total cost and he'd indicated the costs to the Department of the Attorney-General were \$105,584.00. In view of the report that the total cost may very well exceed \$250,000, could the Attorney-General undertake to obtain the costs to Legal Aid and the cost to other parties, like the City of Winnipeg, so that we could arrive at a total cost of the inquiry?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** First of all, Mr. Speaker, I will obtain the information with respect to Legal Aid cost because that is within my jurisdiction. I expect that they will be rather minimal. I certainly will make no effort, because it is not my business to find out how much of that vastly inflated figure is really attributable to the counsel who were hired privately by the Winnipeg Police Association to protect its interests by the Winnipeg Police Commission, by the City of Winnipeg. Sure, by lumping all of those costs in, presumably it comes to more than \$105,000, but that is not a cost paid by the taxpayer, nor through my department in any way.

### MACC Loans - Number applying

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Arthur.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a

question to the Minister of Agriculture. How many farmers have applied for the 9.75 percent loan program through the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the program that was announced for the 9.75 percent in the Budget Speech is a program that will be used in trying to renegotiate some of the most difficult cases of financial hardship that the department has been dealing with. I will take the specific question under advisement, but we are in discussion with financial institutions and going over a number of clients in the Province of Manitoba. Those funds, Sir, were never intended, and the announcement didn't say that the 20 million would be disbursed just overnight. They are a part of a package of restructuring, Mr. Speaker. The program that was announced will be carried on throughout the year in an attempt to restructure between 100 and 200 farmers to save those farms in order that the restructuring will be in such a way that there is some longevity to those farm units. That's what the program was intended to do.

Sir, the \$20 million program was never intended to save all the financial problems in the Province of Manitoba. There is an onus on private lending institutions and clearly on our national government through FCC to follow our suit to assist financially-troubled farmers in this country.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, I wasn't expecting to get quite the kind of verbiage that was coming from the Minister. I'll ask him another direct question. How many loans have been approved under this program?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question under advisement. We have the regular loan program. As I indicated, this loan program will be part of a major restructuring package to save farm units in serious difficulty. They will not be put out overnight. We will check what applications there are, and they are being presently handled by the staff, but I will get the numbers for my honourable friend.

**MR. J. DOWNEY:** Mr. Speaker, it is seeding time; farmers do need operating loans. Can the Minister of Agriculture give us the assurance and the farm community the assurance that every applicant is taken seriously and moved upon very quickly by his government, Mr. Speaker, so that in fact they can go to the fields this spring and put a crop in? Will he take immediate action so the loans can be approved this spring?

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member misunderstands the nature of the program. The program is . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. B. URUSKI:** Mr. Speaker, the honourable member leaves the impression that this program is one that will

guarantee operating credit to all farmers in the province. We have an Operating Loan Guarantee Program that we've operated and extended. In fact, that program this year will provide some \$50 million to \$60 million of operating credit.

The program that we announced of the refinancing is a program to try and restructure through negotiations with private lending institutions to see what they're prepared to do, because they are involved in some of those loan transactions. Using these funds, this will be able to assist about 100 to 200 farmers in restructuring their debt load in order for them to survive. This program was not designed to provide cash in terms of immediate restructuring of farmers who are unable to receive operating credit.

A program dealing with operating credit, Sir, was put forward by provinces at the National Conference last November in Toronto, and was outrightly rejected by the federal Minister of Agriculture to top off provincial programs, Sir.

### Grenada Demonstration - stay of charges

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Attorney-General considering the \$250,000 Grenada inquiry, and ask him since the City of Winnipeg has asked the police chief to reconsider his actions in relation to the performance of his police officers, will the Attorney-General now reconsider his decision not to proceed with any charges?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** The premise and the question is inaccurate, Mr. Speaker, and I will not deal with a question that starts with an inaccurate premise.

### Address for Papers No. 8

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, since the Attorney-General is embarrassed to answer that question, I will direct a question to the House Leader. On January 23, 1984, I submitted and the government accepted an Address for Papers concerning correspondence between the government, the Franco-Manitoban Society, the Government of Canada, Manitoba 23, etc. It is now a considerable period of time since that was submitted and I wonder if the House Leader could indicate what problems have been encountered in preparing that submission.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, there have been no problems encountered in preparing the submission. It took a lengthy period of time to ensure that the return would be accurate and that all files were gone through. There was actually very little correspondence. However, we have now determined what it all is and approximately two months ago all the letters requiring third-party clearances, which were a condition placed upon the

acceptance of the Address for Papers, went out and those replies are now coming in. I hope to have them all shortly but some of them are taking some time, particularly those third-party clearances which are out of province.

**MR. R. DOERN:** Mr. Speaker, I would also like to ask the House Leader whether the government intends to proceed with a Freedom of Information Act in spite of its dismal record in that regard?

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I would commend to the attention of the honourable member Votes and Proceedings of this Session, which record the First Reading of that bill.

### School of Nursing, Portage Closure of

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

**MR. L. HYDE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Community Services and Corrections.

On April 8th when questioned, the Minister indicated that she would be reviewing her decision on the closure of this nursing school at Portage with the Psychiatric Nurses Association.

Has this review been completed, Mr. Speaker?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, curriculum elements are being reviewed and consultation is proceeding to date, and I think I did say - perhaps the member opposite didn't hear or recall - that the general parameters of the decision are firm. There is the financial saving, there is a better way to train the needed people power for the centre and the curricular issues we expect, will be fully reviewed and it will have a final implementation schedule by the end of the month. But to date nothing that we have been reviewing has changed the basic assumptions or parameters of the decision we made earlier.

**MR. L. HYDE:** A supplementary question to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker.

On the same date of April 8th and on previous occasions to this date, will she meet with the people of Portage la Prairie in the public meeting on this important matter in order to hear the concerns of the people of Portage? Is she prepared to meet with the people of Portage la Prairie on this important matter?

**HON. M. SMITH:** Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving letters and personal delegations of people here from the Chamber, the mayor and the council, from the nurses, and I will continue to receive input from them but since this is a policy issue having to do with the delivery of service throughout Manitoba, I don't see what could be gained by the meeting proposed by the member opposite.

### Charter - progress in compliance with

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

**MS. M. PHILLIPS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Attorney-General which I would have thought the Member for St. Norbert would have asked if he is truly interested in equality.

I wonder if the Attorney-General can explain what our record of progress to date is in compliance with the Charter.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, I was just about to say in preface, I was more than somewhat astonished when I commented on Law Day, which was sponsored by the Canadian Bar Association, the Manitoba Bar, in a non-political statement. The Member for St. Norbert should have chosen that for a well-prepared political diatribe. The Manitoba Bar Association will not be amused.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question, in fact Manitoba is an acknowledged leader in this area. The Equality of Status Bill introduced in the 1982 Session; the amendments to the Vital Statistics legislation; The Marriage Act introduced in that Session; and above all, amendments to The Pension Benefits Act introduced by the former Minister of Labour Mary Beth Dolin have set an example for the whole country on significant equality legislation.

We have already announced in the Throne Speech, and we will be introducing the first legislation in Canada, among the provinces, with respect to pay equity. We don't need that kind of savage attack from the Member for St. Norbert which in fact denigrates this day, which should be a day in which all of those - and that was the way I put it - all of those who are dedicated to the question of equality would join. That cheap kind of political attack has no place in this House.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. The members will find on the . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** If honourable members wish to conduct a private debate, would they do so outside the Chamber.

I would remind all members that the guidelines respecting question period include the admonition that a question should not seek information, which is set out in documents accessible to the questioner, or for purposes of argument on matters of past history.

### Boissevain Land Titles Office - status of

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister.

Can the First Minister advise the House if in the interests of good public policy or for reasons of enlightened self-interest, that he has decided to keep the Boissevain Land Titles Office in operation?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, it's a matter of ensuring there be cost efficiency, as well as of course at the same time ensuring there is a balance insofar as what can be continued at a local level in respect to appropriate service. The Attorney-General has this matter under his jurisdiction and is dealing with it.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, a supplementary for the First Minister. His government passed an Order-in-Council that said that the Land Titles Office would close on April 26th and since that time he has met with people, he has received letters, he has entertained argument, and has said that he was considering reversing that decision. In view of the fact that April 26th is coming up very soon, could he tell the House whether or not he plans to proceed with the closure?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I think that question would be best dealt with by the Attorney-General. I have had some further discussions with the Attorney-General and . . .

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** You know I find it rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, from day to day we have honourable members concerned and worried about the size of deficit and then every day we keep hearing from honourable members across the way hundreds of thousands of dollars additional expenditure, millions of dollars additional expenditure they are urging and pressing this government to undertake, Mr. Speaker. They cannot have it both ways.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the First Minister.

Would he consider simply cancelling the \$90,000 advertising program for lotteries, telling the people what the government is doing with lotteries money? Would he just consider cancelling that \$90,000 and keep the office open?

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** I would like to put on the record because there's been some comment about advertising, the total amount of advertising by the Manitoba Government is approximately one-half of the amount of advertising that is spent in respect to total overall expenditures by either the Conservative federal government in Ottawa, or the Ontario Conservative government, or the Saskatchewan Conservative government, Mr. Speaker. We have a responsibility and we will not — (Interjection) — I know honourable members don't like to hear facts — Mr. Speaker, we will not abdicate our responsibility to ensure that Manitobans are made aware of important programs initiated by this government.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Mr. Speaker, to the First Minister or to the Attorney-General, whoever will take the

responsibility. Will one of those honourable gentlemen please tell the House whether or not they will be proceeding to close that office on April 26th?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Attorney-General.

**HON. R. PENNER:** Mr. Speaker, I have very carefully considered the matter. I presented arguments in this House yesterday. Later on today I will be advising the Premier of my recommendation and either one of us will make an announcement in the House tomorrow.

### Advertising - government spending

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable First Minister.

**HON. H. PAWLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to a question that was posed to me the other day by the Honourable Member for Morris. Before I do, just in case there's any misunderstanding, my reference to advertising was on a per capita basis being approximately one-half, and a per capita basis as to the costs of advertising conducted by the Conservative governments of Saskatchewan, Ontario and/or the federal government in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, the question that was posed to me — (Interjection) — maybe we're not performing well compared to other provinces ensuring that programs are properly explained in the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, the question that was posed to me by the Honourable Member for Morris the other day was in respect to the Bovey Commission which had made recommendations in respect to higher education in the Province of Ontario and the Honourable Member for Morris asked me if it was the government's intention to officially react to some of the recommendations which came forward in the report, namely, higher university tuition fees, enrolment cuts and the recommendation for faculty hiring incentives.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the intent of our government to, though the Bovey Commission Report may very well be applicable insofar as the Ontario situation is concerned, it's not our view that the commission holds much by way of what could be positive or constructive insofar as the Manitoba scene is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, we intend to do all we can at the provincial level, given financial and jurisdictional constraints, to ensure a well-functioning quality education system at the post-secondary level in the Province of Manitoba. I fear that the Bovey Commission Report would, in fact, potentially take us along a different road than the one that we ought to be following as Manitobans, the Province of Manitoba insofar as the University system is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as the supplementary question by the member pertaining to whether or not we would put in place a similar commission as the Bovey Commission in the Province of Manitoba, there is no intention to do that at the present time.

### PCBs - danger aspects of

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Niakwa.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health.



On CKND television, I saw an employee of the Manitoba Government wiping down a vehicle which could have been driven through the PCB spill in Ontario. He was wearing protective equipment except that there was no mask being worn. What are the dangerous aspects of being in contact with PCBs and how does one become infected?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister for the Environment.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, the other day the Member for Niakwa on Monday, in fact, had a great deal of problem rephrasing his question. I didn't think it would take him 48 hours to rephrase it, but I'm glad he did finally manage to do so. Unfortunately I'm not sure he's got a question even now, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** I'm not sure he's got a question even now, Mr. Speaker, but if the noise stops on the other side, I'll attempt to answer him.

Mr. Speaker, since the incident has occurred we have indeed responded to complaints that were raised with the department, the staff has indeed responded and at this point in time I can advise the member that a number of cars were washed down by the staff of the department and I shall send to the member opposite a leaflet here which gives a great deal more information on the question of PCBs. But the washing down of the small amounts of PCB on a vehicle with a cloth containing solvents does not put PCBs in the atmosphere. According to the proper measures of dealing with this, a mask is not indicated as a requirement.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** Mr. Speaker, to the same Minister, I guess he had a little trouble understanding my question. I certainly had a lot of trouble understanding his answer. You know it took me 48 hours to pose my questions, Mr. Speaker. It took him five days on the spill at Carman to come up with some sort of an answer.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister on Monday advised that he had 20 telephone calls requesting information on the PCB spills and I would like him to advise the people in the Province of Manitoba, what has been done to set up, to look after these people who think that they've been in contact with PCBs? What has been done to look after the people of the Province of Manitoba?

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated just before, if the member listened, we have responded to the calls that have been received by the department. At this point in time, and not including the ones that may have been received today, we have received approximately 70 calls. Of those, until the end of the day yesterday, some 25 to 30 of those have been dealt with directly by staff going to the households where the calls had been received from, they had inspected the cars and in some cases, some washed down by staff was required, and in other cases it was not indicated.

As I think I have already indicated on Monday, one car only at this point in time, has been impounded.

Those members who have indicated that they fear it may have affected their health, were told to see their physician. The Chief Medical Officer has been in touch with the medical profession and the Medical College to advise how to deal with this particular problem.

**MR. A. KOVNATS:** A further supplemental question, Mr. Speaker. I have been waiting for the answer. How has the Minister advised the people in the Province of Manitoba as to the danger of being in contact with PCBs, and who to contact if they think they've been in contact with PCBs?

I want to know how he has advised the people of the Province of Manitoba of the danger of being in contact.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, what the member's problem is, whether he doesn't understand or he doesn't want to understand, or he has a problem hearing, or maybe all of those.

I had indicated, Mr. Speaker, that all of those who have called have been responded to and those by phone, at this point in time. We are endeavouring to visit all of those who fear that their vehicle may have been splashed or sprayed with some of the substance.

There is, as has been indicated by the Chief Medical Officer, even the column that the member was holding up awhile ago, that there is no danger to health, per se, for members who might have travelled that road. But, if indeed some people feel that they have been unduly exposed, then they are advised to see their physician. I have so indicated on the program which the member was laughing at awhile ago in reference to the radio this morning. I so indicated to the media, who have questioned me yesterday or the day before, and unfortunately or fortunately, depending on how you look at it, this particular problem . . .

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** . . . is not only one of ours, it's primarily one that the Ontario Government is having to face right now. The information which is provided by the Chief Medical Officer from Ontario also applies in Manitoba. — (Interjection) — Hey, big mouth there, just give me time to answer and listen.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Mr. Speaker, I'm one who firmly believes that from these experiences, unfortunate as they may be, there is something to be learned, and indeed it does bring about the greater awareness of all people that indeed all of us have to address the issue of dangerous goods. As far as that is concerned, Mr. Speaker, we've got no lessons to learn from the Member for Niakwa or the other side. We are far ahead from where they were ever at the time they were in government and far ahead of all the other provinces where they happen to be in government.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please, order please. Order please.

May I remind all members that oral questions should be short, concise and to the point; and answers should also be short, concise and to the point.

### **Student Aid Branch - Backlog status of application**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Business Development.

**HON. J. STORIE:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Friday, I took a question as notice from the Member for Morris.

The Member for Morris was inquiring about the current status of the backlog of appeals with the Student Aid Branch, Mr. Speaker, and he had indicated in his question that he was seriously concerned about the four-to-five month delay. Mr. Speaker, there is no backlog at the Student Aid Branch. There is no backlog with respect to the fall and winter program, and the new spring-summer application period which began only six or seven weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, is well in hand. Approximately 75 percent of the appeals have already been heard contrary to the information that was provided by the Member for Morris who is fast gaining a reputation as having some of the worst sources in the opposition.

Mr. Speaker, the time for review, which is normally six to seven weeks, not months, is well in hand. As the member may know, the review is a complicated process. The delays that are occurring, and again I indicate that there are no appeals which are of any great length. The appeals are based on information that is provided by the applicants. In some cases that information isn't complete. There are other kinds of situations which create delays. The process is continually monitored. We are as concerned as anyone else about delays that implicate or have implications for students seeking aid. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no backlog and the member's information is incorrect as it has quite often been in the past.

### **PCBs - monitoring sewage**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question for the Minister of the Environment. Since his department is providing advice in terms of vehicle cleanup, could the Minister indicate, given the very toxic nature of PCBs, whether his department intends to monitor the sewage effluent of the City of Winnipeg since this wash water containing PCBs will be in the sewage system?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of the Environment.

**HON. G. LECUYER:** Mr. Speaker, I have at no time indicated that the staff from our department were washing down into the public sewers. They are indeed, as I indicated, washing with cloths and solvents and all of those, Mr. Speaker, are being put in barrels, secured, and they will be put back on the truck that's hauling these transformers.

### **Provincial parks and campgrounds - May opening**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is a follow-up to the First Minister yesterday in his address to the Minister of Natural Resources. Can the Minister indicate how many provincial parks will be closed on the May long weekend coming?

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the story that appeared in the paper was not accurate. I'm advised that there is going to be a correction made. The delay in the opening has to do with campgrounds, not provincial parks. So the campground portion may be delayed, but not the park itself.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The Honourable Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** To the same Minister. I think it's even more important, if there are campgrounds being closed, can the Minister indicate how many campgrounds will be closed?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I think that is a matter that should be taken up during Estimates review because there are hundreds of campgrounds in the province, and unless I had notice of the question being put today, I could not answer that specifically. We're in Estimates today anyway, Mr. Speaker.

### **Boissevain Land Titles Office - Cost of operation**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Highways.

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** Mr. Speaker, on April 12th, the Member for Turtle Mountain asked about the government services costs of operating the Land Titles building in Boissevain, so I want to provide him with that additional information since he has raised the grievance on this matter and asked several questions on it.

In addition to the costs that will be saved by the Attorney-General's Department, there is approximately \$25,000 in operating costs each year for staff, heat, light, maintenance and so on, so there is that additional saving of \$25,000 in that particular area.

### **Boissevain Land Titles Office - Proposed use of building**

**HON. J. PLOHMAN:** In regard to the other leases, the member asked about other plans for Boissevain. There are no plans at this time to change the leases or any other requirements for government use at Boissevain at this time.

### **Dip-netting - closing of season**

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Thank you. I direct my question to the Minister in charge of parks and Natural Resources



and would ask him why the government has decided to close the dip-netting season for suckers in the Whiteshell and the Nopiming area?

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Oh, oh!

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure why, but I'm sure there must be a good reason.

**MR. R. BANMAN:** Mr. Speaker, while I know that many members of the House might not appreciate the importance of this particular move that the Minister has undertaken, let me assure you that in the eastern part of Manitoba that has over the years become a tradition and almost a part of the rites of spring in our rural areas. While we make light of it here today, I want to tell the Minister that I would seriously ask him why that has happened, because a lot of people are starting to call, have done it for years and years and years, and now suddenly are being told they can't. I would like to know why.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order please.

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before we proceed to the Order Paper, I would like to announce that the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources will meet next Tuesday, April 23rd, at 10:00 a.m. to begin consideration of the Annual Report of the Manitoba Telephone System. I would expect, Mr. Speaker, that, as has been our past practice, following that start date, we would continue to meet Tuesdays and Thursdays with committees to deal with the various Crown corporations either in that committee or the Standing Committee on Economic Development.

Mr. Speaker, would you please call the Second Readings on which debate has been adjourned in the order in which they appear on Page 2 of the Order Paper?

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Health, Bill No. 2, the Honourable Member for Pembina has 40 minutes.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Stand.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, Bill No. 17, the Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

**MR. G. MERCIER:** Stand.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, Bill No. 21, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

**MR. B. RANSOM:** Stand.

**MR. SPEAKER:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 22, the Honourable Member for Lakeside.

**MR. H. ENNS:** Stand.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Honourable Government House Leader. Order please.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I would like to test the will of the House as to whether or not there is a predisposition to waive Private Members' Hour today. If there is I would then, having that leave, move that the House go into Supply.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased that the Honourable Member for La Verendrye defers to the Member for Elmwood.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Health, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for River East in the Chair for the Department of Health, and the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Natural Resources.

#### CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

**MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos:** Committee, please come to order. This consideration under the Department of Natural Resources is now focusing on Item No. 1.(g)(1) Computer Services: Salaries, 1.(g)(2) Other Expenditures.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, would you clarify where we're at? We are under 2.(a)(1), (2) and (3).

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** No, we cannot pass the resolution without the Minister's Salary.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I realize that. We were debating under 2.(a)(1), (2) and (3).

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Okay, sorry, correction. We have passed up to Item 1.(j)(1), 1.(j)(2), but we cannot have that resolution.

Mr. Minister.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, we had passed everything except the Minister's Salary. There is no resolution involved there.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** There will be after we pass the Minister's Salary.

**HON. S. USKIW:** That's right. We were on Regional Services, Item 2, when we adjourned the other night.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Okay.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, we had been debating the conservation officers' aspect of it under this end of it. Am I correct, Mr. Minister, that's where we're at?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** You're correct. The Chair wants to correct itself.

We are now on Item No. 2.(a)(1) Administration: Salaries of Regional Services, 2.(a)(2) Other Expenditures, 2.(a)(3) Problem Wildlife Control - the Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you. I just want to raise one other point here myself. My colleagues might have some other comments that they want to make or questions that they want to raise there. Under the Problem Wildlife Control, I think we had a little bit of confusion between the wildlife, we were getting into wildlife . . .

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, we were all over the ballpark.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** On this particular problem, Wildlife Control, this is the aspect, we deal with bear damage to some degree, am I correct?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Could the Minister maybe indicate how many complaints or applications have we had specifically related to bears under the wildlife problem?

**HON. S. USKIW:** What is the nature of the question, Mr. Chairman?

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I was asking specifically in terms of complaints about the bears, how many complaints have we had along those lines? I have a few follow-up questions just on that.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, maybe I should give the member the whole list here. We had 1,223 beaver complaints, if you like, or complaints related to beavers; 73 related to polar bears; 755 related to black bears; 64 with respect to elk; 10 with respect to moose; 252 with respect to deer; 110 with respect to wolves; 108 with respect to coyotes; 48 with respect to foxes; 259 with respect to waterfowl; 186 with respect to other fur-bearing animals; 170 other protected species; and 226 with respect to unprotected, for a total of 3,485 complaints, if you like, or references.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** That would include all the complaints that come in regarding wildlife problems. Okay, specifically on the bear aspect of it, is this an increasing thing from year to year - 755 - I believe the Minister said - complaints have come in?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes. I am advised that it's virtually stable on change year over year.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I suppose my eastern region there, the southeastern portion of it there close to the forestry, is one of the areas where a variety of these complaints come forward. Why I raised that, I had an individual who put in a claim especially, I believe, in oat crops during the course of the summer. The bears get in there and raise havoc.

I wonder if the Minister could clarify the procedure in terms if a complaint of this nature comes in, because in the minds of people there is sometimes confusion because I believe, if I am correct and maybe the Minister can clarify that, that the crop insurance does the adjusting if there is crop damage.

Could the Minister maybe just clarify the procedure if somebody has damage along these lines?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, the citizens are permitted to kill black bears on their own land in defence of their own assets or properties. That's provided for under subsection 46(1) of The Wildlife Act. So in most instances individuals solve their own problems. If they cannot deal with it, the department assists by deploying scaring devices such as propane bangers and crackershells, or by setting culvert traps or leg holds and neck snares. It gives you an idea of what the response mechanism is.

We have also if I may, Mr. Chairman, a program for beekeepers where the department offers a Bear-fence Grant Program. A beekeeper is entitled to \$100 for each fence that is installed up to a maximum of 10 fences per year, so that \$1,000 per one year is the maximum grant available to a beekeeper.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I think maybe the Minister has misunderstood what I was trying to get at. In the event that there is relatively considerable damage done to the crop, what would the procedure be that a farmer would go through in terms of trying to get compensation because I believe there is a compensation program in place?

**HON. S. USKIW:** No, Mr. Chairman, that is the problem, I guess. There is no compensation program for bear damage to crops. There is the bee program or beehive protection program; but specifically for crops, no.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Well, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister. Then I have to indicate that one of my constituents obviously has gotten funds that he should not have received because I had a case last year where in fact as many as 20 bears moved into an oat field and created considerable damage. He put in a claim and our resource people checked it out, the crop insurance people came out and did an adjustment and he got compensated to the tune of \$300 and-some-odd dollars. His anticipation was that he should have had more and that was where part of the problem came from. That's why I asked exactly the procedure that has to be followed because I wonder if maybe the Minister still insists that there is no compensation program for this.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I would hazard a guess that he must have had his crop insured and received a benefit from his insurance contract. I don't believe there was any benefit paid from the department.

Perhaps maybe there are extenuating circumstances which resulted in some extraordinary consideration. If the member would give us the detail on that situation, we could trace that down.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, I will try and get back to the Minister. The information I received was that the resource people had done the inspection and indicated it qualified for a compensation. Then the next step was that the crop insurance people did an inspection and ultimately he got a cheque from the province. But I will make a point to try and confirm the information that I have so that there's no confusion about that end of it.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that crop insurance often asks the department to do an assessment and to make a determination as to the cause of the damage, whether it was bear or other animals. That helps them in their assessment. Other than that I'm not sure of any role that we've played re compensation.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Fine. I have one other area that I would like to go into. I had the occasion, as I indicated last time, to travel a good portion of the province in the last six months and talk with a lot of people. One of the concerns that was raised with me in regard to the Porcupine Mountain and Duck Mountain areas, there were problems with the elk moving down because of heavy snow and lack of forage, I suppose.

One of the old-timers out there indicated to me that part of the problem that was developing in these mountains was the lack of a wolf program or predator control program in that area. I stand to be corrected, but I believe the predator control program for wolves, I think, was terminated somewhere in 1962 or maybe after that, I'm not quite sure. Apparently, because there is no control program in place, this is part of the reason that the elk keep moving down into the flats where they're more vulnerable to hunting pressures, etc., and create damage to farmers.

What I would like to know from this Minister is whether he is considering to maybe reimplement some type of a predator control program again, or whether this isn't a problem really in terms of the wolf situation.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, it's true that since about the early '60s, there hasn't been a mechanism to deal with wolves in that sense. But we do have, where there is need demonstrated, an ability to try to thin out wolf populations through one sort or another. We do move in if there's a serious problem but as a general policy there has not been a program.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Well, based on the information that was given to me and this was just verbal information, do people from the Minister's department feel that there is an increasing problem with wolves? I'm talking elk and deer in the parks.

**HON. S. USKIW:** I'm told that it does arise but on a spot basis, and that's how they try to treat it, but it's not a general problem that has been expressed.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** With respect to the problem with beavers in the Duck Mountain area, especially on the Swan River Constituency side, I wonder if the Minister could indicate what program is in place at the present time to assist farmers and municipalities in the control of beavers that cause problems.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, there are two situations possible, but in that particular area only one applies and that is the provincial controlled program. In the Riding Mountain, there is a federal-provincial agreement on control of beavers, but in this area it's a regular program, which means we assist local citizens with respect to reported problems re beaver activity and so on. But there is not a general program per se. It's based on a reporting basis. If there is an acute problem, we will respond to that particular problem.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** That program is in place throughout the entire area, or is it limited to certain areas within the constituency?

**HON. S. USKIW:** That is applicable provincially, other than where we have a federal-provincial agreement on beaver control.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Are there any changes anticipated in the beaver control program for the coming year?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Nothing more than our efforts to educate and encourage local people to place control, as much as they can, on their own initiative.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Does the department encourage or issue trapping licences for the reduction of beavers in problem areas?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, that is one mechanism that is being used. The problem we have currently is that the prices for beaver pelts are so low that it's not very encouraging to the trappers to move in and take them out. That is a difficult area for us to resolve at the moment.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** I would just like to place on the record that I appear to be getting increased numbers of complaints from land owners, including some municipal people, regarding the problem with beavers in various parts of the constituency, but primarily the Duck Mountain area seems to be where most of the complaints are coming. There was some indication that perhaps the department was not going to maybe be as active in working with the local people in controlling beavers, and I just wanted to find out whether this was in fact a policy change or whether it was misinformation that was being brought to my attention.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, as far as I'm aware, there is no change in policy or in scope of program. The regular program is ongoing and will continue. We are trying to encourage local governments and individuals on the local level to take a larger role along with us, but we have not diminished our effort in that respect.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Moving to another area, that's the problem of timber wolves. I've received a number of

enquiries from the farmers in Pine River area and I believe the Minister probably has received some correspondence with respect to these concerns of ranchers in that area, complaining about the large number of losses they have incurred in their livestock program by timber wolves and their concern with respect to control measures that are currently in place and I believe, their lack of control. Also, I understand there's insurance available through private insurance companies to cover these losses and, therefore, the department has indicated they would not entertain any compensation. I wonder if the Minister could indicate any new control programs or any programs that might be anticipated to help these farmers in that Pine River area and perhaps, other parts of the province that are finding increasing problems with timber wolves.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, again we try to respond to local situations, Mr. Chairman, in that particular area, we've had 18 wolves removed, of which 12 were removed by trappers and 6 by our staff. So we are aware of that particular situation and have tried to deal with it somewhat. There has been a program in that area.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Minnedosa.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Under the resource protection, I suppose I could cover it under this item. I'm sure the Minister got a copy of the letter this morning together with a fairly large petition from the residents from the Grand Valley area protesting the location of a waterslide in that area.

In view of the reasons recorded for their objections and the amount of signatures and the fairly large representation of those objecting to it, I wonder if the Minister is considering taking another look at locating the park in that particular area. They're not against the waterslide park in other areas, but that particular location seems to have caused some concern out there with about 86 percent of the residents there signing a petition opposing it.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I think there's some confusion with respect to the role of the department in that question. The department's function there is merely to anchor the landlord if you like, providing for asset of property for the location of the waterslide on a lease basis. The question of whether a waterslide should be located there, of course, comes under various planning acts, under the municipal act and local government authority.

So we really can't address the question at our level as to whether or not that particular development conforms with the wishes of local planners and in particular, the local R.M.s and the City of Brandon. That has to be dealt with at that level. We have merely responded to an application for a lease of the property and we have entered into that lease. A contract has been signed a couple of months ago which is irrevocable at this point in time.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** I noticed the R.M. is one of the participants in the objections to the location of the park, and I'm sure they are members of the planning district. What jurisdiction would have some authority

here, and could the Minister forward the relative information on to that particular department?

I notice that the senior district planner in Brandon has received a copy of it. Would this be under the Municipal Affairs Planning Branch? Would that be where they should express their objections?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, it's probably late for an objection . . .

**MR. D. BLAKE:** That's what they're afraid of.

**HON. S. USKIW:** . . . in that there is a contract already let with respect to the lease of the property.

If there is an avenue for groups wishing to challenge that project, it would have to be I would imagine through local authority which has control over their development and the kind of development plan they have in the area. This is a recreational waterslide facility and that's going to be the only activity in this park. It appears to be consistent with recreation in the area.

But notwithstanding that, we really are not involved in determining what should be done where in municipalities. That has to be a local decision, whether it's industry or recreation activity through private sector or otherwise. That's not our function.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his remarks. I'll see that the proper authorities get a copy of this if they haven't already got one, and we'll take it from there. It may be that the Minister of the Environment may be involved in it also, I don't know.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, just to make one more comment, I have to assume that the local company or the local entrepreneur has complied with and conformed to all of the local regulations with respect to environment and municipal planning, etc. That has to be an assumption at our level. If it isn't so, then there is recourse for people that have some objection there. They will deal with it at that level.

**MR. D. BLAKE:** If they have complied with it, I find it odd that the R.M. would be one of those objecting to it at this stage, because I'm sure they would be well aware of what's going on if they are members of the planning district, or whatever it's called.

I know the Brandon Industrial Commission have sent a letter supporting it, so there may be some local controversy out there on it that may have to be solved locally then.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Inkster.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** On the same issue, this is Crown land, is it not, Mr. Minister?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, it is Crown land.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Is it land designated as a recreation park?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, that's right.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Then do we not have responsibility . . . sorry, I am too fast.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** We have to record what's going on.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Yes, okay. Then do we not have responsibility for protecting the land and the heritage resources within that land as a department?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, our particular interest is protected by the fact that we as government through the interrelationships, or the relationship we have interdepartmentally, have to sort that out at this level. With respect to whether the project complies with local planning authority is beyond our jurisdiction.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Well, Mr. Chairman, since the responsibility for the protection of the land is under the department's administration, I would think that any lease we would sign with anyone to offer any kind of facility within any of our provincial parks and in fact, in any Crown land, would meet standards by the province in the protection of the heritage that the land was originally purchased for in the cases of parks. In the case of Crown land, we should certainly be aware of what we are meting out before we enter into leases. The archaeological history of that area is not something new; we have known that for an awful long time.

Perhaps, could the Minister tell me if the lease has written into it anything which would prohibit the developer from disturbing or, in effect, destroying by its disturbing an archaeological site?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I am advised that when this was considered initially that it did indeed conform with all of our concerns having the supreme authority over that particular area. The archaeological portion of that site is not under lease agreement; that has been kept out of it. We have looked at all of that and it's my information that all of those interests have been protected.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** If I am interpreting correctly then, the land that is of archaeological significance is not included within the boundaries of the lease.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, that would be too sweeping a statement to agree with. There may be a minor portion of it that would be overlapping, but we do have a resident archaeologist on site and will be there during the course of the development to assure that our interest is protected there from an archaeological point of view.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** I don't want to give you a hard time, Mr. Minister.

**HON. S. USKIW:** I won't let you.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Obviously, you are one of my colleagues and you wouldn't let me anyway. But I just want to be assured that the lease as drawn has protection for the government to control any development on that site so that the archaeologically significant area will not be detrimentally affected.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I think those sentiments have all been considered. I might point out to the

Member for Inkster that in the agreement that we have entered into with the developer there is a provision that the developer shall contribute sums of money annually towards the interpretation of the archaeological site. So there is co-operation, as we view it, on the part of the developer to make sure that this is preserved and enhanced.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** Thank you, Mr. Minister. I would just like as well to comment on an earlier item raised by the Member for Swan River. This is my concern that when we get into wildlife control programs, and those two mentioned so far have been beaver and wolves, at least, when I came in today into the Chamber, and also bears and other species.

I believe, and I speak not only from the heart but also from the head, in research that I have done and looked into other jurisdictions, and it quite simply appalls me at the kind of wolf control programs that have been undertaken years ago in Manitoba with the widespread poisoning programs in the Interlake, in particular, and also what's been going on in the Yukon and in northern British Columbia. The primary reason for the poisoning in both those jurisdictions is they're blaming the wolves for any problems that they have, usually caused by over-hunting and habitat destruction.

With the timberwolves here, it's very easy to blame everything that happens, every animal that dies, on wolves. — (Interjection) — As the Member for Emerson just hollered out - Wolf! - they cry wolf all the time.

**A MEMBER:** We never cry wolf.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** That's right, you should never cry wolf. I believe there is protection via the department in water fowl depredation and also wildlife depredation on crops. I believe very strongly that is the route that we should be going as far as compensation and not into some kind of a population control program aimed at wiping out the species because that is, in effect, what usually happens in it. It is just that people get this totally irrational hatred and in many cases fear and whatnot, of wolves.

I have some inferences to this deer feeding program we had going this winter and some of the deer feeding stations turned into tremendous wolf feeding stations as well. So some of the local people, in particular, were sitting out trying to shoot the wolves as soon as the wolves came anywhere near it. There aren't that many left in the province, especially in the southern more part of the province, and in most of the province it's a wiped-out species. Where there is sufficient habitat, it is still in existence, but if the attitudes revert back to the old wolf control programs, it certainly would be a threatened species. They are probably the most single most important species that we have in the maintenance of strong and healthy herds of the animals upon which they prey. It is a far more selective form of preying on their prey species.

If mankind could control our population half as well as wolves control their population we wouldn't have difficulties of over-population be it here - or here certainly we don't have the problem - but certainly in other jurisdictions we do. I am just putting a plea in for the province not to participate in exacerbating or

even in continuing some of the quite irrational fear that people try and raise in campaigns counter to the wolf in particular.

As it refers to beaver, has the province looked into some experiments that are being done, I understand, in the U.S. where they are actually trying to introduce beaver and bringing in wood for the beaver to try and build more dams across areas where there is water shortage because it's just so incredibly expensive to try and build dam structures for water retention. Here we have a very domestic species, to say the very least, who will do an awful lot of that work for us and actually assist many farm areas more so than they will harm.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, I find this very interesting listening to the Member for Inkster when he talks about the wolf problems and don't kill the wolves and stuff like that, and the beaver is looking after the drainage problems for the farmers and water control.

I wonder if the Member for Inkster has ever been affected by having wolves killing livestock, as was indicated by the Member for Swan River. Until you have that personal loss or you have beavers building dams all over the place where you flood out your crops, there are two sides to the story. It's not quite the way that the Member for Inkster is illustrating here that the farmers out there are trying to kill all the wolves or all the beavers, that is not the case at all, but there's a way of controlling some of these things. If everything was back to nature the way it was many many years ago, then we could say, that's fine. But ever since man interfered, instead of making their living off the land, then these things have a bearing on it and there has to be a control factor in it.

When the Member for Inkster is indicating that there is compensation for the operators if they lose livestock, the Minister just finished explaining to me that there is not, so maybe either he or the Minister can clarify who is right in this aspect of it.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the Member for Inkster is certainly right, well, he's completely right with respect to one perspective on the issue, but I think the world started to change after there was a second person added on this planet, I guess. When we had one person, we had all the freedom in the world and when there were two, we lost 50 percent of our freedom. As we evolved and developed the natural assets worldwide, it is not peculiar to Manitobans, that we have affected our environment and have altered it. Sometimes we have altered it to the point where we have not any longer a natural problem that was there, but a problem enhanced by the fact of our own actions. So, when we do that, which results in unreasonable increases of, for example, any species in a given area because of what we have done for that species, then there has to be a countervailing responsibility with respect to those who are adversely affected.

So that's sort of the high-wire act that a department like ours has to perform all the time, and it's not a black and white issue; it's a very gray issue and everybody is right on it - we're all right.

I happen to have a great deal of respect for the wolf. I think that is a very important species that should be maintained, enhanced, or whatever. We certainly shouldn't lose it. On the other hand, if we have created an artificial environment to the point where that species is dominant and more than they should be in a given situation, then we have to have methods that would respond to the needs at that time given those circumstances. So, it's all hypothetical, but I think it sort of tells a story of where we are.

If we don't drain a ditch, we don't have a pond at the other end; if we don't drain it, we have less agriculture, and there are all sorts of arguments on all of these issues, pro and con. Hopefully, we're getting wiser as we move along. I think we're much wiser today with respect to the use of natural resources than we were 100 years ago when this country was pioneered.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Scott would still like to see it that way.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Mr. Chairman, with respect to the timber wolf problem in the Pine River area. It so happens that these people are farming in an area where the timber wolves are prevalent and they have experienced considerable losses. I understand that the control measures are such that the poison only knocks out the weak timber wolves, or the very young. I wonder if the Minister could comment - is this, in fact, the program that's in place to try and limit the kinds of control on the timber wolves?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised, yes, there is a wolf control program in that particular area at the moment. Now whether it's adequate or effective enough, and that's the same information I gave the Member for Swan River before in terms of the number of wolves that have been removed.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Mr. Chairman, the fact is ranchers in that area, I might point out, have also suffered cutbacks with respect to the CRISP Program. Many people in that area have been cut off from getting the CRISP Program. They have incurred huge losses on their cattle program because of the losses through the timber wolves. I understand that the Minister - maybe it was the Minister before you came into this office - had indicated that there was no compensation program in place. Is this right?

**HON. S. USKIW:** That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Is there some will on the part of this Minister to scrap the Wolf Control Program and in fact introduce a compensation program for ranchers in this area?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, if there was a will, there isn't a wherewithal and I guess that's where the answer lies. We have no funds provided in these Estimates for that kind of a program.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Inkster.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** I don't want to take up and delay anything here, but I think it's important to put some

things in perspective as the Minister has done as well, and I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman.

But as we encroach more and more and more on the wee bit of natural environment we have left in the southern half of the province, we, as mankind, have a very high duty to assist in the maintenance of ecological zones in the species that live therein. I don't know, and I'd be exceptionally surprised if it would ever be proven out, and I've done a fair amount of reading on wolves, both their habitat and their patterns, that it can be shown that anything that man has done has done anything whatsoever to increase the population of wolves. It's usually exactly the opposite.

As far as making them a more dominant species and we have perhaps to look at what other, I'm not aware, as well, if anything we have made them a more dominant species. If you take away their food supply by, for instance, if there are situations of over-hunting, over-poaching, whatever, their population drops as well, and the vast majority of any reports I have seen of people where wolf kills have been blamed on everything, have actually been done by wild domestic dogs, or domestic dogs that are wild at night. This is the difficulty in proving wolf kills for an insurance program.

I would certainly much prefer to see us move towards a compensation program when we're dealing with species that are becoming more endangered as we encroach in their territory.

The big question is, should we be encouraging through the sale of Crown land, be it one way, or any kinds of grants towards clearing of Crown land or private land even, towards additional agricultural incursions into marginal areas, especially when we already have a beef industry that is in some difficulty. It doesn't seem to me to make a tremendous amount of sense to open up and go further and further north into more and more marginal land where the operation may well be even feeding where the grazing period is even less. It makes it somewhat perhaps questionable whether we should be, as a government policy, enhancing the capacity of new operators or of present operators to expand into marginal areas at the consequence of the environment in that area if the natural environment is still there.

I'm not saying don't do anything whatsoever, but I am saying that it doesn't make a heck of a lot of sense to me when the population of beef cattle, for instance, in the province has been decreasing for a number of years for us to be expanding into new areas for new beef production. I can't quite jibe, you know, keep the two together when we cut down in beef production in the southern part where it's more profitable and move it into marginal areas where it is probably less profitable.

The poisons and the whole policy of poison, I personally just cannot accept. It's indiscriminate killing, and it doesn't just hit the species you're going after. It hits other species as well. It will hit coyotes. It will hit dang near anything that feeds on any kind of carrion. They're most indiscriminate. They can't be proven to be sound, I don't believe, and I would much prefer to see us move towards an insurance-based program for wildlife depredation on species, as mentioned by the Member for Swan River. I fully support his initiative or his support for moving in that direction and away from wildlife control programs, which costs us an awful lot as well in manpower. I think that the other situation may well be better versed.

Certainly before we make moves into things, we should be dealing with people who understand and are experts in wolves. We have people in the province currently who are doing extensive research. There has been a lot of research done over the years, and we're just now getting a better understanding of that species in particular. So that's all I wanted to say, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, you know, one can spend days and days debating the pros and cons of wildlife management. I think one has to put into balanced perspective what we want out of our total environment. You know, I think we have better control of that today than we had when we had the buffalo roam the prairies, because had we had some control then, we would have still had the buffalo. So I have to take it from there that we have managed our resource better in recent years than we have in past years.

On the other hand, you know, there are people that get carried away with viewpoints having to do with the preservation of nature in the natural setting to the point where they don't fully understand that the human being is part of nature and part of the environment, and also wants to have room to play. Therefore, there has to be some consideration for human interest, apart from the interest of wolves and all sorts of other species.

Recreation is a very important thing to all living things. Anyone who has observed animals knows that they participate most fully in recreational activities, but the human person is one that likes to have a lot of opportunity for recreational activity. That should not also be compromised in the interests of total, natural, environmental sort of desires on the part of some people in society that have only a very narrow perspective.

You know, three-quarters of Manitoba is what I consider to be a wilderness area. Therefore, we have to somehow balance how we utilize the other quarter, where it is a matter co-existence between people and the rest of the living species in the area. I guess we will always be wrestling with that issue, how you use water, lakes, how you use recreational vehicles on water and on land, and where. All of these are issues that are indeed important, but I don't think one can take a very narrow viewpoint on any of those issues, one to exclude the other. We have to develop a means of co-existence in a way that allows maximum opportunity for people to use the resource as well as animal life.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm just recalling the problem we had trying to keep pigeons around this building. They got wiped out.

Mr. Chairman, this item of \$140,200 for problem wildlife, I guess that basically hinges around the bear, the beaver and the wolf. Are there any other of the wildlife species that they can be compensated for if they do damage?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Correction, Mr. Chairman, we do not compensate for damages as a . . .

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** This is control.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, we have a control program not compensation, other than waterfowl damage. For that particular area, we do have compensation programs.



**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Inkster.

**MR. D. SCOTT:** I'll try to make this my final comment, because I want to have things move along. I understand Mr. Anstett wants to get into it now too so. When we speak of narrow viewpoints, up till now man has not had a very good reputation in protecting species. That is not improving, I don't think to any great extent. The rate of loss of habitat is higher now than it has been in any time in our history.

The attitude that the narrow viewpoint is one which is environmental, I think is exactly completely wrong. I don't think the Minister was alleging that at all, but other members opposite may be trying to interpret that's what he meant.

But the quarter of the land that we have in Manitoba where man has primarily settled is the quarter of the province with, by far, the greatest diversity of species, both plant and animal, and of terrain. When you get up into the northern tundra, which is the bulk of the northern part of the province and into the far edge of the arboreal forest, that area is exceptionally fragile but also very little diversity.

So the species that are threatened isn't mankind. For us to want recreation and to be able to get out and enjoy nature, we have to protect it more than ever, because our enjoyment is at its expense. If we want to be able to have that for future generations to enjoy as we have when we've grown up, we have to be that much more careful than our forefathers were, far far more careful.

That's, I hope, the final comment I have on the issue, but it's just that I personally do not feel that anywhere in Canada and in most of the world, as a matter of fact, that wildlife policies have been very well thought out. In large measure, they have been geared to providing for the destruction of species determined or called predators and also for the preservation and the enhancement of species which man himself likes to take through the exercise of hunting.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I want to get off that subject, unless somebody wants to comment on that.

I would like to raise a question to the Minister as to the aspect of the elk ranching. Would that come under this category?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Sorry, I missed that.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** That's fine. I just wanted to raise a question with the Minister as to the aspect of, let's say, the elk ranching end of it. Should we deal with that under the wildlife aspect of it, or where do you want to deal with that?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Under Wildlife.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Wildlife? Fine, we'll deal with it under wildlife.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, that's fine.

Mr. Chairman, I do have to apologize to the committee. We did give wrong information. I have just been advised that there is compensation paid for crop damage as a result of bear activity, deer, elk and moose, as well as waterfowl, and where there is hunter-killed livestock. So we do have a program for compensation.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Minister, because I was beginning to think that I'd have to go back and fix somebody's clock.

**HON. S. USKIW:** You were right, Albert. You were right.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(a)(1)—pass; 2.(a)(2)—pass.  
2.(a)(3) - the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister was talking about beaver damage in answer to a question from the Member for Roblin-Russell. I just want to clarify what the status of Ministerial permits or Ministerial authority is with respect to the entry onto private land for the removal of beaver dams is, and how long when those authorities are granted, they are in effect.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Ministerial authority.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Yes. I was just recently asked by the Cooks Creek Conservation District which received that authority this past winter and because of the winter and the access problems they had, they weren't able to take the action and they don't know how long the authority asks and they're looking for that information. Perhaps the Minister could provide it directly to them.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I will ask staff to make certain that they do contact the Cooks Creek conservation people. Is it municipal or conservation?

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Conservation Board. If there is any problem, I would urge the Minister to ensure that they have adequate authority to solve the problem because it's not the beaver that are the problem, it is the size of the ice flows that result from the series of small dams which then creates jamming and massive flooding on occasion.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(a)(3)—pass.

2.(b)(1) Northwest Region: Salaries, 2.(b)(2) Other expenditures - the Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Is there any activity in road maintenance or building with respect to this section?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Would the member clarify. Is he suggesting or is he indicating road activity, building activity in the forest area? Is that what he's talking about? It should be dealt with under forestry, but it really doesn't matter.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Okay. No, that's okay.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** It appears that on Salaries there's a reduction from \$912,508 to \$868,200, is that a couple of staff reductions? If it is so, what are the changes?

**HON. S. USKIW:** In the Northwest Region.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** The Northwest Region.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, yes, there's a reduction of a CO, a vacant position, which was removed, and a secretary.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(b)(1)—pass; 2(b)(2)—pass.  
2(c)(1) Northeast Region: Salaries; 2(c)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, maybe just to speed up the next area here where we deal with individual regions, there was one CO deleted under the Northwest Region. I believe that would probably apply also under the Northeast Region. Would that also apply under the Interlake regions or could the Minister indicate where the deletions are?

**HON. S. USKIW:** There are no changes in the Northeast.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** May I call all the regions then, and the Minister will deal with it all. The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Yes, if the Minister could just indicate under the Regions, we have a whole series of them right up to Item (k) where the deletions of the COs are taking place.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Minister.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, in the Sprague area, there is one reduction of a CO and one in Flin Flon.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Would that be in the Southeast Region or the Eastern Region?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Sprague would be Southeast, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Are there others in the other regions as well, where we have reductions of COs? So the question I have is, are these actual deletions of COs in the field that will not be replaced?

**HON. S. USKIW:** I'll just explain. In administration we have a reduction of 6.26 staff years; in the Northwest Region we have a reduction of 2 which we just mentioned; no change in the Northeast; no change in the Interlake; no change in the Southwest Region; no change in the Western Region; one reduction in the Southeast; one in the Eastern Region, and nothing in the Whiteshell Region; one reduction in Fire Suppression in the Administration and an increase of Fire Suppression in the Operations end of 6.48.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** One further question, a concern I want to raise with the Minister is the two deletions in the Southeast Region and the Eastern Region, I think these are areas that are probably very vulnerable to

poaching — (Interjection) — yes, one in each region. These areas are very vulnerable to poaching because of their close proximity to the city. What is the rationale for the reduction of these two positions in there?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm advised with respect to the Southeast Region, that there was a reorganization that took place that in essence, bound together the Piney and the Sprague areas under one person, whereas it was handled by two previously. And that's been under way for some period of time and it just culminated.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Why I raised it is because according to the information I received, is that there's an increase in the poaching aspect of it in the area there and I feel concern when there's an increase in that aspect of it, that we'll be deleting staff. What seems to be a problem anyway is that the staff cannot cover the areas adequately. I know that isn't the total solution, we discussed that the other day. But maintaining of staff is one thing, but when we delete I have concerns about that, and I'd ask the Minister to maybe have his staff review the trend - maybe I don't have the right information - but if the trends are for increased violations and poaching calls of that nature in that general area, if this is a case that the trend is, that there's going to be increased pressure in that area, whether he would reconsider those positions.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, the member should be aware that when we identify a problem area from time to time, what we do is redeploy people or staff from other areas to zero in on the crisis area, there is such a development. So although we have a basic staff in each region, we add and take away from them depending on where the needs arise during the course of the year.

I might add one other point. The member referred to poaching and I suspect that he probably includes in that nightlighting and all sorts of things. As far as I'm concerned we intend to be very very harsh with respect to those activities. I think we should be prosecuting every one who is nightlighting or poaching, that we should push it all the way through the court system every time it happens and I intend to instruct staff to do accordingly.

**SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I want to compliment the Minister on that statement. I certainly support him all the way in that and I think it goes a long way towards maybe indicating how he feels about this.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(c)(1) to 2.(f)(2) were each read and passed.  
2.(g)(1)—pass.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** With reservation - pass.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(g)(2)—pass; 2.(h)(1)—pass; 2.(h)(2)—pass.  
2.(j)(1) - the Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** In the Whiteshell region, I'm just wondering, with the designation of the Lake Mantario

area there, do we have special staff that look after the control of that area because it is now with my understanding a non-mechanical use area for boats, snow toboggans and stuff of that nature. Do we have special staff that look after that responsibility or how is that being handled?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, there is no change in staffing from what we had. We had 22 staff there and that is going to continue.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Well, just a further question. But is it that kind of staffing that looks after the control of that area, because obviously there is going to be a certain amount of pressure, especially on the outskirts of the designated area for mechanical use of motor boats and snow toboggans?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, during the peak season, we also add to the basic staff complement departmental staff which is the short-term seasonal staff.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(j)(1)—pass; 2.(j)(2)—pass.

2.(k)(1) Enforcement and Legislative Services: Salaries; 2.(k)(2) Other Expenditures—pass.

2.(m)(1) Fire Suppression - Administration: Salaries; 2.(m)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I wonder if the Minister under Fire Suppression could give us a bit of an outline as to what has happened in the past year and I know we can't anticipate what's going to happen in terms of the conditions for this year, but maybe put on record an update as to, let's say, our water bombers, the amount of staff that is involved generally, just a general statement on that as to what has happened and what is anticipated.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, for the 1984 fire season, we had experienced 692 fires involving 130,000 hectares. Of those, 287 or 42 percent involving 80,000 hectares or 61 percent were related to lightning. Person caused fires, there were 405 which is 58 percent of the total involving 50,000 hectares which is 39 percent of the total. Agriculture related were 88 to 13 percent involving 34,000 hectares or 27 percent of the total. Indian settlements, there were 142 which is 20 percent involving 8,000 hectares or 6 percent of the area. Other persons, we had 175 which is 25 percent and 8,000 acres or 6 percent of the area. Fire Suppression costs, lightning related \$5 million, and human related \$1.5 million for a total of \$6.5 million in 1984.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Those figures just quoted by the Minister, those are not reflected here. This is just the staffing.

**HON. S. USKIW:** No, that's last years.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Oh, I see.

**HON. S. USKIW:** They are last year's Fire Suppression Program.

Now, we have in the appropriation for this year, in the administration end, 13.20 staff years which is a

reduction of one and that's a vacant position, and in the Suppression Operations we have an increase of 6.48 or a total of 57.28.

With respect to the season's projections for 1985, groundwater tables were generally above normal at freeze-up, above average snowfall throughout most of the province. South-central and eastern regions received average snowfall. The Duck, Porcupine and Riding Mountain was much above average snowfall. Weather forecast for April indicated below normal temperatures. Showers predicted throughout with snow squalls at month's end. Average start-up dates for fires in the south is April 20th. North of 53 is May 1st. Eight fires have been reported to date; 25 fires were reported by this date last year. We do not expect to have the same high number of spring fires as we experienced last year.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Rupertsland.  
Mr. Minister.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Sorry, Mr. Chairman, I should continue my response to the Member for Emerson. With respect to the water bombers, we presently operate three CL-215 water bombers, and they are supplied and maintained by the Department of Highways. They are used exclusively by the Department of Natural Resources for fire suppression operations. The member probably is aware the CL-215 is a special purpose aircraft and is not suitable for other purposes such as hauling freight or sprayings - purely for fire suppression.

We are signatory to a federal-provincial agreement with respect to a co-operative supply of CL-215s. This agreement provides for the interprovincial sharing of CL-215 water bombers during periods of emergency. The Federal Government buys one CL-215 and provides it to Manitoba, and Manitoba purchases one outright at a cost of \$6.2 million in 1984 dollars. The federal CL-215 will be delivered on April 1, 1986, and the Manitoba CL-215 will be delivered April 1, 1988, and we of course deploy these throughout the province as required during the fire season, and average approximately 275 flying hours per person per machine or per plane.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I don't want to get ahead of the member for Rupertsland, but I wanted some clarification. At the present time, we have three water bombers and we have two more coming based on an agreement with the Federal Government. We also have the option, if I understand that correctly, an agreement with other provinces in terms of being able to draw on other units as well. Is that from across Canada or is that just with the neighbouring provinces, or how do they work that?

**HON. S. USKIW:** It's an agreement right across Canada, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** How many machines would really be available then in that respect if you had a very dry summer, any idea?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Fifteen CL-215s.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Rupertsland.

**MR. E. HARPER:** I just wanted to ask the Minister in respect to the reserves in the North. Sometimes there are forest fires that may develop near a reserve or on a reserve and usually the band members go and put the fire out. Usually they don't have any budgets for that. Our Department of Indian Affairs doesn't allocate any budget for the band and usually there is some agreement between the reserve and also the conservation officer in our Natural Resources Department to help put the fire out. Could you elaborate on the policy in terms of recovery losses of the money spent to the bands?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, we have to have a set of priorities on how we respond to those kinds of problems, and the first one of course has to do with respect to the protection of human life. The second priority is property, and of course beyond that are the resources.

With respect to activities on reserves we do respond and, of course, whatever the costs are, we do bill them directly to the Department of Indian Affairs.

**MR. E. HARPER:** I had a letter sent to me from one of the bands inquiring about the recovery of the money that is spent to putting the fire out. They sent it to Indian Affairs and they sent it back and told them it was the responsibility of Natural Resources. They also forwarded it back to the Natural Resources, and they said that it wasn't their responsibility.

**A MEMBER:** It's a grey area. It's the way they do things.

**MR. E. HARPER:** I know how bureaucrats work, but I have had the experience of working with the Natural Resources when I was Chief in Red Sucker Lake. About a mile away, there was a forest fire, and we called the conservation office, which was located in Island Lake 50 miles away. By the time they responded, it was sort of late in the evening, toward the dusk of the evening. By that time, we had it in control. The conservation officer came in and said, well, we have these eight trained personnel that he had. There is no need for the band members to get involved.

What happened was the fire picked up and they lost all their fire equipment, their hoses and everything else. If it was left to us, we would have put it out. We would have had it all put out, you know.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, perhaps there is some confusion. We recover our own costs from the Department of Indian Affairs. We do not recover the costs of the band. That is something that they have to deal with themselves. If there is either staffing or whatever the band supplies in order to protect the band area or the reserve area, we're not involved in that with respect to recovery of costs.

**MR. E. HARPER:** I think that policy should be explained to the band members so they know the channels and how to react to it. If it's a forest fire maybe, they have to watch for a while until they can see who comes in. But those are some of the things that the band members have to deal with. I would appreciate it if something

could be put in writing to the bands so that they know how to proceed.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, that is a very valid point. Maybe what we should do annually is send a letter out to all of the reserves, to the band leadership, explaining what the rules are and how they participate. That way, it would remove any ambiguity or doubt or whatever to what each role should be.

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

**MR. A. ADAM:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On the last point of the damages on the reserves, that also applies to Emergency Measures where we would deal with the movements of people, if necessary, in the event of a flood and provide assistance for them. Any costs thereon would be transferred back to the federal people. If it's going to be done for Natural Resources and fire disaster, it should also be done in conjunction with the Emergency Measures Organization to cover other situations as well.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, I have a series of question that I want to pursue in this area regarding forest fires. Especially, I'm going to look at the extreme northern part of the province where we have, in many cases, desolate areas. What is the normal approach by the department?

We sometimes hear of fires being out of control, is it the intent of the department to try and control all the fires, even the ones that are up North, because many of them are in areas where I don't know whether fire always create damage, but in some areas I think the costs of trying to control some of them, especially in some of the boggy areas up there - when a person flies over it, you wonder an effort would be made to try and necessarily control these fires. The kind of timber that is involved is very marginal probably and never been harvested anyway. It's probably, you know, a natural state of reforestation to some degree.

I just wonder, are all fires - do we try and control all fires or do we let some of them automatically just burn?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that we have ever been able to control all of them if there are many at one given moment. Therefore, there has to be a priority list or a means of deciding which ones we respond to first. It is all based on a criteria relevant only on the basis of value of the risk involved.

That is, if you have a forest that is of marginal economic value, you would rate that one lower than one of maximum economic value. So all of those judgments have to be based on that kind of criteria. Of course, if you are talking about human life and communities, then they rate ahead of all of that. It's common sense, in essence, that has to apply.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I'd like to now pursue the area of burning permits to some degree with the Minister which always creates a certain amount of concern, I suppose. The people that live close to the forest areas are

probably a little bit more conscientious about it, and realize the implications of fires in that area. When we get into the organized municipalities, there always seems to be a conflict between individuals who want to do some burning, they have been brushing land. Even the smallest type of burning that takes place, we know it's obviously going to be there.

It appears that, at times, people are maybe a little over-zealous in terms of not issuing permits, and as a result it creates all kinds of problems sometimes. I would like to have the Minister maybe just give us an indication as to the criteria for burning, because there is a time period - I don't know exactly when it starts - when if you want to do any burning, you have to apply for a permit. I wonder if there is a bit of a differential based on the organized municipalities where, in most cases, the danger and the consequences are not as dramatic as when you do it close to forested areas.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I think what I should indicate to the Member for Emerson is that we have, in fact, rethought our whole position with respect to that question. What will apply more than anything else from here on in will be common sense related to the individual situation, rather than a rule that would apply regardless of individual circumstance.

That is going to be a little more cumbersome to implement, because we will still retain the permit requirement because we have to know where the fires are, who is setting them and for what purpose. But the resource people out in the field are going to have to work out a common-sense approach with the individual wanting to do the burning, based on local circumstance and individual circumstance. So we won't have the problem of universal regulation being the law of the land being applied across the board, even though those are not necessarily important or necessary for that particular situation.

We have developed this as a result of our discussions with people that are doing the burning, and I think we're putting together a brochure sort of as a guideline on how to handle that question, rather than as a regulation. I have sent - has this letter gone out? - a letter with respect to the new policy and, if members wish, I am prepared to xerox and table that with members opposite. Perhaps someone can arrange for that.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the Minister again, and I am beginning to wonder if he will be doing this through the whole Estimates here. I certainly appreciate his comment about the common-sense approach in that aspect of it, because I think maybe some of that was lacking in the past. If we are looking at it in a different direction, I think many people will be pleased about that. I certainly feel much better about that aspect of it.

I would like to deal just briefly then with the peat moss burning aspect of it. There has been a lot of pressure that has come down from various groups and organizations, I suppose, in terms of abolishing the burning of peat moss. I wonder if the Minister could maybe indicate what their approach is going to be in that, because to the farmers involved, and I think many

of them are in his constituency that are involved, possibly his and the Minister of Municipal Affairs where a lot of the peat moss is being burned. But maybe just to clarify that, many of the people that actually have been buying Crown lands or purchasing some of these lands that have a depth of 4 or 5 feet, or 3 or 4 feet, however many feet of peat moss on top with very good productive soil underneath, the only feasible way to remove that to make good arable land, and some of it is very good arable land underneath the peat moss, has been the process of burning off the peat moss. There has been a lot of criticism directed towards that, and I want to speak in justification of the farmers that have bought this land with that in mind. If they cannot use that approach to get rid of the peat moss, it puts them in a dilemma.

I am wondering, before I get critical of that aspect of it, whether I could maybe have the Minister's approach on that aspect as well.

**HON. S. USKIW:** The rules that I have just enunciated apply to peat burning as well. The member will probably observe in the course of the days and months ahead that the seasonality of burning is going to be removed to a large extent. It's our hope that with proper care and consideration, when we issue the permit, that we will be able to burn peat at a time of the year when it burns best and smokes the least. That's a major change. We will have to monitor the performance of that policy to make sure that it is indeed working to everyone's advantage, but we believe that if properly handled it can be done better that way.

The problem with restricting peat burning to the wet season is that you get more smoke than fire and therein lies the hazard along the roadways and so on, which environmentalists complain about and people using the highways complain about. So we are attempting to deal with that in a way that will accommodate the need and at the same time minimize the adverse effects on the public as a whole. The same letter applies to those people.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Well, I am sure the people in the area that are involved with the burning of peat moss will be pleased to hear that, because I think those people that know what burning peat moss involves. Once you start the fire, it's virtually impossible to put it out and you cannot control which direction the wind comes from, so as a result, sometimes on highways, I realize the danger aspect of it.

But might I suggest that maybe in cases like that there could be signs posted that this is a peat moss burning area, or something to that effect, so that people would drive with extreme caution when the smoke happens to be coming across the highways.

I am not belittling the danger aspect of it, but to really understand the whole situation as once a fire is burning, you don't just shut it off when the wind doesn't come the right way. It continues burning, and that is where there has been some confusion in the minds of the public that when these peat moss fires burn that they should not be burning. It is a way of life out there and it is a matter of maybe using, as the Minister has indicated, instead of issuing the permits for wintertime, maybe by allowing them to burn in summer, at the dry

time which was restricted till now I understand, that probably the problem will be of a smaller nature.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 2.(m)(1)—pass; 2.(m)(2)—pass.

2.(n)(1) Fire Suppression - Operations: Salaries; 2.(n)(2) Other Expenditures; 2.(n)(3) Northern Development Agreement - the Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. McKENZIE:** 2.(n)(2) - Could we have a breakdown of the \$3,901,800.00? It's the same both years. Is this a set fee, or it's shared with the feds, or what's it for?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, we know that there is going to be a certain cost there annually and so we usually apply the sort of best intelligence to putting a number on that. If we overexpend, we end up with Special Warrants; if we underexpend, we lapse it, I believe. So it's an open-ended thing because you can't put a cap on a fire.

**MR. W. McKENZIE:** Okay.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, just before we leave this section of Fire Suppression, I believe I can probably speak for all people of Manitoba. To the Minister we would like to say we hope that we have a very reasonable year with forest fires this year.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Good idea; I go for that.

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

Resolution 119: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$19,440,800 for Natural Resources, Regional Services, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Item No. 3.(a)(1) Engineering and Construction, Administration: Salaries; 3.(a)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Yes, under 3.(a), Engineering and Construction, my No. 1 question, is this for a physical construction of grains and stuff like that, or is this the planning aspect of it that we are discussing here? Probably the physical aspects of it come under the last portion there. I suppose at that time, the Minister, will be presenting this year's program prior to that because possibly questions - it would help, because I believe the engineering and construction under this end of it relates to the physical construction end of it?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to do that. I have no problem with respect to giving the member an advanced copy, that is in advance of when we are going to consider that item. This particular section relates to the planning and project management section, which is the backup administration.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Well, I suppose it doesn't really matter. We can do it whichever way the Minister feels comfortable with, because somewhere along the line

members will be wanting to discuss major projects. Members will be wanting to discuss the certain projects in the areas or the non-committed portion of it, whatever the case may be, somewhere along the line. We can deal with the engineering aspect of it here and then deal with the major projects later on, whichever way the Minister feels.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the member would agree, then, at the next meeting I am prepared to table that document for his benefit.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Agreed.

**HON. S. USKIW:** That's fine.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Okay, Mr. Chairman, then under this section here, I believe many of the projects that are being considered where we need engineering services, survey work, etc., the planning. Is this the area that would be dealing with projects on a joint basis with Ducks Unlimited, for example?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, I presume if there are major projects under way where we have engineering input, yes.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** The reason I raised that is because I believe that Ducks Unlimited has various projects within the province that they are working on or contemplating. In most cases it obviously involves water and diking and stuff of this nature, dams, etc., and I wonder if the Minister could maybe indicate as to the kind of working relationship that develops between the engineers from Ducks Unlimited and the engineers within his own department on some of these projects, because I would like to maybe illustrate a specific project. Maybe I should do that to just give an example of what I'm talking about.

I'll relate to the Rat River Containment Project in the southeast portion. It happens to be in my constituency as well, but something that has been contemplated since when I was reeve, which was quite a few years ago, when the banks of the Rat River were burned out at that time during the dry season, as a result water was channelling was from the Rat River into the Gilbert Creek and was flooding through various rural municipalities, namely, La Broquerie, Hanover, De Salaberry, that area there. For years we've been trying to work out some kind of possible solution to the problem.

We're at that point now where, in conjunction with the planning that is taking place, I think we're looking at between 5,000 and 10,000 acres of land that is being designated as a wildlife management area, and involves the containment on one side of the Rat River so that it will not create any flooding problems in rural municipalities. The LGD of Stuartburn just passed a resolution a short while ago authorizing co-operation in that respect together but jointly with Ducks Unlimited and Water Resources.

What I am trying to arrive at here with the Minister is: what kind of a working relationship do we develop because part of that project will be undertaken by the engineers from Water Resources and part of it by the



engineers from Ducks Unlimited? Why I'm trying to establish the kind of working relationship that is going to be developed, rather than have the buck passed up and down, I would like to have a bit of an insight as to how you view the operation and mechanics of it. Would the Ducks Unlimited be the authority or is Water Resources going to be the major authority with Ducks Unlimited tying in with that just so we can proceed with the initiation of it?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the Ducks Unlimited engineering people do liaise with our engineers and with our wildlife people on all of their projects basically if they are of any significance. All of the hoops that they must go through to get a proposal approved take place before we get into a commitment with them through Water Resources. The approvals under planning mechanisms, municipal or planning districts, the Interdepartmental Planning Board is involved. I think the environmental agencies are involved. Conservation agencies are involved. All of that happens before we get into a sort of legal relationship, if you like, or supportive relationship to their project. So we're sort of at the end of that.

All of the public interfacing is already behind us at that stage. So once they have that approval then we are in a position to acknowledge that, yes, all of that has been processed and properly cross-referenced, and we would not be violating anyone's authority by being involved with them on their project in whatever capacity it is that we are from time to time.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Is it then the responsibility of Ducks Unlimited to go through all these hoops and get all the clearances and when they've done all that they come back to this Minister's department to get their final package put together? Or is it a joint venture?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I gather that it can work either way. They can be the proponent and go through all the hoops, but quite often what we usually do or what we may do is establish a committee or a board for a given area where that board is composed of local people that have an interest in the project, who then are part of the process as well. So it's not a hard and fast rule, if you like.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** This category would not have any involvement, for example, in the Atikaki Park, the designations of parks or stuff like that. This is strictly on the basis of Water Resources and the construction end of it. Fine.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Chairman, I have some questions here for the Minister, and I don't know whether he should deal with them or later on in the Water Resources field. It's regarding water from Saskatchewan flowing across into the municipalities in Saskatchewan and flooding the farm lands in two municipalities in my constituency and I know that the Prairie Provinces Water Board was dealing with it. The problem is prevailing against the farmers. I'm told today in Saskatchewan, they have these PFRA pumps and

they're really moving the water, so it's flooding Manitoba farm land again.

Would it be better when we do Water Resources and Mr. Weber is here, or is it now? — (Interjection) — no. I can raise it. Well, where the watershed is the water comes in from the Assiniboine River. The municipalities involved are the Rural Municipality of Russell and the Rural Municipality of Shellmouth. On the Saskatchewan side, the municipalities involved are Calder and Langenburg.

This has been a longstanding problem. The farmers in Saskatchewan have learned that the water flows much quicker to the watershed which is the Assiniboine River if they build their own drains and get these big pumps in. Of course, when they do that the Manitoba farmers who have the last drainage system to the river, they are being flooded.

I've had four calls today of water coming across from Saskatchewan. I talked with the municipal secretary in Langenburg, and they are not doing anything. They know that the farmers have improved their drains to move the water faster, but it is my understanding - I spoke with the regional director of Thompson from Neepawa - that a study has been under way now for some four or five years and he figures that the study is completed as far as he thought it was.

But in the meantime what do I tell these constituents who are phoning? They are prepared to even sue some of these Saskatchewan farmers for moving the water. I know the problem you get in with drains and the course of natural drains and water, but I'm wondering what I could tell the reeves of especially the R.M. of Russell where the problem really prevails today.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I really am not aware of that situation, but let me say to the member this, that we will have that information for him tomorrow. Is that okay?

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Fine, okay.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I suppose we're going to run into the same situation here, Mr. Chairman, where we probably want to get into some of the water resource aspect of it. It's combined to some degree with the next item as well as with Capital Projects.

I just wanted to raise the issue. I touched on it briefly the other day with the opening remarks regarding the Souris River aspect of it and apparently major undertakings, capital constructions, are taking place. In Saskatchewan, I believe they're building a dam, a boundary dam, I believe it is called, which will affect dramatically the water flows from Saskatchewan into the Souris River to North Dakota and then back into Manitoba. I would like to ask the Minister and probably can pursue it a little better later on if he wants to, but to what extent has Manitoba had any input with their engineers or consideration in any of the developments that are taking place? Have we had any involvement at all?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that we are aware of their activities there, and there is ongoing



liaison, if you like, between the two provinces. It isn't a subject matter that does come under Water Resources, per se, and we don't have our Water Resources people here at the moment. We will have them here tomorrow.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(a)(1).

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Mr. Chairman, that's fine; I'll accept that end of it. I just wanted to raise the issue so that the Minister knows that we want to get that subject a little further.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Every year I ask my question on the Assiniboine South Hespeler Report and I'm told it's coming. Could the Minister give us an update on the arrival of that report?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that it's a project of such magnitude that we would have to send the Minister of Finance on another funding mission, something in the order of \$200 million, and that probably explains why we're not overly anxious to get going with it. There is an attempt made to modify and bring the cost of that project down somewhat, but we're not in a position to give you any information other than that at the moment.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** I take it from the Minister's remarks that he has received the report.

**HON. S. USKIW:** No, the report is in its final drafting stage and there's an environmental impact assessment that is under way.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Just a comment before we start moving on, Mr. Chairman. I just want to raise the issue with the Minister to some degree about his engineering staff, by and large.

Invariably these professional people are, in the eyes of the average individual, probably a little overzealous sometimes in their planning. I'm not being necessarily critical of it, but I want to refer to a specific project where the municipality and some of the farmers involved in that proposed project felt they could do it for - the government came in, I believe, with engineers' figures of \$150,000, whereas the farmers in the municipality thought they could deal with it and accomplish the same purpose for about \$25,000.00. When the Minister says he might have to send the Minister of Finance out to maybe borrow some more money, I have some concern about that.

What I'm trying to illustrate to the Minister is that sometimes maybe his engineering staff have a way of coming up with project figures and cost benefit ratios that sometimes could be questioned. At least I certainly have some difficulty with that from time to time. I think maybe they act too professional at times and that maybe a more realistic approach could be used in some of these things.

What happens, invariably, when the cost figures come in that high, the municipalities and everybody throws

up their arms and says, well, we can't undertake that kind of a project. I think possibly just a little different approach in these matters, or it might be advantageous to them to make some deals with the municipalities and let them undertake some of this work rather than have the government undertake some of it.

**HON. S. USKIW:** That last statement is probably where it could rest. If we can get the same kind of product from the municipal level, that we are estimating at a much higher cost, we certainly are prepared to undertake that item as a positive suggestion.

I rather have my doubts. We just had an experience with respect to a very similar suggestion where the municipal figure was \$25,000 and ours was \$2 million, so it kind of tells you how far apart we might be sometimes. Perceptions really play a major role in that and until you have all of the engineering facts you really don't know.

The other thing that has to be considered is that often lay people minimize the needs for certain standards, whereas engineers have to put their engineering stamp of approval and their credibility on the line when they recommend two governments or any public body a certain design or certain standard for a certain purpose or to perform a certain function. So it's hard to fault the engineers who must stand on their credibility as engineers, when they guide us along the way of standards that we either accept or modify at our level, but at least they have to give us their expertise on it.

Now it's true, we even have that problem in Highways, that the municipal councillor might be the person that would say, well, we can build that bridge for half the cost; you're overbuilding it, but they don't have to put their stamp of approval or credibility on the line. If the bridge doesn't stand up after a couple of years, they are not the losers, but if we had an engineer that designed a bridge that fell apart on us, he wouldn't be with us very long thereafter. You have to, to some degree, take it with a grain of salt, the suggestions that there are massive savings to be made, but the end rule of thumb - and I think this is where the engineers are either credible or otherwise - is when we get the tenders in and where the engineers' estimates of the cost of a project come relatively close to what the industry's prepared to submit in their tenders, given the specifications that are agreed upon. So there's always a market test out there with respect to what the cost should be.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I just want to make sure that I didn't leave the impression that the municipalities, when we talked to them undertaking some of these projects, I would still anticipate that the government would pick up the cost, not the municipalities. They could probably just do the work cheaper than the government could do that at times.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I was quite serious. If I thought that I could have a municipality do a project for us at great saving to the Province of Manitoba, I would not be above entering into a contract with them.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Could I ask the Minister - I don't have my notes with me - it seems to me the department were doing an engineering study or feasibility study on the possibility of irrigation in the Brandon, Portage area from the Assiniboine. Is that report completed?

**HON. S. USKIW:** We just talked about that. That's the Assiniboine South Hespeler project.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** I thought it was the Holland you were to know.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On Page 40 of the departmental Annual Report it refers to the Whitemud Watershed Conservation District and the study on the feasibility of diking westward to protect it from flooding. Could the Minister tell us what stage that study is at and does it just discuss the diking of Westbourne or does it go further into that long-standing problem?

**HON. S. USKIW:** I'm advised that the study is complete, Mr. Chairman. It is a local decision and there is a question of funding that's involved. That decision has to be made by the local conservation district authority.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wonder can the Minister and his staff advise me if they've been able to resolve the problems of my constituent, Mr. Deering at Grandview, regarding the dams and the problems with water in that community. I'm sure they're quite familiar with it because he's been here many times.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I can't bypass the observation that the member is responding to the issue while the gentleman is here in the room, and perhaps that's the role, maybe that's coincidental, maybe I'm unfair to the Member for Roblin-Russell.

In any event, that has been an issue over many years. I'm not sure whether there's any resolution of it that might satisfy Mr. Deering. Information I have is that the department has virtually exhausted itself on the issue and cannot resolve the difference of view as between the departmental engineers and Mr. Deering.

I have not really been apprised of the details of it personally, but I know that it's been around a long time.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Could I ask the Minister are these discussions ongoing, are they continuing to see if they can resolve the differences of opinion?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Well, I'm advised that the engineers do discuss it on occasion, but they have not changed their position with respect to the issues that have been raised.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Might I just suggest then with this seasoned, experienced Minister and his persuasive

powers, possibly that if he would involve himself the situation could be resolved to the satisfaction of both sides. He certainly has the ability to do this with many other things and I think if he accepted that challenge, he could probably resolve the matter.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, you know it's most interesting. This issue has been before two or three governments now and they have not been able to resolve it. It has nothing to do with being partisan. It has to do with engineering questions. I'm not sure that I'm the miracle person that the member suggests I might be. I'm not above taking a look at it, however. I'm always willing to do that, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I thank the Minister for that commitment.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(a)(1)—pass; 3.(a)(2)—pass; 3.(b)(1) Technical Services, Salaries; 3.(b)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I just want to make the one comment here under some of these areas here that possibly when we get into Water Resources, we might be making reference back to them, Mr. Minister, because — (Interjection) — it's all the same, so just so that maybe we'll be bringing up issues like that without trying to be out of order on that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Shall we pass this one?

3.(b)(1)—pass; 3.(b)(2)—pass; 3.(c)(1) Regional Engineering Services, Salaries; 3.(c)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Yes, just for my own clarification, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister.

When we talk of Regional Engineering Services, we have I'd say, a key engineer for the various areas in the province. How many of these regions do we have, for example?

**HON. S. USKIW:** We have six regions and we have four engineers that are responsible for the six regions.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Do these engineers also cover the conservation districts? Do they work with them as well? Irregardless if there is a conservation district or not, these regions apply and the engineers would be the ones that are responsible for working in that area.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, the conservation districts really have an option. They can either use our services or they can buy outside services. Our services are provided without charge to them.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Well then, are there cases where they would hire somebody else? Maybe that illustrates a point I was raising before. Maybe there could be differences in terms of costing depending which engineers you use.

**HON. S. USKIW:** I'm not aware of any that are using an outsider currently, although potentially, I guess it's possible in the sense that if there's a disagreement

with respect to engineering recommendations on the part of the district versus our engineers, then they have the option of going out to the market for a second opinion or a reference if you like.

One other point, Mr. Chairman. The advice I'm getting is that sometimes we are overloaded with work at a given time. If the district is somewhat impatient with respect to their project and wants to get on with it, they have that opportunity as well.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I just want to make the comment, I'm surprised that our engineers would have that much work on their hands because very few projects really have been taking off over the last years. Money seems to always be a problem. I think engineers seem to have lots of time to do a lot of planning, but don't actually get to undertake too many of the physical projects themselves.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that we're projecting \$16 million of capital works compared to \$12 million a year ago, so that gives the member an idea of the scale.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Okay, we'll have a good look at those projects.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(c)(1)—pass - the Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Under this section, does this include any services to municipalities if they request some engineering services within their programs?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, that's correct, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Is that provided free of charge or is there some money recovered from the municipalities?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, there is a recovery from the municipalities, Mr. Chairman. Survey crews - we recover \$175 per day. For reports, I believe, it's on a cost basis.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Has there been any change in the costing recently?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, Mr. Chairman. There was a dramatic increase in charges for services provided; 75-175 for surveys.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** Could you explain that in more detail as to what that entails?

**HON. S. USKIW:** That's for doing a survey, one day's work, for a whole survey crew. That's about three people, Mr. Chairman. The private sector would be about \$350 for the same service. This rate increase became effective as of April 1?

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** This rate increase became effective as of April 1?

**HON. S. USKIW:** I'm advised, Mr. Chairman, it was mid-year last year.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Well, I just want to pursue that a little bit. In fact, I want to thank the Member for Swan River for bringing up this issue because that concern has been expressed by municipalities about the dramatic increase.

First of all, I'd like to ask the Minister the justification for that kind of a dramatic increase in mid-year when the budgets for the municipalities have been set and here they get thumped with an increase of that nature. What has it done to the work load, drains, that municipalities normally want to undertake? Is there a falling-off of this service? Are they going to do it ad hoc now and use their own discretion in doing some of these things instead of using the services so that proper drains can be made? I have a concern by doing that, that this is what will happen. It will develop a trend in the municipalities that they won't be wanting to use the services that are available and I'd feel concerned about that direction because I think professional services are needed in terms of doing the planning and designing of these drains, and municipalities are fighting dollars just like government is, and here we're thumping them with a dramatic increase in that respect. I just want to see the justification and the Minister's rationale in terms of what he foresees will happen in the municipalities.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the change that occurred last year did not apply retroactively, that is to projects already launched, but did apply to projects yet to be launched after that date. So that, in essence, there was no dirty pool involved with respect to commitments that have already been budgeted for.

With respect to rationale, I believe it is very simple. Governments are no different than anyone else. Costs go up and, therefore, there has to be a mechanism to generate revenue to pay for those costs. It's a question of how much subsidization goes into providing a public service. The old rate is described by our engineers as being ridiculously low. I don't know how long it's been at that rate of \$75.00.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** It's not that terribly long ago that it used to be free.

**HON. S. USKIW:** I'm told that rate stood for about 10 years, Mr. Chairman, so that gives you an idea just why it makes some sense to make the adjustment.

The fairness, of course, has to be judged by what the private sector would be charging for the same service. As long as we are providing a service below that of the private sector, then I don't believe there is legitimacy to complain. There's always the option to go outside the government system if it's felt that we're charging too much for the service. I think the rule of thumb would be right, if indeed, we find that we are handling all or the bulk of the service. That tells us that the municipalities must have shopped around and have been satisfied that our rate is reasonable.

I should also mention that it's the same rate that the Department of Highways charges for their service to municipalities.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Does the Minister feel any concern about the fact that the quality of drains that are going

to be undertaken by the municipalities by maybe avoiding the engineering costs, that could have a detrimental effect as things move along?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, the opinion is that what we accomplished through the change is we were able to get rid of frivolous requests. That is, municipalities that want to undertake engineering works or studies know that there's a cost attached to it and it's not a matter of just doing it because it doesn't cost anything and putting it on the shelf sort of thing, not following through with the projects. It's reducing our burden of activity, if you like. It's making the municipalities more responsible with respect to those requests.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Well, when we consider the fact that under the agreement with MGEA, nobody can get laid off and the fact that the government because of financial restrictions is undertaking less projects, I believe, than they have in the past, would it maybe not be better to - we have to pay them anyway - be able to provide this kind of service to the municipalities even if it is a subsidized rate than have our engineers maybe undertake frivolous planning and engineering for the government.

**HON. S. USKIW:** The Member for Emerson should be aware that a lot of our engineers are summer employees only and are called in for jobs that are quite specific and time definite if you like or term definite.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Just a further question.

Has there been a dramatic negative reaction by the municipalities on this or maybe I'm raising an issue that isn't a matter of that major concern. I believe that if I was reeve, I'd certainly want to raise some concern about that aspect of it.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I suppose if it was an issue that anyone would be exercised over, then I should have received a phone call or a letter and I don't recall either unless it's occurred prior to my coming into this office. I haven't heard a thing from anyone.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Swan River.

**MR. D. GOURLAY:** One further question on that same topic.

Were the municipalities advised that there would be a rate increase at the time?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, and again, I remind the Member for Swan River that increase was implemented several months ago.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(c)(1) - the Member for Roblin-Russell.

**MR. W. MCKENZIE:** Just a brief question.

Are there any more water conservation districts in the planning stage for the province?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, there are about four in the making at the moment.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(c)(1)—pass; 3.(c)(2)—pass; 3.(d)(1) Conservation District Authority, Salaries; 3.(d)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Emerson.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Yes, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister give us an update - he's indicated that there are more districts being contemplated and how many we have at the present time - and maybe give us an overview as to, I think, there's the promotion of forming conservation districts has been undertaken over a period of years already. There has been a resistance in some areas and some areas have formed these districts. I would like to maybe have the Minister indicate how they are working. Are they working well and how many more being contemplated maybe and then we'll have some questions on that?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, there are five in existence at the moment. There are four in the planning stages and we have put together a group within the department that would give encouragement and support services towards the planning and establishment of conservation districts - a much more aggressive fashion than we have in the past.

The Agrifood Agreement is a major part of that, Mr. Chairman.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Okay, we don't want to get into the next section again where that is in there, but come back to the districts itself. What the Minister is telling us then that he's going to send out a bunch of salespeople that are going to be promoting, under high pressure to some degree, the fact that they shall either form districts or will cut down some services and we will not undertake any third order drains and major drain clean-outs and stuff of that nature. Is that the sort of approach that the Minister is saying that will be undertaken?

**HON. S. USKIW:** I'm not sure whether I'm within the rules, Mr. Chairman, but I'm going to ask whether the Member for Emerson is advocating that process?

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Mr. Chairman, I refuse to get drawn into that. If we have the responsibility, we'll deal with it and then we'll be accountable for the questions that we give, but I want to get back to that. It might have sounded frivolous, but is sort of the heavy hand of government going to come down to have areas form conservation districts, and those that do not go along with it, as I indicated before, are they going to be cut off from certain services, in terms of developing third order drains, etc., because as we get into the projects, I'll get into that a little deeper. I wonder if maybe that is why some of the projects have already been halted. I just hope that the Minister is not going to be looking at the strong arm, almost threatening tactics, to get people to get into these districts.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I don't mind putting on the record that some of those comments were my comments to my staff only a very short while ago.

No, it's not going to be a very harsh approach. We want to encourage the development of more conservation districts for very obvious reasons. On the

other hand, I don't think we're going to beat them into it. We may apply the carrot approach; that is always a method that works from time to time and perhaps I should remind the Member for Emerson that our experiences in agriculture should lead him to believe that the carrot approach works better.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I did not always agree with him them and I probably won't now.

Coming back to the formation of these conservation districts, on paper, certainly the rationale for it looks feasible and sells well in that respect. The difficulty - and this doesn't apply in all areas the same - because what happens, and I can refer to my district that they represent where we have local government districts but low assessments where what we call past the escarpment, where the water problems develop and then come into the Red River Valley into the flats, and maybe the ratio, in terms of forming some of these things should be considered very carefully because the low assessed areas with the poor land, where the water problem develops, and rural municipalities, for example, in the flats where you have the high assessment, a flat type of area, that they are concerned that they will be picking up the major portion and the costs in this case to alleviate problems in sort of marginal land.

This has been part of the resistance that I am aware of, in terms of forming water conservation districts in some areas. Where you have a relatively consistent type of assessment and land base, I can see the feasibility of it much more so and easier to sell it that way; but when you have a very diversified area it gets a little harder to sell to some of the people.

**HON. S. USKIW:** The provincial grants provide for between 70 and 90 percent of the costs of the work that's carried out and there is a ceiling of 10 mills with respect to the levy that is imposed on the system by regulation of the province; so there are limits beyond which local levies cannot be applied for that very purpose.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** I realize that. The problem I foresee is that if you have marginal land with low assessment, 10 mills on there is maybe not as dramatic as when you have it on 640 acres of Red River Valley clay where the assessment is already high and 10 mills, in many cases, at a time when the cropping people are not necessarily in that good financial position.

I realize they don't necessarily have to have 10 mills but, invariably, when a district of this nature is formed and you involve maybe four or five municipalities, the expectation is that if they get into this certain things will be undertaken and when these things will be undertaken, of course, your tax dollars are going to shoot up dramatically. I'm just bringing this forward to the Minister because obviously he realizes that these are the things he'll run into when he goes out and tries to sell his conservation districts. Maybe before he does that, I've attended some of these meetings where the initial promotions took place and bring forward the resistance that took place at that time and if he's going to be using this approach, maybe there's some way to adjust those things, I don't know.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I think the record speaks more than anything for the process; and that

is that (a) the districts don't have to, are not compelled to raise 10 mills. That is a ceiling imposed upon them, beyond which they cannot go. The experience to date is that they are nowhere near that level. Some of them are less than half of that level so that, in essence, local decision making is involved and they have to assume some responsibility for the level of taxation at the local level.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** Just to maybe clarify the workings on the conservation districts, the Minister indicated that - what is it - 70 to 80 percent — (Interjection) — 70-90 is granted by government under projects and the balance is levied against the participating municipalities.

In terms of benefit to the municipalities, it would vary, I suppose of course, but at the present time the province has the responsibility of maintaining and building third order drains. The government also has the responsibility of water resources, in terms of cleaning out river beds where required; and I understand, under the conservation districts, if that would happen, for example, where you have, for example the Marsh River - I use it as an example - where a drain-out is being requested to some degree, if they were under a conservation district and undertook that kind of a project, would the government still pick up 70-90 percent of that or does the government, under a conservation district, say which projects they will fund from 70-90 percent?

**HON. S. USKIW:** The 70-90 formula is based on the order of the drains involved - 70 percent on third order and 90 percent on the fifth and higher, so that is sort of the controlling mechanism as to the amount of commitment. We always have the opportunity to participate in the kind of projects that the member has alluded to, namely river clean-outs, but we are not required to or compelled to, by any statutory provision. That is purely voluntary on the part of the department and if they agree with the project, of course, they may do so.

**MR. A. DRIEDGER:** What the Minister is saying then that even if a conservation district is formed, they undertake certain projects that the government can, at their discretion, fund or not fund these projects, so it isn't an automatic funding - you know if they'd undertake certain projects that the funding is there. So the heavy hand of government could still make a decision and say, no, we will not fund certain projects.

**HON. S. USKIW:** The department gives or provides grants to the districts based on a multi-year program that is already before us. We know what the program is, so it's not as if we're shooting from the hip on each project. We're at a one-year projection operation now and we're trying to get into a three-year projection on programming.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Member for Gladstone.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Is there any federal involvement in this, in any of the funding?

**HON. S. USKIW:** As I alluded to earlier, Mr. Chairman, under the Agri-Food Agreement there is potential for

national or federal participation on a project basis, not for the whole district program.

**MRS. C. OLESON:** Just specific programs?

**HON. S. USKIW:** Yes.

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

Resolution 120: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty, a sum not exceeding \$6,769,900 for Natural Resources, Engineering and Construction, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1986—pass.

Mr. Minister.

**HON. S. USKIW:** Mr. Chairman, I believe that there's a disposition to call it 5:30 p.m.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Committee rise.

### SUPPLY - HEALTH

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER:** Committee come to order. We are considering the Estimates of the Department of Health, Item 3.(b) Regional Services.

Item 3.(b)(1) - the Member for Pembina.

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

The Minister has got a major request for increased staff in this section, so I'll have a series of questions for the Minister on that. But first of all let's establish, is this the section under which we can discuss the public health nurses, the co-ordinators of home care, etc. etc.?

First of all, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate whether last year, presumably, there were 571 approved staff positions, 571.25 to be exact. Were those positions filled last year? Were they entirely filled last year?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I'll take the question as notice.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Okay. If they weren't, could the Minister indicate the number of vacancies, and then if we can move right in then to this year's request of another 49.5 staff years and what areas those new staff are going to serve the public?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Minister of Health.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** First of all, I am sending over to the honourable member an answer to a question that he posed yesterday re the staff on leave - the two positions. I'll send that over to him.

At the present, out of the 571.25 of last year, there are a total of 49.5 positions vacant. We are in the process of filling 28 of them at this time. The situation - I might as well go through and give this information that I have now.

As you see, we're asking for 49.5 more staff. The situation is this, that out of these 44 - first of all, there are five new positions out of these 49.5, term positions for Home Orderly Program established in 1984-85 to increase the program.

Then there are 44.5 new positions, and I'll give where they are: 18 in the Winnipeg region, three for the Eastman Region, two for Westman Region, one Central,

four Interlake, four Parkland, seven Norman, three-and-a-half Thompson, and two for continuing care.

Now that is by region. Now I would like to give a breakdown by specialty or whatever. Out of the 44, I'm still talking about the 44.5 now, 25 are extra or added staff for continuing care, 7.5 through Northern Health - I think that we covered that - and 12, mental health.

Then there was an approval for staffing of two vacant positions in 1984-85 from Regional Services in support of diabetes education programs. To replace these staff years, two new positions were established in 1985-86 from funds received from the Manitoba Health Services Commission. That is now one will go back in the Eastman Region and one in Thompson Region for two other positions.

There is a term position established through redirection of funds in the Thompson Region to provide support for delivery of the program. New positions were established in the region through redirection of existing operating funds in support of Northern health initiatives as follows: Norman Region, 1; Thompson Region, 1. So that is another 2.

The rest of the extra under Salaries is classification, change of position, annual increments and adjustments to staff turnover provisions in direct salary adjustment and so on, severance pay, overtime and so on.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister, I think, indicated that 49.5 positions were vacant and the government is currently filling 28 of those vacant ones. Could the Minister indicate whether that vacancy at 49.5 positions vacant represented an average vacancy throughout the year in Regional Services?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** No, this wasn't filled up. My honourable friend, I'm sure, is aware that there was a temporary freeze on hiring. This is why I said that we had been authorized to recruit 28 now. We expect that the freeze will be completely lifted fairly soon.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** The freeze the Minister refers to, could that set a guideline for his department as to a particular vacancy rate that has to be maintained in terms of percent? Could the Minister explain the nature of the freeze?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** It was just a guideline, because I think that we were going over our Budget. It was a temporary measure, and we were aiming at 7 percent, which in a way, in certain areas, wasn't too difficult in our department because of the turnover that we have because of large staff. In some areas, it was a little more difficult. But we could switch them around. One time we had these people, and then we had these two positions reinstated.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** A guideline of 7 percent would leave one with roughly 40 positions vacant, and I think the Minister indicated 49.5 are vacant right now and you're in the process of filling some 28. That would seem to indicate that at least in terms of the Salary line in Regional Services that the department would not have spent the \$16,332,900 budgeted. Can the Minister indicate approximately what - probably he hasn't got his Estimates or his calculations done for



year-end, but what was the approximate salary saving by maintaining the 49 or approaching the 49 vacancies?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I'll have to take that as notice and give the information later on.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Does the Minister anticipate that he will be hiring what would amount to the full 99 people in Regional Services this fiscal year? In other words, filling the 49.5 vacant positions. I realize he has indicated he's filling 28 right now. Is it the Minister's intention to have all 99 positions filled this fiscal year?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I think I should answer it this way. If my honourable friend is asking if we'll be authorizing, if we'll try to get these positions, the answer is yes. If we anticipate that we'll have all of them filled, the answer is no, obviously, and I think my honourable realizes that there is always some turnover but that is not controlled. It is just because the people are leaving for some reason or another and you have to recruit and hire. In other words, where it is feasible, to have all these positions filled.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Were the vacancies evenly distributed throughout the region?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Out of the 29 in the regions, there were seven in Winnipeg; five, Westman; one, Eastman; one, Central; three, Interlake; three, Parkland; five, Norman; four, Thompson. In the Mental Health Centres the vacancies were: Brandon 16.4 and in Selkirk 4, for a total of 49.5.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Where's the half?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** In Brandon.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, in terms of the 12 new positions in Mental Health, where does the Minister anticipate placement? I realize he's given me the placement by region of the 44.5. Where do the 12 mental health workers fit into the regional scheme?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Five in Winnipeg; one, Central; one, Eastman; one, Interlake; one, Parkland; one, Norman; one, Thompson; one, Westman.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** In other words, five in Winnipeg and one each in the other regions, is that what the Minister is saying?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Right.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** What's the classification of the mental health workers? Are they to be working with an expanded community residence program? What are they going to be doing?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** They'll be working with the clients in the community as other regional staff, and we'll be providing assistance and support to the community residents.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** What training or educational background is the department looking for in the 12

mental health workers? Are you looking for RPNs? What training?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** There will be psychiatric nurses, psychologists or social workers.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate whether in the past year the level of service decreased with the 49.5 positions that were vacant, and the level of service from the department had decreased, in what areas were the decreases most evident?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** We should remember that we're not just comparing, all of sudden there are 49 less employees. As I said before, there is always a vacancy, there is always a turnover. We did not have to cut any services at all, but in all fairness, let's say that we might have been behind in some of the services that we were doing, pulled behind a bit, but we didn't cut any service. We might have been a little slower in responding.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Was that subject to any complaints from the receivers of those services?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** It's hard to measure in the community because I don't think there's a year that goes by that there is not some complaint. There was the odd complaint in the community, but there were complaints from school divisions that felt that we were a little slow in responding.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** The school divisions in what area?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** There would be some school divisions in Winnipeg and Brandon. There might have been others, but I can't recall at this time.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** What were they complaining about?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** What?

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Yes.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I told you that we were slow in responding.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** To what?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** To providing the service.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Of public health?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Well, whatever the service was. We're talking about regional staff and it could be immunization, it could be public health nurses, it could be screening, it could be different programs. I certainly haven't got the record of them all.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, I speak only from talking to individuals in southwestern Manitoba and talking not only to the people who receive services such as home care, but also to the providers, because I believe, if I'm not mistaken public health nurses are under this program, and the Minister indicates the



guidelines of a 7 percent vacancy rate was impacting fairly severely on their ability to deliver their programs in a manner that people had come to expect and there were people - and I believe home care was also part of the service delivery program in here - who were complaining about the reduction in service and hours that they were faced with in terms of home care program delivery and the complaints were diverse. The Minister has received letters from some of our colleagues on this side of the House on behalf of their constituents and I'm sure he responded to them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that gets us into the area that I was discussing in the opening of the Estimates, that even though this government doesn't want to ever make the admission, there has been a reduction in the level of service in the last three years through the Department of Health in their program delivery.

Now, the Minister can say that was necessary because he was put under budget constraints, that the government hasn't got a money tree that it can pull additional revenues from and so on and so forth, and can in no small way, probably from a purely administrative and fiscal standpoint, justify the suggested guideline of a 7 percent vacancy which it would appear that in this particular regional services division, the Minister met and exceeded, because, as I say, a 7 percent vacancy rate would equate to approximately 40 staff positions empty and the Minister indicates they were about 25 percent over that, in that there were 49.5.

But, Mr. Chairman, this exactly reinforces the growing feeling and realization by Manitobans that the one promise that was made to them by the New Democrats in 1981 that they believe that they could keep; namely, providing health care not cutbacks, this is the one promise that Manitobans thought that the New Democrats could keep and it now appears as if it has fallen along the wayside of other promises made and that, indeed, the Minister is having difficulty maintaining the promise of health care and not cutbacks.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it's interesting to note that we've got a government that for the fiscal year of '84-'85, and I don't know whether it existed before, had a guideline of a 7 percent vacancy which was the recommended vacancy rate to be maintained throughout the department. Now, if you're in a government and you're in an administrative position, and you make the decision that the budget requires a 7 percent vacancy rate, you are making a decision between two positions. Firstly, that if you make the decision that you can maintain a 7 percent vacancy rate, you are making the decision that you're overstaffed and that you can afford to keep 7 percent of those staff positions vacant and still carry on with program. Now if that first option isn't the one on which you base your decision, and you maintain that your staff is bare bones, that there is no surplus staff, then the other position must exist that you are mandating a guideline of 7 percent vacancies with the full knowledge that you're going to have to reduce the level of service.

I would suggest, given the Minister's request for some 49.5 additional staff positions in fiscal year '85-'86, that the second scenario is the one that was the case, that when the government and this Minister made a decision to reduce budget that they were going to have a 7 percent vacancy rate, that they did it with the full

knowledge that services would be reduced. That was evident from, as I say, some of the letters from families whose parents were receiving home care, from various people throughout the province, including the providers of the service who were indicating that they were just plain run off their feet because the vacant positions, the work had to be done by the remaining people and they just didn't have the time.

So, Mr. Chairman, if I can say in the most moderate of tone that I can muster, that if there is any clear evidence available to members of this Assembly and to the general public of Manitoba, that this government has broken its election promise of health care and not cutbacks, it exists in this discussion that we've had today where the Minister has indicated that there was in excess of 7-percent vacancies in Regional Services — (Interjection) — but your numbers are in excess of your guidelines.

In this Regional Services, you have 49 vacancies. A 7-percent guideline would allow 40 vacancies, you're 25 percent over your guideline that your department set in terms of vacancies. That is, as I say, the admission that this government has failed in its promise to provide health care and not cutbacks.

And when I made that statement in the House in the opening remarks in introducing these Estimates, it was pooh-poohed by the Minister that it didn't exist. There was the odd thing maybe they said that they couldn't live up to, like maybe they didn't build quite as many personal care homes and the Minister said, with regret, that the panelled waiting list had increased and they regretted that. But here, Sir, is an area of program delivery throughout the regions of the Department of Health in Manitoba that have had a breakdown of vacancies spread, not evenly, but certainly distributed throughout the entire spectrum of Manitoba. I think - if I've got my numbers down correct, the Minister went fairly quickly - there were 7 positions in Winnipeg, 1 in Eastman, 5 in Westman, 1 in Central, 3 in the Interlake, 3 in Parklands, 5 in Norman, and 4 in Thompson that were vacant.

Mr. Chairman, as I say, that is probably the most definitive example of how this government has broken their election commitment and that the people of Manitoba know that election commitment has been broken in terms of their complaints, not only to us in opposition, but to the Minister and to the government MLAs of reductions in service, of longer times between visits by public health nurses and other people out of Regional Services. And I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is going to be the first of a number of examples now that we get into the actual delivery of services in terms of staff complements that we are going to find that this department has followed a dictum from the government that they must maintain a vacancy rate in order to cut budget, to cut cost, to save money and that has resulted in a lowering of the level of care available to Manitobans in all services provided by the Department of Health and that flies 180 percent contrary to the election promises made by this party in 1981 and to one of the commitments that Manitobans believed they would keep when they decided to give these people the opportunity to govern in Manitoba.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, if my honourable friend feels that this is the best proof that we have

gone down on the services, I'm very sorry to disappoint him, to show him that he's absolutely wrong again. He has misunderstood other things and he's misleading, I won't say purposely, but he's misleading the committee.

First of all, the vacancies in that, and what my honourable friend is comparing, of the 571 is not 49.5 percent, it is 29 percent. The other 20.5, as I mentioned, came from Brandon Mental Hospital and Selkirk Mental Hospital. So that brings it down to not over 7 percent, but around 5 percent.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** You mean you're rolling in staff from the Health Centre as well as the Mental Health Centres in Selkirk and Brandon, in this 571.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** No, they're not in that part.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Why does staff . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Wait a minute, wait a minute. We are talking about 571. These are people in the regions and when you want to talk about the staff in Brandon, it'll be the next thing when we talk about Brandon Mental Health Centre and then Selkirk Mental Health Centre. So it's 29, not 49.5. Now I did not say that there was this vacancy all through the year. I did not say that at all, I said at a given time. It is at the end and I say that we're filling some now and the others will be released.

There's another thing. I said it was a guideline and there was a committee, if we made proof and most of the time, our total for the department was around 2 something percent. Because if there was a vital thing, especially when the service was given, exactly what we said, we would not cut down on service and that was allowed, we were allowed.

Now if that is not sufficient, let me give you an idea of what happened in the different years. In '81, on a monthly caseload, we had 10,523 - that's for home care I am talking about - in 1982, 10,646; in 1983, 11,000; 1984, 12,651. The homemaking services during that time or community and VON in '83 was 6,790; in '84, 7,000. Now that doesn't look like a reduction as far as I am concerned.

Then let's look at the cost. We have not reduced. I am not going to apologize for trying to be as careful as possible. You know we have been told many times that we just throw money, that the NDP party just throws money at problems. We have been accused of that, starting in the Schreyer years, many times, that we just throw money at problems. Of course, we are being very careful.

I will concede something here. It seems that maybe we have a reputation of being more interested in social programs, but the Conservative Party - I think they will give me this - have a reputation that's not always warranted of maybe being more careful in economic matters. We have not cut on services at all; we have increased services.

As I say, the way we are going now, if we increase health care just what we are doing now, nothing more, nothing less, we will be tripling our budget - no, for the total budget of the department and the commission would be over triple to take care of just the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

We are bringing other services. My honourable friend said yesterday, are you going to be able to do all that with all the money it is going to cost for mental health? There will be some areas, of course, that you can point and say fine, you have cut down a bit on that program, but that is not the way we look at it. We are looking at the complete health care. I think we have progressed quite well; we have progressed in construction, getting caught up with everything. I am not saying there aren't any problems; there always will be problems.

As I stated on many occasions, we are at a crossroads and the point is very important. Either we keep on the way we are going now, and we are going to have the same complaints, the same concerns, and the costs will be prohibitive; or we try to freeze it, to cap it, and then actually we will be going down.

So we are saying we must make changes. We must change the motivation; we must try something. This is what we have been challenged to do by the opposition last year. We accept that; we know that's true. We are trying to work with the people concerned. The famous document of last week, it doesn't make any recommendations at all, but it gives you some of the figures that will be placed in front of the different committees that we have and I hope that will help them assist in making some changes.

I still think if we are going to save it, we have to try to work together at least in some areas. If not, if everybody wants to take advantage of something, and my honourable friends say what would you do if you were in opposition, well, that's something else. I am just saying what I personally think, not what my party is telling me to say, what I personally think. I think if we are going to save this we have to work together.

But my friend will have to get up real early to prove that we are cutting down, to say that we are cutting down because we are not. I gave the figures. There has always been some changeover and some vacancies in there. I stated that there were about two across the department, about 2 percent, 2.5 percent vacancies. We are dealing here with just the people in the region; so that's 29, as I said. Many of them are in the process of being filled now. That certainly wasn't for the whole time. Most of the time there would be people that would be in administration and areas like that where we could wait a bit because we have always made the case if the people had to wait for home care and so on, and then we would go over the limit if we had to in home care. If it's brought to the attention that someone needs home care, nobody has ever been refused.

I think I stated how many new positions that we want and it's been steady. This is not a pre-election budget. Look our Estimates over the last three years, look at our five-year program and so on, and you will see that we will be consistent and above board. Of course, we are going to be careful and we might make mistakes.

Let's not forget that there has been a big change in the method of funding the health program also. Let's remember that when we left office in 1977, they had changed the system from cost-sharing to another system that we did not like at all, that we opposed.

The first period in the Conservative Government of the Day, the Lyon Government, profited because there was much more money. In fact, the reduction of the share of the Provincial Government, was away down in the area when we look at it. Sure, I think that the

Minister of Health, Monique Begin, said that it was wrong, they were keeping money, and I think it was through Judge Hall. We have never said that they were doing anything legally wrong because then they could spend the money they wanted. But with the share of the money that they got from Ottawa, the share of the Government of the Day was way down for Health.

Then we returned to office in late 1981 and the situation had changed again and then we were certainly shortchanged. We received some of that money back but certainly not all of it. Now you have a government in Ottawa, and it doesn't matter what stripe it is, Liberal or Conservative, who are saying no way are we going back to cost-sharing this, we are going to cap it. Now during the election campaign - in fact, it was at the by-election when Mr. Mulroney won in Nova Scotia - he made the commitment that they would be looking at cost-sharing and they did. So those are all factors.

I am not going to apologize for saying that we are trying to be very careful. We would be crazy if we didn't. We will have to start making some cuts, but you can't point to one thing, when the total funds and the total staff are increased, and say you are cutting down on services. But as I say, the way we are going now we will triple our budget within 10 years.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, it wasn't me that about 25 minutes ago indicated that a suggested guideline for vacancies was put in place in an attempt to reduce the spending because they were running into a budgetary problem. That's what the Minister said 30 minutes ago.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I did, yes, that's right.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** And it is . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** In this government as a whole; it's not just our department.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I appreciate that's government as a whole. If you are reducing your budgets and allowing a vacancy rate to exist that obviously is higher than normal - or else why would you mandate it? I mean why would you put out a guideline if you are going to just simply maintain normal staff turnover vacancies? The guideline was to suggest a higher level of vacancy than what would normally exist - right? - and that in the Department of Health caused a reduction in service delivery in Regional Services, as evidenced by the numerous letters the Minister received. He's got lots of them. And, Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned an interesting proposition. He said that the funding had changed and the method of funding from Ottawa changed.

Now he can correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe in 1982, his government, his Minister of Finance negotiated a new agreement with the Federal Government. That agreement, as we approach this fiscal year, has been subject to a lot of controversy because Manitoba was going to lose some \$72 million compared to the old formula and that became the centrepiece of negotiations and basically a little bit of whipping up for an election platform issue.

Now that has been resolved. Certainly it may not have been resolved as generously as the government

would have liked to see, or we would have liked to see in opposition but, nevertheless, \$50 million of the \$72 million is going to be restored this year with an additional \$65 million coming to Manitoba next year as the only province receiving equalization payments that is going to get that.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding - and the Minister can correct me if I'm wrong - that in the first two years, in other words, fiscal 1983-84 and 1984-85, the Province of Manitoba received under the changed formula - which they complained about for this coming year - more dollars than they would have received had the old formula been in place for those first two years, 1983-84 and 1984-85. — (Interjection) — The old formula that we had when we were government, just newly negotiated before we took office.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Minister and the government don't want to talk about that. They blame the whole series of potential cutbacks and the fact that they had to freeze salaries, that hospital budgets were going to remain at zero percent, because the Federal Government wasn't coming through with \$72 million. Now they got their \$50 million this year.

But the point I want to make with the Minister is that the fiscal year in which this guideline for vacancy was in place, i.e., fiscal year 1984-85, was the year that the Province of Manitoba was receiving more money under equalization, under the new formula signed in 1982 - not signed in 1982 but negotiated in 1982 - with the Federal Government by this New Democratic Party, more money and with that more money - and the Minister made the point here just a couple of minutes ago in replying to my suggestion that services have been cut back, he was saying that funding has been a problem.

Well, in the year that he mandated and was reducing staff by a 7 percent vacancy rate, which was the guideline, and he may have been below it for the end of the year, but during the year he might have been over it, I don't know, but in the time that he was doing that the province was receiving a higher transfer payment under the new formula than they would have had the old formula that they inherited in 1981 continued for those two years, 1983-84 and 1984-85. It was only when we got to 1985-86 that the new formula reversed and put Manitoba at a disadvantage in terms of what the old formula would have provided in equalization payments to the province.

So, Mr. Chairman, what we have is the interesting scenario that while the Province of Manitoba was receiving in fiscal year 1984-85, more equalization payment under the formula negotiated with the Federal Government by the Minister of Finance in 1982, they were mandating as a budgetary cost containment, cutback measure, a vacancy rate which reduced services in Regional Services.

Now it's interesting, Mr. Chairman, that this year - and these Estimates were drawn up prior to the decision being made on the \$72 million - and I realize the Minister put the full \$72 million in his Budget, which was an interesting manoeuvre, but these departmental Estimates were drawn up on the background that they were going to be short \$72 million. Because that was what the letters said from this Minister to the hospital board, to the personal care home boards, to everybody, that we are going to have budgetary problems this

year; that we're going to have to tighten our belts; that we're going to have to take a lower budget cut.

So, presumably, the philosophy of the reduction of \$72 million that the Minister indicated was a problem in his budgetary communication with the hospitals and the personal care home boards and the other funded institutions, would have been reflected in this set of Estimates. But, Mr. Chairman, as we approach an election year and the Minister has been subject to complaints about service cutbacks, we see not only an effort to fill the positions, we see the government no longer having a hiring-freezing guideline. I think the Minister indicated, I think he said that is being phased out, that now they can go back to full hiring. — (Interjection) — You're right, it was a temporary thing and now that we're into an election year, the hiring freeze is off. We go and we hire - not only fill the positions that were vacant but we add 49 more - in an effort to prove to the people of Manitoba that, you know, we care about health care.

It's astute politics. It's astute politics for this government in their last year before an election, to increase the staffing complement and rush headlong into hiring to fill vacancies, that theoretically were important to leave vacant last year because of budgetary constraints, at a time when the Federal Government was putting more money in equalization payments, certainly, than they are this year.

So, Mr. Chairman, the Minister can justify what he's done in numerous ways, but the message is becoming clearer and clearer out there to the people, that this government has indeed not lived up to the election promise of health care, not cutbacks; that in 1984-85 service reductions were in place because of a guideline which allowed vacancies or required vacancies to be higher than normal. And now as we approach an election year, lo and behold, there seems to be no end of money for new staff positions and hirings and filling vacancies, because that's what the Minister is indicating now.

It is indeed to stem the changing opinion that this government has not lived up to their commitment. It's good politics, but it's a little callous. But that's fine, this government has not been renowned for doing things without their eye on the election and this department is demonstrating that they indeed have their eye on the election with this set of Estimates.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I also know the style of my honourable friend. No matter what I say, he will use his figures and will keep on insisting; no matter what I tell him the motive is, he always implies there are other motives. And I'm not faulting him too much for that. I guess that's a natural thing.

I can only say that that is not the case. If you look at the situation in the three years you will see the pattern and furthermore, I wish you'd make up your mind. One day I am told that I am doing that just to save money. Whenever we bring programs in I've done it just to save money. The next day I'm throwing money to pad the bill to pretend that I want to do all the things. Well, I'm not very astute if I'm doing that, there's something missing. There's something missing if I'm doing that. I can't be accused of being too cheap on one side and then on the other side, that we're playing games.

Now if my honourable friend - I gave him the explanation as a gentleman; he should have corrected himself to 29, but he kept on, and he's going to keep on talking about 49 percent; and he won't mention what I'll tell him now, but I'll tell him that had we tipped on to 7.5 percent as the guideline, we would have had 143 staff year vacancies and our actual vacancies on March 29th, and that was built up at the end - this thing came in early in the year - there was 68 or 3.6. I don't know what the normal thing is. The normal thing probably would have been very close to it.

Let's get this straight. This was a guideline that went to all departments of the government.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Did you say 68?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** In the whole department, yes, 68, for 3.6. Now the situation was that this was a guideline for all government at a certain time and it was for a question of a few months. There was a committee set up that reviewed any request to suspend, to waive that. The first priority, as we said, as we continue to say, was the Department of Health. The Department of Health, all kinds of positions were waived and we filled these positions. You can look everywhere; you can see the increase that we've done in that. Now we had made some announcement and we're very serious, we're going to hire these people. There's people in the mental health and so on. We're going to be careful. It was done before; it was done in the Schreyer years, one year, that at the end of year if we see that we're spending too much there might be a directive, that's happened - well, it happens every day in Conservative Government. It happened with the Federal Government and so on. They say, whoa, we've got to start saving. We've got to pick up and it happens in families, when they're spending too much money.

I don't apologize for that, but I will not go along with a member who says that automatically we're cutting down on services. We are not. When certain departments were hard hit, maybe unjustly, but then the Department of Health was prioritized, was always allowed to have them, and look over the last three years and I defy you to find any other department that got as much as the Department of Health. A percentage increase, money increase or whatever and we're exempted from more of these tougher rules that we had.

Every day the people want more and more service and that will keep on. This is what I keep repeating, that we'll have to look, we'll have to motivate people differently; we'll have to bite the bullet; we'll have to spend the money wisely. That doesn't mean that you're going to cut down, and if we don't do that, and it's funny that they would accuse an NDP Government of doing that because an NDP Government has always been told you're just throwing money at problems and I'm told that again today.

The situation is that we're going to be very careful or it's not the NDP or the Conservatives that will suffer, it'll be the people of Manitoba because we're going to lose on it. That's all I'm saying. There's one thing I can't really - I'm not going to try to correct my honourable member because I don't know. I can only say, when I was talking about the money from Ottawa,

I'll repeat what I said. I said that we've always gone along; it was a partnership; it was founded by two partners, the Federal Government and the Provincial Government and we've always maintained that the financing should be done by both.

When Monique Begin was the Minister of Health, I remember telling her that when she prepared her famous bill that we didn't object to what was in the bill. I objected to what wasn't in the bill. Whenever we talked about when there's supposed to be these changes and that you can talk about that without talking about financing, it's the most ridiculous thing in world; but then we were told there were different actors in the Department of Finance.

I made a suggestion that we have a meeting with the Federal Minister of Health and the Federal Minister of Finance, as well as all the Provincial Ministers of Health and the Provincial Ministers of Finance. That was refused. I made the same suggestion to Mr. Epp; he accepted that. He wants to meet with the Minister of Health. In fact, I think that we're meeting next month here in Winnipeg, I understand, to discuss the act or so around the middle of next month and then eventually we'll meet with the Minister of Finance.

The statement, as I said, that this government has always said, we fought it. When it was imposed on us, we lost that battle in the Schreyer years when they changed to the formula that they have now. We wanted cost-sharing; we wanted to pay dollar for dollar or half the bill. I know what happened when they changed. The immediate years, in 1977-78, around there, it was the formula amount, that I'm sure of. It was a formula that it took a few years, the first few years. This is what they're saying happened now under this new formula, but this is definitely what happened that year.

I was under the impression - and now it's my turn to stand to be corrected - that with the new - they changed the system again and the system that they started about '82 or I don't know exactly when, that it was the opposite then, that we were getting less money. That's what I was always told. If the Minister of Finance was here, he might know different. I'm talking about the total thing. I stand to be corrected. I'll admit that, but the situation is that certainly there's less money in comparison to '77 and it's certainly, the big point I was trying to make is we would love to go back to cost-sharing. We're ready to pay our share and to live with that.

I remember at one time what they were going to have all that flexibility, when Lalonde was Minister of Finance. In fact, that's when the fight started between Lalonde and Turner because Lalonde lost that one and there was going to be all kinds of things but they were going to stay on that cost. — (Interjection) — Lalonde was Minister of Health and Turner was Minister of Finance and that's where the battle starts. — (Interjection) —

Which report are you talking about? He was talking about all these programs. He's going to put everything in there; he was also going to go - which I believe should be looked at - it would cut down a lot of the cuts he was talking about the guaranteed minimum income.

**A MEMBER:** I remember that.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** You and I were there. We're the old guys in here. So the situation, Mr. Chairman,

is that this government, rightly or wrongly, has certainly chose health as a priority and the situation is that we haven't done all we would like to do but we're spilling a hell of a lot of money.

**MR. H. ENNS:** I bet you could talk to me and we'd get it all straightened out.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Well, that might be. I'm going to let you take me out for dinner and we'll straighten it out. Frank's not coming or I'm not going.

**A MEMBER:** Frank's got PCBs; he's irritable.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** So, Mr. Chairman, I admit that we took precautions; there were a few months that there was a cut down, but I want that clear. I want it clear that we did not go to the 7.5 percent at no time. I want to make it clear that that guideline was for a limited time. It wasn't for the full year. I want to make it clear, with the department that we have, we'd always have turnover; we'd always have vacancies and I also want to make it clear that there was a committee that we presented our case and if it was felt that it was a priority it would be waived and that was done in most times in the Department of Health except on administration, in some areas like that and there were a few things delayed.

As I mentioned, I give you the case numbers, so how in the heck can anybody say there's a reduction, when in every case there's more this year than last year; so you can isolate a case and say, here, you spent maybe two hours less. Well of course, and we would be accused of not being careful, of being ridiculous, of playing the games because there's an election if we kept on not assessing home care. Home care - there's a danger. We say that home care will keep people out of institutions and you can also have a situation which will be just an add-on if you're not careful. It has to be you have to watch it; you have to assess it, to evaluate it and you can't just say, okay, you're allowed 10 hours and then that's good for life until you die. Sometimes it increases and sometimes it's reduced. The situation, the famous case that we heard last week, the situation that we've gone back there again. We had gone from 35,000 in one year to 45 to 73. If that is reduction, I don't know how you figure that out. There might have been in certain areas a reduction in hours and there was an addition in other areas.

Now, I'm not going to bring that case again because how can I lose when somebody is saying when I'm reducing. How can I lose when somebody — (Interjection) — well, what the hell do you think I've been talking about?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please, order please.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** . . . What do you think I've been talking about?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, order please.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** So, who is?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

I call the Member for Pembina to order.  
The Honourable Minister of Health.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Can my honourable friend deny, will he not accept my figure that we spent last year \$73,000.00? That's not hospitals. I think there might even be transportation added to that as compared to 43 or somewhere around the 40 the year before and 35 the year before. If he can't deny that or won't deny that, how can he tell me there's a reduction? Sure, he might be able to tell me that there's reduction in certain hours. Sure, does that mean that there's an overall reduction?

Then, if we didn't have reduction in certain hours, if we just decide that it's assessed once in a lifetime, that you would have that for the rest of your life, we've never claimed that. We said that this is being reviewed and then it's not home care. Home care is a joke if you don't do that. Because the people change, some people, at a certain time, need much more care than another period and that has to change or there's no reason at all to have home care.

We had a situation that this would cost as much as keeping people in an institution. We broke all the rules in the world and we're still told that we're cutting down.

No, my honourable friend has not and will not be able to make the point that we've cut down. He might take an isolated case and say here you've got three hours less but he'll look at the total cost, the total money, the total programs, and new programs. Everytime we build a hospital or a personal care home, we have to keep that thing going.

My friend is not stupid. He knows that better than I. He made a pretty good calculation yesterday on the mental health institutions. He made a pretty good calculation and he knows how costly it is. Unfortunately, I'm sorry if my friend is disappointed, but he still hasn't made up his case that we are cutting down on services.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, seeing as how the Minister has a fixation with the case we discussed last week, I simply want to point out to the Minister that in 1981, that individual had 96 hours of home care. Included on that was eight hours Saturday, eight hours Sunday. Today she has home care five days a week for a total of 70 hours. The Minister nods his head.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Well, five days plus this 10 hours that they can use anytime they want. it's not just five days a week; 12 hours, 5 days a week, plus another 10. Isn't there an increase . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** . . . and the total in 1981 was 96 hours of home care service; total in 1985, under a New Democratic Government that cares and doesn't cut back is 70 hours.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** That's ridiculous.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate to me how long his temporary guidelines on vacancies were in place and from what month to what month?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** The guidelines came from the government in January and it's been announced that it's off. — (Interjection) —

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** In January of when?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** This year, 1985. I'm talking about this year so it was for a question of months. That didn't mean that if you have less than 7 percent vacancies that you had to fire people. It was nothing like that at all. This was a guideline that you trying to go at, as I say, there was a special committee. It was just that when you instead of just filling these positions right away, if there was a situation where people were under - and there some that were over that because they couldn't fill the position for different reasons. They didn't have to worry about it. Those that had less than 7 percent, they could not automatically just go and fill these positions right away. They had to go through a committee and show cause why they should be done. As I said, the Department of Health, in most instances, when it was a question of services, this was weighed.

Now, there were some areas, especially in administration and so on that we went along with the rest of them. That is not the picture that my honourable friend is trying to show that all year there were all these vacancies over 7 percent and we cut down in services. I kind of showed you and gave the information to the committee that we had 3.2 percent vacancies at the worst period, the worst time that we had, not over 7 percent.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** This is a government-mandated vacancy policy. Did the Department of Health have an in-house policy with the department itself prior to January 1 of '85?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I'm sorry I missed it.

No, it was just the guidelines and that helped to adjust the position at the end of the year that we wouldn't have had to lay off anybody in any department. As I say, this guideline was for the whole department.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Can the Minister indicate what dollar savings were achieved?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** You asked me that. I said I'd get it for you.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** You're going to get that for me?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** If I can. That's pretty hard to do.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, the Regional Services, I believe, contains the — (Interjection) —

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Excuse me. Is my honourable friend asking me for the department as a whole? I don't know how you can get that. I thought you meant the region, the question that you asked me before. I don't know how you would get that. What percentage would you have in a group like that anyway? I don't know.

As of now, I'm instructing staff that if they can find it, they provide me with the information.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, maybe I could put it another way and the Minister might be able to provide the information.

When a government develops a guideline on vacancy, they obviously must have some idea of how much the achievable savings would be per department. Could the Minister indicate whether such a guideline was provided by the Minister of Finance for the Department of Health, that from January 1, 1985, they could achieve so many dollars of salary savings by not filling positions? Was a guideline such as that given to the Minister of Health from the Department of Finance or whomever put the guideline out?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** There is no way that we could have a dollar amount. The honourable member would like us to take as a given that we wanted to save so many dollars - not necessarily. We had a deficit to start with and we cut down in every way possible. We had a memo internally and the government has all tried to cut down on travelling also, on those kind of expenses. I sent a memo all through the department and I don't know how much money I've saved on that.

The situation is, how do I know how long it would have taken to fill these positions? I can't tell him that and I understand that the Minister of Finance would not be in a position to - I never heard of this and we certainly did not set a figure and say, this is what we must save. It wasn't anything like that. It was just trying to cut down as much as possible where it didn't hurt and it didn't interfere with the quality of service that we were giving.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** In other words the Minister does not know whether he indeed saved any money, as requested by the Minister of Finance or the Treasury Board Chairman, or whomever? The Minister of Health

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I didn't say that.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Well then, that is what I'm getting at. The Minister is now saying he didn't say that, yet he's saying he can't get the information, he didn't have a guideline. What I'm trying to find out from him is what this policy from January 1st achieved in terms of savings.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** First of all, it wasn't what you wanted to achieve, it was a policy that we set, so we're not going to start that you're going to talk us into giving and say this is what you wanted. We wanted to save money - period. Of course I know we saved money. If somebody is not working and not paid - unless I'm putting the money in my pocket - we're saving money, but I don't know how much. I don't know if there would be that guideline, how many people would be off, I don't know how long it would take to hire people. I don't really know that and it should be fairly easy to understand. I don't think there's any way of measuring that. If you say approximately how much, maybe we could have some ball-park figure - an educated guess somewhere in the ball park - but I don't know.

But you're asking me how much; I can't tell you that, but I know we've saved. And the purpose is that if you

don't necessarily have a figure and say this is what you have to save; it wasn't a goal - that that could be a different exercise. They could say to the government, they do at the Estimates at times; they'd say, okay you want so much, you're going to get half of that, now you put it where you want in an area. It might be in the home care; it might be something like this. This you can do. Or they might say you've got to knock off half a million dollars or so, but that wasn't the case.

This was something that was a temporary thing to try to cut down the deficit and to be in a position where, if there are any problems at the end of the year, you wouldn't have to lay off people until you were sure of the policy, until you had the Estimates for the following year, that you're not all of a sudden in a position that you might have to suspend or fire these people later on. I think it was a good policy. I don't think there was anything wrong with that at all.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Well, you know, I don't know how the Minister can come up with his last conclusion that it's a good policy when he doesn't know how effective it was. He's telling us that it's a good policy but he doesn't know how much money it saved. I don't know how he can determine that policy is good if he doesn't have any information basis to base that statement on.

Maybe the Minister could help me with his staff indicating, of the \$16,332,900, what was the expenditure last year? Maybe that would give us an idea.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** There is no problem in giving you the difference between the approved budget and the actual spent. And I don't know why my honourable friend is pretending that this is so hard to understand and to think that you have to know exactly what you're going to save or the policy has failed. I can imagine if we relate this to a family, and the husband and wife meet with the kids and they say, hey, things are getting tough; I don't if I'm going to keep my job; we have to borrow more money; you have to be careful and the family all participate, all co-operate. The money, I don't know if at the end of the year he can tell me how much we saved. He doesn't know how many dresses his wife would have bought if she hadn't been careful, or how much groceries they would have bought or things they didn't need. That's pretty hard to figure out, but I think he could tell at the end of the year, well, I managed because I cut down. I was able to go along without borrowing that much money and that's what we were trying to do.

But if my honourable friend wants the difference between the money that was voted and the money actually spent in there, I'll give him that.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(b)(1) . . .

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Hold it, the Minister is going to provide some information.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Oh, I can't do that now.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** You can't?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** No. If you want to rest, we'll adjourn.



**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Well I just assumed you were sitting down to get the information from your staff.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** That's the trouble Donny, you assume too much.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Yes, I assume more competence than you have . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Leave us alone.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, under the Estimates we got into a brief discussion a while back and I can't remember what item it was under. The Minister's got \$650,000 in Other Expenditures. Can the Minister explain the nature of how those additional funds will be spent, and when he's providing the information on how closely the actual budget expenditures will match the budget last year on Salaries, could he also provide the same information in other expenses and indicate what was the amount of money actually spent on Other Expenditures last year?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** On the last question, the question of how much we actually spent, again I'll have to take that as notice and we'll try to give you that information the next time we meet.

Now the Other Expenditures, yes, I have the information for that. New initiatives money approved for that, that is a total of 295.3 and that is Continuing Care, 148; Northern Health Program, 93.5; Mental Health Programs, 53.8.

Transfer of capital costs of office equipment to Government Services for purchase of office equipment - that is not a plus - a minus, 10.7; operating funds redirected to re-establish positions used in 1984-85 to establish the Diabetes Education Program, that is also minus 52.2 - in brackets - 52.2.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Run that one by me again. What was that one again? The Diabetes Program.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Operating funds redirected to re-establish the position used in 1984-85 to establish the Diabetes Education Program. We took the position from here for diabetes and that's in brackets - 52.2. Transfer operating funds to Salaries for establishment of term in Thompson Region to provide support in the delivery of programs, again in brackets, \$19,000.00.

Now the operational cost increase, that was for a total of 227.9 and I'll break that down: Home Orderly Program, Winnipeg Region, 67.5; expansion of the Maternal and Child Health Program in all Winnipeg hospitals, 46 to 46; operating costs associated with increase in position in Eastman region, 4.5; resumption of a health education role at a higher level of specializations and comprehensiveness resulting in extensive travel and communication, 17.7; provision of medical services to communities of Cormorant, Moose Lake and Easterville in Norman region, 92.2 and that is the total of 227.9.

Then there was another 658.2 broken down as such, increased use of professional medical consultants in

the North, 25,000; increased mileage due to duty shifts requiring more extensive travel, 19,000; utilization of fee-for-service to provide for pre-natal classes rather than increasing staff levels in Winnipeg region, 60,000; increase in sessional fees required to maintain psychiatric consultation and MOH services at current levels in Eastman region, 29.8; reduction in computer expenditure (Winnipeg region), 1,000; Additional funds approved by Cabinet for increased aircraft costs for Norman and Thompson region, 4,000; transfer of funds from communicable disease control, 21.2(b)(2) for computer-related costs re IMS in Westman region, 25.4; increased funds for computer-related costs re IMS in Thompson region, 54.7.

Now, when I'm on my feet, is my honourable friend interested in the staff breakdown, the new one? Okay, that's a total of 623, 3.25; regional directors, there'll be eight; public health nurses - I'll give the '84 and then the increase, if any, 160 to 167.25; community health workers from 16 to 15; public health educators, from five to eight; mental health, 7.5 to 90.75; services to the aged - resources workers, from 9 to 6; home care workers, from 122 to 149.5; home ec., 13 to 16; team managers 5 to 4; administrative support staff, 102 to 101; audiologists and audiometrists, 9.5 to 10.5; term 13.25 to 9.75; home care term, 26 to 30; home orderly term, 5 to 5 for a 571.25 to 620.75.

The distribution of staff by region, totals, Winnipeg, 225.25 to 245.25; Westman, 77 to 79; Eastman, 46 to 50; Central, 46 to 47; Interlake, 48 to 52; Parklands, 51.5 to 55.5; Norman, 41.5 to 49.5 and Thompson, 36 to 42.5. The other information that I have, if my honourable friend wants it, that would be Other Expenditures, the operating budget by region. I can give him that if he's interested. Just this year or both.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** The coming year.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Winnipeg, 663.1; Westman, 338.5; Eastman, 322; Central, 197.8; Interlake, 246.3; Parklands, 275; Norman, 488.2; Thompson, 357.8; continuing care, unallocated, 14.8 for a total of 2,903,500.00.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned mental health workers and I think he had 7.5. Was that to 19.75 or 90.75?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** 77.5 to 90.75.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, in terms of population - I haven't got my Annual Report of the Health Services Commission in front of me - but in terms of population breakdown in the regions, they're not equal, but there is a sizable disparity, for instance, from Central region, in terms of its global budget of 197.7 to, for instance, Parklands, to, for instance, Norman or Thompson as well.

The staffing patterns don't vary a great deal with those ones that I've mentioned, central to Parkland to Norman to Thompson. The staffing patterns, well there's no more than . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Thompson has a big one, 271 to 357.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** In terms of your staffing patterns, I've got 42.5 for this year in Thompson, so you've got a staffing range of roughly a difference of eight but you've got a budget differential of at least 50 percent difference in some communities. Does that reflect travel? What's the reflection, in terms of Central with 47 people, 47 staff delivering programs I would think to probably as many people as we have, for instance, in Parkland and there's 55.5 staff in Parkland in about \$80,000 of increased budget.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, the only thing I can see, it was the pattern established over the years and it would be depending on the caseloads and the distance, the travel and so on that it would be. I can't see anything else.

Another thing I should add also, may be it's not all my honourable friend; maybe I kind of misled him when we were talking awhile ago about this policy. I might have given the impression - I certainly said it was for savings and it was on that but it wasn't the only reason. One of the main things which is actually to provide more responsible service was to give the flexibility of adjusting staff, like when we took two people here and transferred them to diabetes and that kind of thing. That was another benefit we feel we received by this policy. I should have maybe mentioned that before. We might not have had all the argument and given the idea that it was just for savings. It was the flexibility that it gives.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, D. Malinowski:** The Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I've got a note beside this that I wrote from one of the other evenings we were discussing Estimates, that this would be the area that we could discuss the new Diabetic Education Program.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes, it's a joint service with the hospitals and that so that will be all right here.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I don't know, someplace in my notes, but I've got a figure that the Minister gave me the other night, in terms of that there was an additional amount of money dedicated to this. Can the Minister indicate the areas in which the department will be assisting the continued delivery of this new Diabetic Education Program and of particular interest, of course, is the Winkler-Morden area and as to whether they will receive some funding assistance to continue with their Diabetic Education Program.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I think one of the important steps that we've taken in the department has been the establishment of the Health Promotion Directorate with the mandate for developing programs that focus on health promotion and disease prevention - mostly it's prevention that we are talking about - to assist communities to assume greater responsibility for their own health and over the long term to reduce the cost of health care.

Planning is underway for some significant program thrust in '85-86 and the major area development actually

this year, the priority that we have is in diabetes education. Both the department and the Commission have developed an integrated provincial program for diabetes education involving both community and the institutions.

Progress has been made in the establishment of community-based Diabetes Education Centres. During '85-86, community based services will be developed. There will be an evaluation at the end of each development phase and further development will proceed on the basis of the results of these evaluations.

The objective of the program will be to emphasize the provision of education to a person with diabetes, as well as to their families; to increase the knowledge of the skills and attitudes of the health care professionals working in the field of diabetes, and to increase the awareness levels of the general public to the risk of diabetes.

Now the program is being administered through the Health Promotion Directorate, as I say, with a portion of the funding coming from the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

A provincial diabetes education co-ordinator is working in the Health Promotion Directorate. A training program for those employed with diabetes education has been set up. Final funding costs are still being negotiated, so the detailed outlines are not available. The new monies identified for diabetes education so far, will be allotted to the Interlake region, a nurse educator and a dietician; Norman region, a dietician; Westman region, a nurse educator; Central region, a program will be funded on a half-time basis at Morden and a smaller program at Carman - it must be the one my friend was talking about - Winnipeg region, an education team will be located at the Youville Clinic to provide service to the east side of the city as a primary focus.

An education team of nurse educators, social workers, and dieticians will provide a service for children and adolescents. In the Central office, two half-time positions will be working at the program development over the next year. The provincial diabetes education co-ordinator works in the Health Promotion Directorate. The funds coming from the Commission will fund the program for children and adolescents at Morden, Carman and Youville.

The monies for Manitoba Health, that is the department, will fund the Directorate, two positions; Interlake region, 2 positions; Westman region, 1 position; Norman region, 1 position. We will be working closely with the current Diabetes Education Centre at the Health Sciences Centre and the Diabetes Education Service at Brandon General Hospital.

One objective is to co-ordinate the type of information people receive through the program and to enhance communication between the services. I know that one person who certainly was instrumental in - more than one, of course - but the person who certainly felt that it was a high priority was our Assistant Deputy Minister, Dr. Wilt, who felt that was one of the most important things and the one of the best things that we can do to go along with this prevention in working for prevention in this field. He certainly recommended that very highly and I think we're pleased to see that it's going ahead.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, I may have missed the Minister's numbers.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I didn't give you that, I should have. Sorry about that.

The Commission's share of the funding is \$403,000 and I think I did state what the Commission was funding, and the department is 230 for a total of \$633,000.00.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Well, Mr. Chairman, that is a fairly substantive new initiative and with fairly substantial costs attached. I believe, from discussion with the people involved at home in the Morden program that that may well be one of the expenditures that the Minister could recover in one year because of the reduction in the necessity for hospitalization to get blood sugar levels balanced out and the other problems that diabetics do have. I think it would probably be one of the more efficient expenditures and makes use of a fair amount, I think, of volunteer effort as well and co-ordinates that in the community and, no doubt, will be pretty good seed money - if that's the right terminology to use - to be spent to achieve the goal of - well, it's a little difficult to say this is achieving the goal to health maintenance, because you're talking about diabetics who already have a medical problem, but in terms of keeping them out of the hospital and needing more intensive treatment, this program, from what I understand of it, certainly has a great deal of potential, and a great deal of potential for annual pay-back to the department for this kind of money.

I'm making the assumption too, that of the \$633,000, some of it is one-time cost to set the program up. It won't necessarily be an annual operating cost of \$633,000.00.

Mr. Chairman, as I say, from what I understand in discussions with people at home who have been involved in this program, it has every potential to improve the lifestyle and to reduce costs in the acute care hospital system.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I think the member is correct in that eventually I don't think we'll ever see the saving in some of the Department of Health as such. I think you'll see the saving in - the beds will be occupied, but I think it's fair to say, that many of them would have to go in the hospital for treatment, not only that, they might miss a lot of work and so on. They might not enjoy life as much, and this way they will learn to arrest the disease and eventually with the education also, there will be prevention. Maybe the education part of it would prevent people from suffering later on from diabetes.

Now, as far as the funds, a lot of it is wages, salaries and so on, and I think it'll be at least a three-year program before we see any reduction. So, we don't expect it'll be a just one shot for three years and so you can expect pretty well the same amount if not more money.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

**MR. A. BROWN:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm looking at the table on Page 62 of the Community Health Services Annual Report, the table relating to communicable diseases. I realize that we're getting a two-year comparison over here and it's difficult to

determine from two years whether there really is a trend toward some diseases becoming more prevalent in the province than others. It looks as if we have pretty well eliminated some of these diseases.

I would particularly like to ask about shigellosis which I understand is a disease which could be brought in from Mexico or one of the Caribbean countries and I wonder if there has been a marked increase? There certainly is a marked increase in 1984 over 1983. If we go back a few years further than that, is this becoming more prevalent? I understand that this is the disease, and I may be wrong in this, but we refer to it as Montezuma's revenge sometimes, or the Aztec trot, or whatever, and I understand it's highly contagious. — (Interjection) — Oh, right under salmonellosis.

**A MEMBER:** Sam who?

**MR. A. BROWN:** That's what they have in Chicago right now.

Mr. Chairman, there were 440 cases in 1983 and there 688 cases in 1984, so there's a marked increase. So I'm just wondering whether this has been increasing every year or is this just something that just happened to happen in 1984?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Actually we're talking about food poisoning, right?

**MR. A. BROWN:** Yes.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** And I understand that it goes up and down, so . . .

**A MEMBER:** Mostly up, if you've got it.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mostly down if you've got it. I wish my honourable friend would have discussed that when Dr. Sharon MacDonald had been here. I must confess I don't know too much about that. I only have the records of the last two years. I think it is not a true pattern - I think that's the main question that my honourable friend is asking - is it something that is gradually going up. I understand that's not the case. It could be way down again this year. It could be caused by anything, the same as the year you might have more mosquitoes or less mosquitoes, and so on. There's not a pattern I understand.

**MR. A. BROWN:** I thought maybe you had your Chief Medical Officer over there with you. I didn't recognize all the people that were there with you.

I also notice that there has been about 100 percent increase in hepatitis. Now hepatitis I thought was something that we had fairly well under control. Why do we have such a high incidence of increases of a disease such as that, because isn't that really a matter of educating the public on cleanliness, and so on? It's a disease that you contract by living in filth really and it seems to me that that is something that should be able to be eliminated.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I'll take those questions as notice and I'll try to have a better report for my honourable friend.

**MR. CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER:** 3.(b)(1) - the Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, the other night when we were discussing Dental Services the Minister indicated the \$1.5 million could be discussed when we got into the Mental Health section, if I recall him correctly. Is this an appropriate place for him to . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** . . . yesterday, that was this new, the funds. Let's call it a book entry and so on. If we need the money for the dental, as I said, I'd have to go back to Cabinet. In the meantime we took that money, the \$1.5 million, and that's the announcement I made yesterday in discussion that we talked about. We covered that quite extensively last night.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Now just let me understand correctly what the Minister is saying here, that the announcement I believe last night of the \$1.45 million of Mental Health Initiatives, the ones that he announced last night, are the monies that the Minister didn't expend in Dental Services last year - is that what the Minister is indicating?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** \$1.5 million, yes. Yes, the announcement of a program was made under Mental Health Directorate when we started last night. My honourable friend is right, you won't see it all in there, part of is under Mental Health Directorate, part of it is here. I've talked about the new staff. I announced that yesterday, repeated that, and also the whole program would be Brandon and Selkirk, but I don't think there's any funding that you'll find in Brandon and Selkirk, oh except that — (Interjection) — yes the visual thing . . .

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(b)(1) - Mr. Minister.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** You would find \$183.9 under Mental Health Directorate, that's (m), Other Expenses and then there will be 814.3 External Agencies and that, and the Regions - which is what we're looking at now - there will be 330 and 54 for 384 and that's 1.382, and then the Directorate - that would be back to Mental Health Directorate - the new people, that would be 65.5. And of course, what we talked about the adolescent and the psycho-geriatric institution, and so on, that's not covered there. That was in excess of that.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I'm certainly glad that we got into this discussion again because - and I want to be absolutely fair to the Minister so he doesn't accuse me of getting things slightly wrong . . .

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I would never do that, of course not.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Of course not. But what we're talking about in this announcement which has spread throughout the three departments, but this new initiative to follow the recommendations of the Pascoe Report represents monies that would have been spent last year in Children's Dental Health Services that are now

being budgeted in Mental Health. So that we haven't got new dollars coming into Mental Health, we've merely got transferred dollars from the Children's Dental Service Program to establish this new initiative.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** The base, yes, that's a book entry, call it what you want. They could have, at the time, said well you're not going to spend that money, it was transferred last year. But of course we can't accumulate that and the situation, as the Cabinet and the government and the Treasury Board could have said, okay you're not going to spend that money, we'll take it away, and then, fine, go and apply for 1.5.

I don't want a misunderstanding on that because the situation is that we didn't need the money at the time. We weren't going to go ahead with this service so we said could we transfer that, and they said fine. Now with the understanding that as soon as we can develop something, arrive at some decision on the Dental Program, we would get that and it's not here. I must confess that that is done. It'll be a Special Warrant. And last year the money that we had, we spent more money on home care, that money was transferred to home care.

Now what we're asking is actually new money. It's not money that was spent here at all. So, if we go ahead when we're ready to go ahead with the dental program, we'll have to come to Cabinet and that will not show, that will be added to the deficit whatever.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Well now, I want to make sure I understand what's happened then.

The money out of Dental Services that wasn't expended because of the disagreement between the Minister in Brandon over the delivery of the Children's Dental Health Program in Brandon and as a result in Winnipeg, the Minister is now saying that a portion of that money which was not expended for Dental Services went into the Home Care Program, a portion or all of it went in there. I'm making an assumption and I believe it's correct that up on the Continuing Care line the 19.189 is the Budget figure from last year, not the actual expended one. What we will see when we get the actual figure for last year on Continuing Care is somewhere in the neighbourhood of presumably 20 million, maybe 20.2, 20.3 million, which means the increase in Home Care won't be as great in actual delivery of program for next year.

In addition to that, the Minister has persuaded Treasury Board of an inter-year transfer. The money that he saved last year he transferred and expended elsewhere, or at least a portion of it. He didn't budget for Children's Dental Services this year, but took what would normally would have been budgeted there and announced a mental health program. Then, he's going to go back to Treasury Board if and when he resolves his dental program and get Special Warrant and supplementary funding to provide whatever dollars are needed to provide dental services. If the Minister's unable again to resolve the Children's Dental Services, then basically it would be a fair analogy to say that the new initiative is Children's Dental Health money this year. You couldn't say that last year because it went into home care, but you could say that for this year.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I guess you could with the way they explain it, but I'm never one to really catch on to all what Finance does. The situation is that there was no way when we talked about the first decision was that we weren't ready. We were very disappointed we couldn't go ahead with the program that we had worked on for a couple of years and Cabinet decided yes okay we'll try to straighten that out and come back and we will give him the money. That was gone because we knew we weren't going to do it last year. It went to home care.

Now, this year, they said okay whenever you need the money you've got to come back. We're not giving you anything now. It amounts to the same thing. So, therefore, that money they could have said all right we withdraw that and give us money for this program Mental Health. They said well okay they could transfer that money. It's there, then if you need more money, you'll have to come back for more. Yes, that's true.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** 3.(b)(1)—pass; 3.(b)(2)—pass;  
3.(c) Brandon Mental Health Centre - the Member for Pembina.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, before we get into the Brandon Mental Health Centre, the Minister provided me with an answer to the question I posed at the end of the evening last night. I'm just reading it over and possibly we could discuss it now.

I understand from the Minister's memo that a new program has been established by Treasury Board in February of this year which will allow basically, if I understand the program correctly, paid leaves of absence for departmental staff. It indicates in here that they are paid within the salary range of a Medical Officer (1) and seconded to the University of Manitoba for training in the post-graduate program in Community Medicine. A question to the Minister is, whilst they are on leave of absence for, I guess you would call it, the Career Residency Program, even though the salary range here that indicates Medical Officer (1), my question to the Minister is that the salary range they're at right now or are they higher than that and this represents a reduction in salary range? The question I'm trying to pose to the Minister is — (Interjection) — Mr. Chairman, the question would be, I presume, the range of salaries for physicians could vary considerably within the Civil Service. Does this program allow for the leave of absence salary not to exceed Medical Officer (1) even if they are say at the Medical Officer (5) or another range?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** I think we must remember that they could be people like the first one mentioned on that was a Medical Officer (2). So, there's a reduction there — (Interjection) —

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** That's what I'm getting at.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Yes, there's a reduction.

Now, there's others so there's somebody we want to train because they're taking a reduction many of them of what they're going to make. There's a doctor, for instance, Redekopp in the North was working on his own. In other words, he was fee for service. So,

they have to be dedicated people and so on and they can take quite a reduction. They could make much more money in other ways. We're fortunate when you get people like that. We try to recruit them.

It has been working, not quite as well as we'd like to because we need more of them. To say they're on leave, yes, but as I asked yesterday when that question was asked of me is it for education purposes and that's while they're being trained. In other words, we are hiring them, we train them, and in exchange of that they make a commitment to give so many years to the province working.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Minister's response that some of them may take a reduction in pay to enroll in the program but basically I guess I look at it from the other standpoint that this is an educational upgrading which allows them to be more hireable, if you will, and indeed it would appear as if they are going to be hired on with the Department of Health after completing this training, so that the financial sacrifice that these people are making is not as great as what the Minister is indicating because they are taking - I don't know what a Medical Officer (1)'s salary range is - but I would presume it could be a fairly reasonable salary and they are going through, I don't know if it's a one-year course? It doesn't really indicate it. — (Interjection) — Is this just for one year? After that, their commitment is to the department to sign on for a term of employment at the rate of one year for each year of secondment. In this case, I presume they're going to be in leave of absence with Medical Officer (1)'s salary and then in return for that they work for the department one year, is that the correct assumption?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, there is a reason for that. The reason is that it's not a profitable thing. It's certainly education, it's knowledge acquired, there's no doubt about that. but there are not that many that want it because most of the time it will be a financial sacrifice.

Now, fine, it is those probably that might be an advancement; it could be maybe - and we haven't got that many - that might work for the department and they stay with the department; but now we're getting these people from all over. As I say, it might be people that are on fee-for-service or teaching at the university and so on. I know that one of them that came over to see me, there was quite a concern. He was a very dedicated person, very interested, but the difference was phenomenal; the difference of what he could make if he stayed out of it. So that's the only reason it's being done, because we have to hire them; we have to have them; we've been trying to recruit; we haven't been successful for the last 10 years or so and it is a program to help us get these public health doctors.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** The program provides that a maximum of two physicians be enrolled in the program in any one year. Does the Minister have a target number of physicians that he wishes to have on staff, to give us an idea of how many people will, over the next number of years, be enrolled in this Career Residency Program?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** What we would like to do is get around the 16 or so. We have, I understand, about five on staff.

I think there's something else that I should say here. You've probably heard me say at some time that it was so difficult to get the type of people we wanted. There are many doctors that, after working for quite a while, older people - and it's not the attitude that they have. They feel, I've worked hard enough now; do you think you can get me a job working for the government? They take it pretty well as either a part-time job or something much easier than that, a kind of letting down or relaxation, with the facilities, of only so many hours and so on and through Dr. Wilt trying to build up the department, we're trying to get more younger, dedicated people that want to make a career out of this, not just as a form of semi-retirement or something like that, which was in the past.

There are some that are dedicated, who want to do that work and this is the encouragement that we try to give them, but it is very hard to get the type. We will have to replace Dr. Wilt and we're quite concerned because he's very good; I think he's one of the best that we've had. We've had some people that are maybe not quite ready at this time and we had Dr. Sharon MacDonald who was here, a young, aggressive person, very good. These are the type of people that we want, who will make a career out of this.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Mr. Chairman, could the Minister indicate the salary range of a Medical Officer (1)?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** The Medical Officer (1) is from \$45,000 to \$52,000; a (2) will go to a maximum of \$56,000 and if they have a specialty, they get another \$5,000.00.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Presumably, the individual involved here, if she was in the third step of the range in Medical Officer (2), she'd be paid third step of the range in Medical Officer (1). Is that basically the way it would work?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Probably \$56,000 down to \$52,000.00. If that person was over the maximum of the (1), about \$55,000 or so, then she would go back to the maximum of the (1) around \$52,000.00.

**MR. D. ORCHARD:** I guess, Mr. Chairman, what I'm trying to get at is there was one other program. It just slips my mind at the moment. Yes, it was public health nurses where I think the Minister, in his opening remarks - this isn't the same program that you referred to, is it? No, because I thought it was public health nurses where the department saw the desire to increase the hiring of public health nurses and provided - if I could find the opening remarks - at least some incentive, some bursary incentive to get public health nurses into training so that the staff would have them available.

At that time I made the suggestion to the Minister that in view of the staffing problems he was having in intensive care units, and one of the problems - it may not be the only one, but certainly finances wasn't the only problem here that allowed the Minister to persuade Treasury Board to establish a new residency program;

but I make the point to the Minister that in the intensive care units part of the problem is the salary reduction that the nurses must take when they go into the nine-month training program for staffing in intensive care units.

The Minister has, over the past say, year roughly, presided over the opening of additional intensive care beds in at least one of the two major hospitals in Winnipeg and those beds have, from time to time, either not been available, not been open or have been closed because of sickness in one particular case, sickness of intensive care unit staffing, but the problem does come down to a shortage of intensive care unit nurses. If the problems in public health were strong enough that the Minister saw fit to introduce a support program, a bursary program or whatever it is for public health nurses, and now we've got a Career Residency Program newly initiated in February of this year to provide physicians with extra training in public health or community medicine and the need is great enough that the government has provided a residency program which will provide a reasonable salary for these people while they're furthering their training in public health or community medicine, surely it would make good sense to investigate whether a similar incentive program should be offered to the nurses going through the Intensive Care Unit Training Program of nine months. It may not take all that much because I don't know what the reduction in salary is, but they certainly already are paid - the nurses I'm referring to are already paid during the nine-month training period - but with the fiscal constraints that are on all families and all individuals such as they are today, maybe the 10, 15, 25 percent reduction in salary is too much for a lot of nurses to consider upgrading their training into intensive care unit nursing.

So with the information the Minister has given me today on this new Career Residency Program, it simply reinforces my argument that the Minister should be taking a look at a similar program to provide intensive care unit nursing support for their training.

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Mr. Chairman, I didn't want to interrupt my honourable friend, but we'll certainly have a chance to discuss that, but that is a little different. I think I did mention that to my honourable friend that this is our responsibility. By the way it should be discussed when we talk about hospitals, because it is the policy of the hospital. I will, nevertheless, tell my honourable friend that it is not the same problem. We have people from Ontario that are coming to take this course, but they don't stay. They use that as a stepping stone to go into administration and so on, like we were talking a while ago, it's a little different.

That is a policy that has been set by the hospitals. They've had trouble and then they've had trouble in others areas in the North and so on, because if they come here, then they want to stay here. So that is something that is being looked at now and, of course, it might be that the O'Sullivan Report that should be tabled fairly soon or turned over to the government, I think will talk about the role of the nurse and that will be one of the areas that might be mentioned.

I wonder if we could wait until we reach hospitalization to discuss that part of it.



**MR. D. ORCHARD:** Does the Minister desire that we get into the two mental health institutions or will we wait until tomorrow?

**HON. L. DESJARDINS:** Do you want to call it 5:30? We are now on 3.(c) Brandon Mental Centre and if it's agreeable with the members of the committee, we'll call it 5:30 and start on this next time.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The Honourable Government House Leader.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Chairman, before we accept the motion that committee rise, is it understood that if we call it 5:30 in this committee and then adjourn the House here, that the clock time in the other committee room has not yet reached 5:30, so that the two committees would not have to rise simultaneously. Since rather than an adjournment, we're going on a clock time in the other committee of 5:30, if that committee wishes to continue sitting.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

## IN SESSION

**MR. P. EYLER:** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted a certain Resolution, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, P. Fox:** The Honourable Member for River East.

**MR. P. EYLER:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Government House Leader, that the Report of the Committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

**HON. A. ANSTETT:** Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Community Services and Corrections, that the House do now adjourn.

**MOTION presented and carried** and the House adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:00 p.m. (Thursday).