



61836-3

**Second Session — Thirty-Fourth Legislature**  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

**DEBATES**  
and  
**PROCEEDINGS**  
**(HANSARD)**

38 Elizabeth II

*Published under the  
authority of  
The Honourable Denis C. Rocan  
Speaker*



**VOL. XXXVIII No. 75 - 1:30 p.m., TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1989.**



**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Fourth Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
<b>ALCOCK, Reg</b>	Osborne	LIBERAL
<b>ANGUS, John</b>	St. Norbert	LIBERAL
<b>ASHTON, Steve</b>	Thompson	NDP
<b>BURRELL, Parker</b>	Swan River	PC
<b>CARR, James</b>	Fort Rouge	LIBERAL
<b>CARSTAIRS, Sharon</b>	River Heights	LIBERAL
<b>CHARLES, Gwen</b>	Selkirk	LIBERAL
<b>CHEEMA, Gulzar</b>	Kildonan	LIBERAL
<b>CHORNOPYSKI, William</b>	Burrows	LIBERAL
<b>CONNERY, Edward, Hon.</b>	Portage la Prairie	PC
<b>COWAN, Jay</b>	Churchill	NDP
<b>CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.</b>	Ste. Rose du Lac	PC
<b>DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.</b>	Roblin-Russell	PC
<b>DOER, Gary</b>	Concordia	NDP
<b>DOWNEY, James, Hon.</b>	Arthur	PC
<b>DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.</b>	Emerson	PC
<b>DRIEDGER, Herold L.</b>	Niakwa	LIBERAL
<b>DUCHARME, Gerald, Hon.</b>	Riel	PC
<b>EDWARDS, Paul</b>	St. James	LIBERAL
<b>ENNS, Harry, Hon.</b>	Lakeside	PC
<b>ERNST, Jim, Hon.</b>	Charleswood	PC
<b>EVANS, Laurie E.</b>	Fort Garry	LIBERAL
<b>EVANS, Leonard S.</b>	Brandon East	NDP
<b>FILMON, Gary, Hon.</b>	Tuxedo	PC
<b>FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.</b>	Virden	PC
<b>GAUDRY, Neil</b>	St. Boniface	LIBERAL
<b>GILLESHAMMER, Harold</b>	Minnedosa	PC
<b>GRAY, Avis</b>	Ellice	LIBERAL
<b>HAMMOND, Gerrie, Hon.</b>	Kirkfield Park	PC
<b>HARAPIAK, Harry</b>	The Pas	NDP
<b>HARPER, Elijah</b>	Rupert Island	NDP
<b>HELWER, Edward R.</b>	Gimli	PC
<b>HEMPHILL, Maureen</b>	Logan	NDP
<b>KOZAK, Richard J.</b>	Transcona	LIBERAL
<b>LAMOUREUX, Kevin M.</b>	Inkster	LIBERAL
<b>MALOWAY, Jim</b>	Elmwood	NDP
<b>MANDRAKE, Ed</b>	Assiniboia	LIBERAL
<b>MANNES, Clayton, Hon.</b>	Morris	PC
<b>McCRAE, James, Hon.</b>	Brandon West	PC
<b>MINENKO, Mark</b>	Seven Oaks	LIBERAL
<b>MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.</b>	River East	PC
<b>NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.</b>	Rossmere	PC
<b>OLESON, Charlotte, Hon.</b>	Gladstone	PC
<b>ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.</b>	Pembina	PC
<b>PANKRATZ, Helmut</b>	La Verendrye	PC
<b>PATTERSON, Allan</b>	Radisson	LIBERAL
<b>PENNER, Jack, Hon.</b>	Rhineland	PC
<b>PLOHMAN, John</b>	Dauphin	NDP
<b>PRAZNIK, Darren</b>	Lac du Bonnet	PC
<b>ROCAN, Denis, Hon.</b>	Turtle Mountain	PC
<b>ROCH, Gilles</b>	Springfield	LIBERAL
<b>ROSE, Bob</b>	St. Vital	LIBERAL
<b>STORIE, Jerry</b>	Flin Flon	NDP
<b>TAYLOR, Harold</b>	Wolseley	LIBERAL
<b>URUSKI, Bill</b>	Interlake	NDP
<b>WASYLCIA-LEIS, Judy</b>	St. Johns	NDP
<b>YEO, Iva</b>	Sturgeon Creek	LIBERAL

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, November 21, 1989.

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

## PRAYERS

## ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

## PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

**Mr. William Chornopyski (Chairman of Committees):** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to sit again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), that the report of the committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

## TABLING OF REPORTS

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I am happy to table the Supplementary Information for Legislative Review, that being '89-90 Departmental Revenue Estimates. This is a compendium of all department revenue Estimates plus charges and fees that provide for those revenue Estimates.

**Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines):** I am happy to table the Supplementary Information for Legislative Review for the 1989-1990 Estimates for the Department of Energy and Mines.

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** I am pleased to table the Capital Program for the Manitoba Health Services Commission for 1989-90.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

**Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines):** The Manitoba Hydro Act states that the purpose of Manitoba Hydro is to provide for the continuance of a supply of power adequate for the needs of the province and to promote economy and efficiency in the generation, distribution, supply and use of power.

Accordingly, Manitoba Hydro is implementing a long-term strategy of planning and development of an electrical system to meet the needs of Manitoba consumers of electricity at the lowest rates possible.

I am pleased to announce today that as a part of that strategy, Manitoba Hydro has signed Seasonal Diversity Exchange Agreements, each for 150 megawatts, with Northern States Power Company of Minneapolis and United Power Association of Elk River, Minnesota.

A seasonal diversity exchange is an arrangement between utilities that takes advantage of the different seasonal characteristics of their systems. Manitoba

Hydro has its highest loads in the wintertime. Its summer loads are much lower, and so it will have excess generating capacity in the summertime that it can make available to another utility. Similarly, more southern utilities tend to have a larger demand in the summer and thus have excess capacity available in the winter.

The transactions, starting in 1995 and lasting for 20 years, provide for Manitoba Hydro to import up to 300 megawatts in the winter months in exchange for making 150 megawatts available to each of the U.S. utilities in the summer months.

\* (1335)

This arrangement allows all three utilities to maximize the use of its generating facilities thus reducing both capital and operating costs. Manitoba Hydro will have greater flexibility in planning to meet the demands for electricity in the later 1990s. This diversity agreement includes the construction of a new transmission line from the eastern side of Winnipeg to near Winger, Minnesota, approximately 200 miles south of Winnipeg and about halfway between Grand Forks and Bemidji.

The Manitoba portion of the new high voltage transmission line is estimated to cost \$50 million. This line will require an environmental assessment and licence in Manitoba and will require National Energy Board approval. The U.S. utilities will seek to obtain similar approvals, and the parties expect to have all necessary authorizations by May 1992.

These exchanges of seasonal capacity will not only improve the operating efficiency of the Manitoba Hydro system, but the new transmission line will enhance the security of our system and provide an additional means of marketing surplus energy. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

## TABLING OF REPORTS (Cont'd)

**Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines):** Mr. Speaker, may I table the agreements that were signed yesterday? (Agreed)

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS (Cont'd)

**Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert):** Increasing sales and reducing costs are always admirable goals. Announcing sales after they have been concluded and the order has been taken is also an admirable goal. My compliments to the Government for negotiating and announcing this particular sale after it has apparently been sold. Given that the Minister has and not before as our predecessors have done to try and take credit for it, we await anxiously other hydro sales.

The introduction of this report, this ministerial statement, is noticeably absent in that it is the dollar value of the sale and/or the amounts of the sale, which is specifically significant given that this Government has over and over repeated the fact that any

construction costs will not come down on the consumers of Manitoba, that they will be virtually revenue neutral or will generate enough revenue to counter the costs. I would have assumed that they would have taken a strong position and put that form of a statement in the release.

The environmental impact assessment and licensing in Manitoba are valuable requirements and necessary components. I would hope that this Government will live up to its obligation, as stated, of referring these mega-type projects—and \$50 million is certainly a major investment—to the Public Utilities Board for evaluation, for review of the plans and the benefits to Manitobans with a report back through the Minister to the Legislature. So we anxiously await more details, Mr. Speaker, before we give it a final stamp of approval.

**Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon):** Certainly, we are pleased to see the Minister has concluded a seasonal diversity exchange with Northern States Power.

Northern States Power, the name of that utility is no stranger to the people of Manitoba. We have a 500 megawatt firm power sale with Northern States Power, which we signed in 1985.

This announcement, while it is good news and certainly diversity exchanges are not new to Manitoba Hydro, it does beg some questions. My colleague from St. Norbert (Mr. Angus) raised one of them about the nature of the financial arrangements for this transfer of power, this exchange of power. It also raises some interesting questions about what this 300 megawatt exchange does with respect to the start-up of additional hydro-electric generating capacity. It raises a lot of questions.

I am pleased to see that the Minister is capable of signing agreements between other utilities and Manitoba Hydro. Mr. Speaker, we are still waiting for the major agreement between the board of Ontario Hydro and the Manitoba Government with respect to Conawapa, perhaps a much larger and much more economically valuable hydro sale for the people of Manitoba and our economy.

\* (1340)

There are some other problems that the Minister is going to have to deal with before we see the consummation of this agreement, not the least of which is the \$50 million that it is going to cost us for the transmission facility, as well as the environmental questions that are going to be raised as we look at the construction of another line. We will have questions about that as well.

## INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Speaker:** Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct Honourable Members' attention to the gallery where we have from the Calvin Christian School, twenty-seven Grade 9 students, and they are under the direction of John Buikema. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson).

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

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### Free Trade Agreement Impact Social Programs

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). Subsidy negotiations under the Free Trade Agreement are under way in Ottawa under the veil of secrecy, which has been part and parcel of the Free Trade Agreement.

All federal and provincial social and economic development programs will be under active consideration to determine whether they must be dismantled in whole or in part in order to comply with FTA. These negotiations may have far reaching implications for this province in terms of the future of both our economic and social programs.

Surprisingly, in yesterday's Question Period, the First Minister (Mr. Filmon) appeared to have very little information about provincial programs which may be challenged. Yesterday, in response to my question, the First Minister assured us that medical and social programs would not be bargained away.

My question to the Finance Minister is: can he make us the same assurance with respect to the regional economic development programs, small business incentive programs, agricultural support programs, and all other income, incentive and support programs for business and labour in this province?

**Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism):** Firstly, let me say that the Leader of the Opposition's (Mrs. Carstairs) premises are all wrong as usual. There are no negotiations taking place in Ottawa. The free trade negotiations will not take place until after the GATT negotiations are concluded.

Manitoba programs are not on the table. Social programs are not on the table. What is happening—if the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) did a little more research than her Member for Transcona (Mr. Kozak) who happened to phone the Minister's office in Ontario this morning to ask, what questions can I ask the Minister in Manitoba? That is the kind of research they are doing. None of those things are on the table.

What is happening is that research work is being done on incentive and other programs that are conducted in the United States, both at the local and at the state level. My officials from my department and Ottawa are working co-operatively to determine the kind of levels of subsidy that are taking place in the U.S. on a national level, on a state level and a local level to determine what we have to talk about when those negotiations start in some eight or 10 months.

### Subsidy Negotiations

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, that as a Canadian I am concerned about Canadian social programs. I already know the American ones are inferior, and so it is the Canadian programs

that are at jeopardy, and Manitoba programs are a part of this.

Can the Minister of Industry and Trade (Mr. Ernst) tell us what information he has from the federal Government as to what subsidy programs in business, labour and social programs are going to be discussed at these subsidy negotiations, and will he share that information with this House?

\* (1345)

**Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism):** Mr. Speaker, as the Premier (Mr. Filmon) said yesterday and as I have said today already, Canada's social programs are not on the chopping block, Canada's subsidy programs are not on the chopping block, the Canadian Wheat Board is not on the chopping block, none of those kinds of things are on the chopping block.

What is happening is an analysis is being done by provincial and federal (interjection) Mr. Speaker, what is happening is our officials, in conjunction with the federal officials, are analyzing the various programs that could be considered as a subsidy by the United States. We are also investigating their subsidy programs to determine what is going to be discussed when those negotiations start in eight or 10 months time.

Mr. Speaker, it has been made abundantly clear in the Free Trade Agreement, it was made abundantly clear by all officials involved and certainly by this Government, that Canada's social programs and economic development programs are not on the table, nor are they in any way in jeopardy.

### Social Programs List

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, but since the Free Trade Agreement has been completed, we have watched legislation passed at the federal level which hurts the unemployed in this country, and we have watched oats being taken from under the Wheat Board. We are concerned and we want to know since he says that there are a variety of programs, various is what he said, that are being debated and being discussed. Will he provide a list for this House of those programs in Manitoba that are going to be under discussion?

**Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism):** Mr. Speaker, as I indicated before, a number of economic development programs are under discussion at the present time so that our Canadian negotiators fully understand the impacts when they go before that trade negotiation. It seems incongruous to me that the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) would be concerned that our people should know something about what they are talking about when they go to the negotiations. It makes only good sense, in my view, that those people are well prepared when they go—and when they talk about the Western Grain Transportation Act, for one—and talk to the United States about those kinds of things.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is important that there are people who are knowledgeable, not only about what we have

in Canada, but what happens in the United States. The Leader of the Liberal Opposition may know all about what happens in the United States, but the Canadian Government, as yet, does not. We are investigating those programs in conjunction with them.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism has just told this House that there are a number of economic development programs in Canada that are going to be debated, and they are going to be discussed, and if it is anything like the Free Trade Agreement we will lose them.

Will this First Minister, or the Acting First Minister, commit today to having the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism table those lists of programs in this House because this Government has been consistently reactive and they need to become pro-active?

**Mr. Ernst:** Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we are doing, being pro-active. If we followed what the Leader of the Opposition wanted to do, we would be sticking our heads in the sand. You do not think the Americans know what these programs are and that they are going to bring them up? We need to be fully knowledgeable. Our negotiators need to be fully knowledgeable when they sit down with the Americans to discuss subsidy withdrawals; but at the same time, we need to know what the Americans are doing, and that is exactly what we are researching at the present time.

\* (1350)

A good example of a hidden subsidy in the United States that is not widely known, for instance, an exporter of poultry products from Chicago received a school lunch contract in exchange for lowering his export prices to Japan in order to compete with their products. Now that is a hidden subsidy, not something that is well known, but those are the kinds of things that we are uncovering in our investigations of those kinds of things. We want to ensure that those are put on the table so that we have fair and reasonable negotiations when they take place.

### Labour Adjustment Funding

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, but this Government has been ostrich-like since the very beginning of the free trade debate. All we have to look at are the trade statistics to realize that Canada is the one that is being beaten badly under FTA.

Can this Minister tell the House today that given their Government has been willing to provide less than 10 cents per worker to labour and business adjustment strategy programs, what funds are they now receiving from the federal Government for labour adjustment and business adjustment in that we were promised those programs during the free trade debate?

**Hon. Jim Ernst (Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism):** Mr. Speaker, so far we have not needed any.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Mr. Speaker, but that is the most incredible statement this Minister has made in this House on this side or that side. We have 7,000 fewer people employed in this province. When will this Government begin to provide leadership and negotiate those programs that were promised to this province and every other province under the Free Trade Agreement?

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Minister of Industry and Trade. Order.

**Mr. Ernst:** Mr. Speaker, when and if those programs need to be accessed, they are available. We have the Liberal Opposition and the NDP Opposition in this House suggesting that everything that occurs in this country is as a result of free trade. The snow falls because of free trade, and all kinds of ridiculous things are being claimed as a result of free trade.

Mr. Speaker, we have no evidence, they have no evidence at all that any job loss so far in this country has occasioned because of free trade.

### Concordia Hospital Extended Care Beds

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, the announcement today by the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) has of course some good news and some bad news as well. We are pleased that after a year and a half of questioning, he has come forward with the Clinic Renewal Program, but we are extremely disappointed with a number of voids in the Capital announcement that we would have expected from the Minister of Health.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I visited the Concordia Hospital and there were patients in the hallway. The overflow section of the emergency ward was overcrowded. It has been running well over 100 percent. The population—(interjection)—and your brother was not very happy, I should tell the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns), your brother was not very happy. Neither were his nurses and neither were the doctors in the ward of the hospital.

My question to the Minister is: given the fact that the Concordia Hospital has the third largest volume of admissions for the emergency ward of any hospital in Manitoba, why has the Minister not approved the needed 60 extended care beds that would free up the overflow and the beds in the hallways that carry many patients—many of which are elderly—this morning?

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my honourable friend, the Leader of the New Democratic Party's new-found outrage at Concordia Hospital. Maybe my honourable friend ought to explain to the Executive Director, Mr. Enns, and the doctors and the nurses there, why in 1981 with the election of a Pawley Government they reduced the proposed size of Concordia Hospital committed by this Government in 1981. They cut the size of Concordia Hospital. Would my honourable friend care to answer to those doctors and nurses and Mr. Enns, the Executive

Director, why they froze the Capital budget in 1987 when he was in the Cabinet?

\* (1355)

Mr. Speaker, the answer is very, very deliberate and very reasoned and very rational. We are awaiting the report of the Health Advisory Network which hopefully will guide us in terms of Capital redevelopment at municipal hospitals, Concordia Hospital and Grace Hospital, all projects that were before Government for a number of years. We intend to make decisions for the people similar to the \$240 million of announcements today which are projects for the people of Manitoba.

### Health Advisory Network Report Delay

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** It is like dealing with a Stalinistic communication technique dealing with this Minister. The Minister knows that there were hundreds of personal care beds built in that area. There were senior citizen homes built. There were new emergency sections and the architectural drawings, according to the administrative director of the hospital, the brother of the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns), had already been completed when this Minister came to office and froze the health care facility with an increasing population.

My question to the Minister is: a year ago I asked him the same question about the Concordia Hospital and he indicated that it would be held up by the so-called Health Advisory Council. How can he possibly allow this group that he established nine months after they were elected to continue to hold up needed health care facilities and allow patients to be sitting in the hallway, overflowing in the overflow sections of the emergency wards, and not being cared for in the terms of our health care facilities?

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** Mr. Speaker, I might remind my honourable friend, the New Democratic Party Leader, that on May 9 when I was sworn in as Minister of Health for the Province of Manitoba, the Capital budget had been frozen in the province for the previous nine months by his Government, including the construction project for Concordia.

If this was a priority, a new-found priority of my honourable friend and the New Democratic Party, why did he as Government allow it to be frozen, cut back in 1981, frozen in 1987? My answer is very, very clear. We will make decisions in a reasoned manner with the Health Advisory Network's report expected shortly. Those decisions will be arrived at in a reasoned fashion with full consultation with the community.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a substantially different approach than an outright freeze of the Capital budget we inherited May 9, 1988.

Tuesday, November 21, 1989

### Deer Lodge Hospital Extended Care Beds

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, this Minister has continually mislead the people of Manitoba about a freeze. I have the Capital budget approvals. There is only one thing that has been frozen. It is 85 beds that we built and he will not put in the operating staff at Deer Lodge Hospital. If we froze it, why were the beds built? Why does this Minister not open those extended care beds, and why does he keep misleading the people of Manitoba about needed extended care beds in the Province of Manitoba?

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** Mr. Speaker, it is with some amusement that I react to the feigned outrage of my honourable friend, the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer), who in his last eight questions has misled the House seven times. Seven times in the issue of health care out of eight he has not had proper information. I do not expect him to be any more accurate this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend makes a very, very legitimate point at Deer Lodge. There are 88 beds awaiting staffing for which budget is in place, for which we intend to staff for the most appropriate use because they could become personal care home beds, extended treatment beds, chronic care beds, rehabilitative beds. All of them require a different staffing mix. Surely my honourable friend would not suggest we staff and open those beds inappropriately whilst we have a Health Advisory Network task force telling us and directing us and guiding us in the needs of the system.

### Health Care Facilities Extended Care Beds

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** Would the Minister please be accountable and start showing some stewardship of the extended care chaos in this city? We have the Municipal Hospital situation that has not been resolved by this Minister, we have the situation of the 85 beds at Deer Lodge Hospital that we built and he will not open, and we have Concordia Hospital, the fastest growing hospital in the city, that needs and had approved 60 extended care beds that he will not approve.

Will the Minister please be accountable and tell the people of Manitoba how he is going to provide those needed extended care beds in this chaotic situation where beds are built and not operating, and other beds we do not know where they are going to be going?

\* (1400)

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** Mr. Speaker, I will put my record and this Government's record on the line any time. Only in the history of the Province of Manitoba under the NDP Government, Howard Pawley, Premier, this man as a Treasury Bench Member, were 112 beds in the Winnipeg hospital system ordered to be closed permanently as a budgetary cost-saving measure. The first time in the history of the

Province of Manitoba a Government has ordered hospital beds closed. In the the last two Capital budgets, this one and the preceding one, there are in excess of 280 new personal care home beds committed to serve the people of Manitoba. That is the way we resolve problems in the Progressive Conservative Government.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

### St. Boniface Hospital Maternity Ward Expansion

**Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan):** Mr. Speaker, finally after 18 months of pressure from this Opposition, the Minister is moving in the right direction. However, we have a major concern in regard to the Municipal Hospitals, Concordia Hospital and St. Boniface Hospital.

In this House we have raised the issue about St. Boniface Hospital at least eight times and 25 times that unit has been closed, and the Minister promised last year that he is going to look into the situation. Can he tell this House today why he has not included the Capital expenditure for the post-partum ward at St. Boniface hospital?

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** Mr. Speaker, for the simple reason that the hospital participating group has not provided me with their recommendations on the obstetric services at St. Boniface Hospital. Surely, my honourable friend would not want me to move without the value of that expert advice from physicians at St. Boniface, Health Sciences Centre, and within the system.

I simply want to ask my honourable friend, would he have wanted us to remove the \$35 million at St. Boniface which is going to allow the reconstruction of the surgery in the west-end project class? Would my honourable friend want us to remove the over \$6 million investment in cancer treatment by the installation of a new radiotherapy machine? Surely my honourable friend is not saying those projects are not important projects to the people of Manitoba.

### Ambulatory Care

**Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan):** Mr. Speaker, it has been shown over and over that tax dollars can be saved by increasing ambulatory care. Can the Minister of Health tell us why he has not included the Capital expenditure for the ambulatory care in community hospitals?

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** Mr. Speaker, the ambulatory care project at St. Boniface is one which will accomplish several agendas within the Health Sciences Centre complex.

First of all, a number of programs are scattered inappropriately throughout the sizable complex of Health Sciences Centre, and as a result patient convenience and service delivery is not optimum. The committed construction of approximately \$18 million

for the ambulatory care project at the Health Sciences Centre brings those together to offer to Manitobans an enhanced level of service and, as my honourable friend's Leader so heartily endorsed in the throne speech, to place the Health Sciences Centre as one of the leading teaching hospitals in Canada as a result of this investment.

### Concordia Hospital Extended Care Beds

**Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan):** Mr. Speaker, this Minister has ignored the northeast part of Winnipeg. Can the Minister of Health assure the communities of Transcona, Elmwood, St. Paul, East and North Kildonan that the 60-bed extended care facilities at Concordia Hospital will be provided in this year's budget?

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** Mr. Speaker, I refer my honourable friend to Schedule 4 of the Capital Estimates wherein those—and Concordia Hospital, by alphabetical arrangement as well as concern, is placed as one of the first facilities, Concordia Hospital 60-bed extended treatment project awaiting Government review pending a soon-to-be-tabled-with Government report of the Health Advisory Network which will guide us on the over 500 beds that have been proposed as individual facilities throughout the system. That was what we inherited, individual facility promises of certain construction projects subsequently frozen by the previous administration but without a systems approach involved.

We intend to make reasonable decisions to benefit the system of health care delivery in Manitoba and we will continue to do that.

\* (14 10)

### Health Care Funding Out-of-Province Treatment

**Mr. Gilles Roch (Springfield):** It is unfortunate that I have to bring a young child's point of ill health to the House today. It is a young boy in my constituency who has a crippling disease which causes recurring growths in his left ear.

After several visits to specialists in the Province of Manitoba, he was finally referred to a doctor in the United States. He has been undergoing medical attention for this problem for almost three years with a medical specialist in Minneapolis. As a matter of fact, he is there now as I speak. When you add up the bills incurred by his parents during these past years, it amounts to thousands and thousands of dollars.

When it came time to pay the bills the Manitoba Health Services Commission was reluctant to come through with payment. When they did it was long overdue and never anywhere close to the actual costs incurred.

My question to the Minister of Health is given the fact that this child's parents are on the brink of bankruptcy due to the tremendous amount of money

they have had to spend to maintain their child's life and health, why will this Government not compensate his family for all the costs having been incurred through absolutely no fault of their own?

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** I missed my honourable friend's preamble, and I will have to take that question as notice.

**Mr. Roch:** It is unfortunate that this serious incident was not important enough for the Minister to be listening to. He had to instead involve himself with some political banter with the New Democratic Party.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

\*\*\*\*\*

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Acting Government House Leader, on a point of order.

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs):** It would have been more appropriate if the Member would have identified the Minister he was asking the question of prior to entering into the preamble. One has to be somewhat fair in this Legislature, and I am surprised at the Member not identifying the Minister who he wanted to ask the question of.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Order, please. The Honourable Opposition Acting Government House Leader, on the same point of order.

**Mr. John Angus (St. Norbert):** On the same point of order, the facts are that if the Minister was not babbling across the aisle and congratulating himself with his cohorts, he would have heard the question clearly and been able to address it.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Order, please. That has absolutely nothing to do with the point of order. The Honourable Member for Thompson, on the same point of order.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Second Opposition House Leader):** I believe our rules are quite clear in Beauchesne's in terms of the fact that questions are directed at the Government. Opposition Members have no ability to require any particular Member on the Government side to answer. In fact it is quite common. We have seen it happen where the Premier will answer questions that were directed at specific Ministers, so I do believe that the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) was not correct in terms of the proper protocol. I think it was a rather unfair comment in terms of the Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch).

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Honourable Member for Thompson is quite correct where questions are directed at the Government.



Tuesday, November 21, 1989

### Health Care User Fees

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Springfield, with a supplementary question, please.

**Mr. Gilles Roch (Springfield):** My question is to the Minister of Health. It appears that user fees are being forced upon this family as well as many others, which goes against the principle that all Manitobans should have equal access to proper health care services without suffering any financial hardships. Why is this Government allowing the Manitoba Health Services Commission to contribute to these hardships?

\* (1420)

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** I have indicated to my honourable friend that I will take his question as notice. I am unaware of the circumstances that he is bringing to me because my honourable friend has not to my knowledge indicated anybody's name involved here. So I am not familiar with the case, the type of treatment involved, the circumstances of the Manitoba Health Services Commission's obvious response to my honourable friend's constituent. I can hardly—

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Honourable Minister took the question as notice. The Honourable Member for Springfield.

**Mr. Roch:** The Minister is very familiar with the situation. I have a letter from him in this particular case.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**An Honourable Member:** Wrong again.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

### Health Care Funding Extended Payment Plans

**Mr. Gilles Roch (Springfield):** Unfortunately, he does not want to act upon it. Surely we do not want to let Manitoban families go broke simply because they want their child to lead a normal healthy life?

Will the Minister permit the Manitoba Health Services Commission to pay more than his normal benefits in order to relieve his demonstrated financial hardships, because of the fact that necessary care and treatment could not be provided in Manitoba as is permitted in The Health Services Insurance Act?

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** My honourable friend has obviously found the successful lead of the Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake) in already having letters. I answer letters to Members of the Legislature all the time. I even answered a letter to my honourable friend from Springfield, to one of his constituents.

The information that I provided would have been indicating the amount of financial commitment that can be made to provide services to his constituent. There are instances where if services are beyond what Government provides, for instance, at the announcement of the Bone Marrow Transplant Program at the Health Sciences Centre some two weeks ago, one of the people that were there received their bone marrow transplant in Vancouver. The community provided fund-raising support so the family could attend with the mother while the operation proceeded. That is not something that the insured services of Manitoba provides as part of their funding program and the community fell in and provided that needed support to the family. That is not an unusual circumstance but nothing has changed in terms of our support to insured programs to the people of Manitoba. We make sure they get them.

### Health Care Facilities Bed Closure Policy

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** My question is to the Minister of Health. The Minister has a great deal of problems listening to some of the grass-roots concerns in terms of health in this province. I think that was clearly indicated by the release of the Capital budget, which has put three major projects on hold pending the review of the Health Advisory Network. This is, incidentally, the Health Advisory Network which the Minister spent \$58 out of a budget of \$500,000 last year. That indicates the priority given the Health Advisory Network and the studies.

Similarly, the Minister has dismissed concerns in regard to hospital bed closures over the holiday period, despite the fact that the Manitoba Organization of Nurses' Association has now identified two further hospitals and has indicated a great deal of concern about lengthy emergency department waiting lists, particularly in the City of Winnipeg.

I would like to table a copy of the letter they sent to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). I would like to ask the Minister of Health, when is he going to deal with the concerns that are being expressed by the grass-roots providers of health care in this province, and particularly in regard to the hospital bed closure if it is the holiday period—start listening to the nurses and the patients of this province and saying, there are going to be problems unless the Minister gets involved directly in this matter.

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** Mr. Speaker, this is the same issue that my honourable friend's Leader raised on Friday attempting to create the impression that this was a new phenomenon caused by some directive by myself, as the Minister of Health.

Christmas closures routinely happen and have happened at practically all of the major hospitals in Winnipeg, some as far back as 1972. It happens because at Christmastime several phenomenon converge, first of all, patients decide not to take elective surgery to be in hospital over the holiday season; staff from time to time decide, whether it be nursing staff, support

staff, or physicians, that they do not wish to practise extensively during the holiday season and are not available to deliver services.

So for a number of years, hospitals have routinely temporarily closed a number of beds over the Christmas season to match the demand in the system with their hospital beds. If my honourable friend from Thompson is suggesting that the NDP policy is to staff empty hospital beds, then he is indeed wasteful.

**Mr. Ashton:** Mr. Speaker, why, given the fact that the Nurses' Association themselves are saying that the emergency wards are bursting at the seams—that is a direct quote from the nursing association—why will the Minister not recognize the fact that he needs to sit down with the Nurses' Association, talk to the grass-roots providers of medical care and not put his head in the sand on this particular problem in the health care system?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my honourable friend, the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), there has been ongoing and substantive discussion with MONA between my office and their association. Now that is why, for instance, in the Capital program at Grace Hospital there is a substantial redesign, renovation and complete reconstruction of the emergency area to help accommodate the patient demand at the emergency of that hospital. That is part of the solution and the answer to the problem. In a very reasoned manner we are approaching that.

**Mr. Ashton:** I have another question, Mr. Speaker. Why is the Minister not listening to the advice of the Nurses' Association? Why does he continue to appoint a direct representative in terms of the Health Advisory Network? Why is the Minister not listening to the nurses at Concordia Hospital, Grace Hospital, the Winnipeg Municipal Hospitals? Why is he not getting out there and checking with the problems himself because he would see this kind of delay is absolutely unacceptable as far as the grass-roots providers of medical care in this province are concerned?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Speaker, I realize my honourable friend, the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), has been rather weak in his analysis of the health care system, and he obviously has not been keeping up with announcements by this Government.

He claims on one hand that we do not take the advice of MONA and the practising nurses. Mr. Speaker, the \$10 million Health Services Development Fund has an advisory committee. I am proud to say that Vera Chernecki, the president of MONA, is sitting on that to provide advice on the reform of the system to the people of Manitoba. Now if that is not direct involvement by MONA, by the M-O-N-A, in this Government, in seeking their advice on the reform of the system, then my honourable friend is baying to the moon.

## The Pines Project Environmental Impact Study

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings). Yesterday, after months of pressure from this Party and environmentalists around this province, the Minister announced that an environmental impact assessment would indeed be done on the Charleswood bridge. The day before yesterday he almost made good on a promise made to me a couple of months ago to do an environmental impact assessment on the proposed Omands Creek development, and I look forward to a confirmation of exactly what he meant in that announcement.

There is one noticeable omission and that is the Pines Development, which proposes commercial development on the banks of the Assiniboine River in St. James.

Mr. Speaker, will the Minister today be consistent and commit to ordering an environmental impact assessment on the Pines Development, which has already been approved by City Hall without an environmental impact assessment?

\* (1420)

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit surprised that the Opposition would all of a sudden want to take claim for a very serious matter, in which we have given considerable reconsideration on the situation regarding the Charleswood bridge. That assessment was decided upon after we had received a second legal opinion that referred to some technicalities within the Act.

Mr. Speaker, the message that has to get out to the public in relationship to these two projects is that there should not be a need for the province to consistently be in the pocket of the City of Winnipeg on these types of issues. We are setting about today to work with the City of Winnipeg to develop a process whereby their process will be considered equivalent, and there will be no question about whether or not the province has to second guess whether or not the City of Winnipeg has done correct environmental assessment.

\* (1430)

**Mr. Edwards:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I can tell the Minister that the City of Winnipeg has approved the Pines Development without any environmental impact assessment.

Will the Minister today be consistent, as I have asked earlier, and come forward with an environmental impact assessment order for the Pines Development, which proposes strip malls on the banks of the Assiniboine River in St. James?

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Speaker, I hear some banter from the back rows of the Liberal Opposition talking about problems in relationship to this development being in the flight path. There are lots of relationships and controls that can be brought into play to control

developments that are deemed detrimental to airports. What we have here is an example of an Opposition that has only one thing in mind, and that is to raise concern and fears unnecessarily every time we see something that might be remotely connected with a bit of publicity.

**Some Honourable Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please.

### The Pines Project Airport Protection

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister has raised another environmental concern in my constituency, that is the problem of airport noise. Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Albert Driedger) or if the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings) wants to take it he certainly can. How does this Minister expect to accurately study the effects of new development around the airport when he has not guaranteed one resident on the committee that he proposed yesterday, and is he even aware that John Harvard and I established, with the co-operation of the airport -(interjection)-

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Honourable Member for St. James.

**Mr. Edwards:** Is he even aware that the elected representatives of that community established an advisory committee of the residents in co-operation with the airport, and why is there not even one resident guaranteed on his committee which is looking at the effects of new development in St. James?

**Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the Member is coming from because my department -(interjection)-

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

**Mr. Albert Driedger:** As indicated, I do not know where the Member is coming from because my department was actively involved in the citizens committee and made recommendations on that committee that was initially looking at the possibility. What has happened since that time is between the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) and my department that we are moving to protect the Winnipeg airport from the effects of a development. A special advisory committee has been set up to report to the Government by next May. We are concerned about the development along the airport's flight paths and may force the airport to reduce its operations and even move in the future. The committee will be asked to recommend how land in the vicinity of the airport can be developed without causing any problems for the airport's operation.

### Manitoba Telephone System Jurisdictional Control

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) has time for one short question.

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, we are fast approaching a crisis in the Telephone System in this province as a result of the federal autocratic takeover of the regulation of telephones in this country. Nearly 54 cents of every dollar, revenue that the Telephone System derives, is from long distance rates and yet this current Government is not putting forward a desperate effort on behalf of Manitobans to ensure that this does not take place. I ask a question to the Deputy Premier. Will he now admit that this policy his Minister of Telephones has undertaken of what he calls quiet lobbying of his cousins in Ottawa is not working, that this expensive phone booth that they call an office is not getting results, and will he undertake a massive grass-roots campaign of political action and turn this decision around because that is the only language that the federal Government will listen to?

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague as Acting Telephones Minister, I would like the Member to know that the Minister responsible for Telephones (Mr. Findlay), along with his colleagues from western Canada, are in Ottawa today on that very issue putting the case forward for the people of this province.

**Mr. Speaker:** The time for Oral Questions has expired.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder at this time whether I might call the Supply Motion and that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty. I ask that the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) second that.

**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 Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer) in the Chair for the Department of Health; and the Honourable Member for Burrows (Mr. Chornopyski) in the Chair for the Department of Environment.

### CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY—HEALTH

**Mr. Chairman (Harold Gilleshammer):** We will start the discussion of the Health Estimates.

When we last met we were on item 5, the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba: Provides treatment and education services in the field of alcohol and drug abuse. Includes funds for approved programs through community organizations.

Provincial Executive, \$187,700—the Member for Kildonan.

**Tuesday, November 21, 1989**

---

**Mr. Gulzar Cheema (Kildonan):** Mr. Chairperson, if the Minister would agree and talk to the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), he would like to ask him questions on the capital expenditure if it is okay with him.

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** On what?

**Mr. Cheema:** On the capital expenditure for 1989 and 1990.

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Chairman, I would be more than pleased to do that, but we have staff from the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba here who have been here for two different days. Let us proceed with the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba and then we can get to the capital budget.

**Mr. Chairman:** We should proceed through these line by line.

Item 5, the first item is Provincial Executive—the Member for Kildonan.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, can the Minister of Health tell us, because during the Question Period there was a question raised in regard to the federal program, federal initiatives on a cost-sharing basis for the treatment of drug abuse and alcohol abuse in Manitoba. The Minister said he would provide the information at a later date. Could he provide the information today?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Chairman, the NDS, the National Drug Strategy, provides to the Province of Manitoba the opportunity to cost-share on a residential treatment program. We wish to access and to target that fund with an appropriate proposal and we are not in a position to indicate, we are just simply not in a position, we do not have everything finalized to make an announcement in terms of a youth treatment centre proposal which would allow us access to that fund.

**Mr. Cheema:** Can the Minister of Health indicate to us, what is the exact amount this Government can have from the federal Government to start this youth treatment centre program?

**Mr. Orchard:** We have a \$1,531,000 total commitment that we can access from the federal NDS.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, for the last 18 months how much money has this office taken advantage from this fund?

**Mr. Orchard:** As I indicated to my honourable friend, we have not made application to the program because you cannot use any existing program, you cannot use any new initiatives in terms of education and prevention programs. It must be residential treatment.

We have not been able to access the Residential Treatment Fund because we have not implemented any new residential treatment programs for youth which would allow us to access the fund. That is the exact program that we are diligently working on to attempt

to come to a good proposal to present to the federal Government for accessing cost-sharing.

**Mr. Cheema:** It has been 18 months, almost 19 months now, and certainly a few months are required to develop planning, and certainly for the last few months even, in spite of not only the Opposition but in the media there has been major news, and when we can at least tap some money out of \$1.5 million. Why has the Government not developed a plan so far?

\* (1500)

**Mr. Orchard:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the money has not disappeared, the money is available to the province. We have discussed this time and time again when my honourable friends approach us and say, you have money available, spend it. Now I know my honourable friend is not meaning to say that, but that is the natural conclusion one draws, that because the federal Government is going to give us a 50-cent dollar we ought to spend the dollar simply because it is a 50-cent dollar.

I point out to my honourable friend that is the way a lot of federal cost-sharing programs have gone, federal Governments of both political stripes, the Progressive Conservative current and the Liberal previous, and then all of a sudden after the province has accessed the monies the federal Government backs away. Ottawa is a long ways away for the people to protest. Where do they come asking for the other 50 cents on the dollar? Right to the steps of the Legislature.

So the existence of 50-cent federal dollars is approached by myself, after 12 years of experience, with caution. I am not going to go out and spend them because they exist, I am going to spend them because they meet a need and we are able to develop a program to effectively deliver services based on those dollars. I do it with my eyes wide open that the eventual outcome I expect from the federal Government, whether it be two, three or four years down the road, the province will assume 100 percent of the operating costs. I do that with a wide open knowledge that that is a very real possibility based on past experience.

Mr. Chairman, I have told my honourable friend that we are working on a project of youth residential treatment inclusive of some enhanced out-patient treatment services. We are not ready to announce that program. Hence, not being ready to announce it, we can hardly approach the federal Government to access funds without a mature program even though the federal Government is saying, here is the money, spend it. They want to know how, in what manner, in what new program, and we have not been able to present them with a mature policy and program to this date, but we will.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, I completely disagree with the Minister. The Minister is saying we have to have a need. The need is there. The planning has to come from the Minister's office, but why after six months of pressure from the Opposition and also from the media, why have they not developed a program? A

**Tuesday, November 21, 1989**

---

simple question, why have they not developed a program?

**Mr. Orchard:** With all the due respect I can muster to my honourable friend, we do not simply do things because you happen to suggest them or you happen to pressure. You also pressured us to reinstate funding for the In Vitro Fertilization Program and we will not do that.

We have not said there is no need. We have said we have not arrived at a policy and a program which will adequately, in our opinion as Government, meet the needs and access the federal funds. We are not going to rush out and say here is a program, give us the money. The federal Government might say no, but number two, we want to make sure we are using the dollars in a very, very effective fashion. I suspect that several years down the road, regardless of which political Party may govern in Ottawa, those 50-cent dollars will become 100 percent provincial dollars. It has been the history of the past, and I do not see any reason why this one—there are no long-term guarantees in this program either.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, can the Minister at least indicate when did he communicate with the AFM to start initiatives to have such a program in Manitoba?

**Mr. Orchard:** A number of months ago, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, can the Minister of Health share with us the communication he had with the AFM for such a program?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Chairman, one of the first discussions—let us go right back to either May or early June of 1988. One of the first discussions I had with the chairman of the board, and I am not certain if the executive director was at that discussion or not, I simply cannot remember whether he was there, but certainly the chairman of the board was. I said one of the priorities of this Government is going to be an enhanced level of youth drug education, because I am concerned about addictive illegal substances as they can inflict permanent damage on the lives of youth. It is from that moment on that we have been attempting to develop an appropriate approach function and program. I simply say to my honourable friend, those discussions will yield a fruitful program for the people of Manitoba and more importantly for the youth of Manitoba.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, can the Minister table the communication he had with the AFM to develop such a program?

**Mr. Orchard:** It is like a telephone call, Mr. Chairman. I cannot table telephone calls. Conversations are hardly able to be tabled.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, are decisions made in this department, such a major decision, only on a phone conversation?

**Mr. Orchard:** No, Mr. Chairman, they are made in direct conversation across the desk.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, can the Minister indicate to us, a simple question, when those decisions were made?

**Mr. Orchard:** What decisions?

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, the decision to implement the program for the youth treatment centre and to have access to the federal money.

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Chairman, I have been indicating to my honourable friend since this questioning started this afternoon that we are developing a proposal which we think will meet the criterion for accessing the federal funds. That program is not finalized and has not been decided upon. It is very much in the act of planning and discussion stages.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, can the Minister tell us when we should expect a final proposal from his department?

**Mr. Orchard:** I am hopeful to have that done in the near future, but I was also hopeful of having that done as of the near future a year ago.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, what does the Minister mean by near future? How many months will it take?

**Mr. Orchard:** I can only hazard a guess. It will take several months, I would suspect.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, can the Minister of Health tell us how many new programs for the prevention services to youth have been initiated other than what the proposal has been on the table as we have discussed recently?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Chairman, there has been a number of approaches that are new initiatives. One that I think is particularly valuable is the support to the Manitoba High School Athletic Association. It is modest support from the AFM in terms of providing \$45,000 to assist the Manitoba High School Athletic Association in delivery of the target program into the schools. That has been of some significant success I think, but, Mr. Chairman, let my honourable friend know that the AFM is not alone and Government is not alone in terms of delivering this message to the youth of Manitoba.

\* (1510)

Many concerned and community-oriented groups such as service clubs and professional organizations and the police forces have pro-actively pursued with their own resources and with only moral support of Government and the AFM to bring a message to the youth of Manitoba, be it through posters, be it through co-sponsoring with prominent Winnipeg Jets for instance in the "score goals not drugs" poster.

A substantial amount of work is being done in the communities with school-age children outside of Government. That in many ways forms one of the key components of the Partners for Health, Partners in Drug Prevention Program that we believe is a significant

**Tuesday, November 21, 1989**

---

direction that we ought to be taking to harness that activity, that desire to contribute to resolution of youth drug addiction problems and prevention and education programs. That has been a significant effort of encouragement to various groups throughout the Province of Manitoba. So the Government and the AFM is not working in isolation by any means, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, can the Minister of Health tell us what are the programs they have initiated for the Native youths to deal with the drug problem?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, can my honourable friend just—

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, can the Minister of Health tell us what are the new programs to deal with drug problems for Native youths?

**Mr. Orchard:** In terms of Native youth, let me deal with—because my honourable friend has now skipped from program to program—his last question first. Youth intervention strategy is being pilot-programmed with five high schools in Manitoba; one in Thompson; one in Selkirk; and three in Winnipeg, the R. B. Russell Collegiate, the Dakota Collegiate, and the Kildonan East Collegiate.

This involves assessing students in the school and referring them to education and peer programs so that the students themselves deliver on a peer-counselling basis, if you will, those programs or assist in referral to treatment of any of their peer group. That has an involvement with Native youth, obviously, but let me go through some of the other initiatives that have been undertaken this year. The Partners in Prevention Program was a weekend program for youth in developing the teaching-peer activities. Programs were conducted in Thompson with 250 students and in The Pas with 100 students participating.

Again let me indicate to my honourable friend the value in my estimation of this program. This is not a civil servant in a suit and tie coming out to talk to high school students. I am from the Government and I am here to help you. That is not happening. What is happening here is students are being given the opportunity to help their fellows in the classroom and in the community with peer education and the opportunity for peer counselling. That example of not doing drugs, not getting involved with alcohol abuse, from peer to peer is a much more effective message, I am sure my honourable friend would agree, than parents saying to their children, you ought to be cautious, because parents traditionally tend to be ignored by teenagers and preteens. That is traditional, that has gone on for years.

It is a better message, with all due respect to my colleague beside me in the Chair, than the message that can be often delivered by school counsellors, teachers, trustees in the school system. We are bringing that program so that students advise students and by their example show that you do not have to be on drugs or drinking booze to be cool and to be one of the leaders in the school community. That example by itself

I think is a much more effective prevention program than anything that Government can do through Civil Service entry into the school system.

Teens Against Drinking and Driving, TADD is the acronym. The AFM played a major part in helping to organize a weekend conference in April, 1989, in Winnipeg wherein 200 youth from across Manitoba attended. This was co-ordinated by the Manitoba Association of School Trustees. Regional conferences have been held in Thompson, Brandon, Dauphin, and Winnipeg in 1989, again another very successful program involving students helping students.

We held a one-week workshop at St. Benedict's Academy in the Selkirk area addressing alcohol and drug issues and community concerns. Approximately 85 persons attended. That was in April of 1989, called the Recovery Path Conference for Selkirk and area persons.

Student Match—this preventative program matches senior high and elementary students in a peer learning program, again students working with students. These programs are offered in Thompson and Dauphin with the school district.

One to One, another program, is a one-week peer education program held in late June at St. John's-Ravenscourt School. The program was sponsored by the Kiwanis Club of south Winnipeg and accommodated 60 high school students from 27 different schools. It is planned again for this June because of its success. Those are some of the new initiatives that are being undertaken by the AFM in terms of youth drug and alcohol prevention programs.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, could the Minister provide a response to my second question about the program for the Native youth.

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Chairman, I indicated to my honourable friend that the youth intervention strategy, particularly the one at R. B. Russell was highly involved with Native youth from all over. The Natives from all areas participated in that one, but all of the initiatives that we have had have Native students as participants where they are part of those school districts. That is the case in Thompson, Dauphin, and The Pas.

So there is not a Native program here and a white student program here. I mean, they are there together as peers, but all of the programs are involved with Natives as well as with white youth, if you will.

**Mr. Cheema:** It is a well-known fact that on the reserves the problem with their drug abuse and alcohol abuse is not uncommon. Some of the programs are started by the federal Government. Can the Minister of Health tell us, what is the co-ordination between those programs and the provincial programs?

**Mr. Orchard:** Well, strictly on-reserve programs I do not believe we get involved to any degree in the on-reserve programs, but in terms of Native youth where they are in the school systems throughout the province, certainly they are equal partners in any of the programs that we bring forward.

Tuesday, November 21, 1989

**Mr. Chairman:** Shall the item pass—the Member for Thompson.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** I have a question. I know the Member for Kildonan got into the whole question in terms of drug programs. I think the NDP, we also have the concern about the need to move in this particular area. What I would like to ask the Minister is for an update in regard to the initiative allowance last year as part of the AFM funding, the youth alcohol and drug abuse program. In particular I ask the status of that program and what funding criteria have been established for that program?

**Mr. Orchard:** We developed some funding criteria and approaches approximately six or eight weeks ago. At the AFM we had a meeting with a number of individuals who are involved in the community to give us feedback as to how valuable and how appropriate the \$100,000 initiative and the initial proposal of Government would be in terms of meeting and making effective use of that resource.

\* (1520)

We have received feedback. To date I have not had the opportunity to review the compiled feedback and comment from those organizations that we invited to the, I guess you might say, the prescreening of that program. Therefore, I cannot indicate whether we will change the direction that we had in general proposed to those groups, but we were proposing a smaller contribution so it was accessible to a wide variety of groups across the province, not necessarily that you had to have substantive resources to access the program.

We invited the opportunity to seek community participation in terms of matching dollars. I simply cannot answer at this stage of the game as to whether that general approach was endorsed in total, in part, or not at all by the groups that we consulted with in terms of presenting to them that program development some six to eight weeks ago.

**Mr. Ashton:** So we are really not even at the stage of beginning this program at the current point in time in spite of the fact that it was announced last year. The criteria have not been set for the program.

**Mr. Orchard:** The program criteria have been developed, but to make sure that we were achieving a reasonable goal in the program we invited community groups involved in youth drug and alcohol programming throughout the province and the City of Winnipeg to give us feedback on whether our criteria would hit the mark. I have not had an opportunity to review that feedback to see whether we will significantly change, make minor change, or not change at all the proposal we put to them.

No, the guidelines have not been finalized and announced because of two things, the community consultation program and the feedback required. Second, I have to indicate to my honourable friend I have been substantially occupied in the Estimate process for eight weeks now.

**Mr. Ashton:** Have we all not—

**Mr. Orchard:** But you do not have to make any decisions.

**Mr. Ashton:** I wish I was in that situation, we might see some different decisions.

I am concerned in this area. This was announced prior to the '88-89 Estimates. What I would like to ask the Minister is when was the community consultation begun if it is not completed at the current time? Why was it not done preferably prior to the announcement itself? If not, why was it not done immediately after this program was developed? Why are we now in November of 1989 just beginning to really get down to setting hard and fast criteria for this program?

**Mr. Orchard:** Because that is how long the process has taken.

**Mr. Ashton:** We make an announcement, it takes a year before we end up even developing the criteria for the program, is that what the Minister is saying? Is that the time line in terms of programming of this nature?

I mean the Minister publicizes this matter fairly extensively. I think the assumption would have been—it was announced for the '88-89 fiscal year. At this rate we are not going to see anything done on this particular program until the next fiscal year. We are only four months away from the end of this current year. Are we going to have to wait until the 1990-1991 year until we have this particular program put in place?

**Mr. Orchard:** Well, Mr. Chairman, let me remind my honourable friend that a commitment to youth, drug and alcohol abuse programming was made in the throne speech, which is an indication of what Government's direction is going to be.

It is similar for instance to the announcement in the throne speech, whenever we resumed the Session after the election in 1988, wherein the throne speech contained a commitment to reverse the previous NDP Government decision to close River House, the only women's treatment centre in the Province of Manitoba for women with substance abuse problems and alcoholism problems. The previous Government was going to close that. We said no, it will not be closed, it will in fact remain open, it will in fact have an enhanced level of service.

I am pleased that today I was joined by my colleagues, the Honourable Gerrie Hammond and the Honourable Charlotte Oleson to participate in that opening of River House and Christie House, a reinstatement of a treatment program cancelled for women by the NDP in 1988, an enhanced level of service again making River House and Christie House leaders in the women's treatment program, not only in in-patient treatment services, but leaders in out-patient treatment services.

Now that program was announced in 1988, in approximately July, in the throne speech. It is now formally up and running as a commitment of Government, because you do not rebuild what others

**Tuesday, November 21, 1989**

---

have attempted to tear down over night. I am pleased that we were able to rebuild River House for the women of Manitoba. That was being torn down brick by brick by the NDP.

**Mr. Ashton:** Mr. Chairperson, it is interesting when you ask the Minister a direct question. I mean he sometimes will come up with answers that have no relation to the question that has been asked. I found it interesting today when he did not quite understand the question from the Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch), because I remember in the House where he said, well, what was the Member's question again and referenced a question of mine and then proceeded to give an answer anyway. I have just seen that replicated today.

I am talking to the Minister about this program and I will ask him directly a very simple question. Maybe the Minister will be able to answer this one. When was this program announced?

**Mr. Orchard:** I believe the concept of the youth drug program was announced at the same time in the throne speech that the reinstatement and enhancement of service at River House was announced in the first throne speech this Government put down in 1988.

I cannot give my honourable friend the exact date because I do not recall when we first came into Session in 1988. The reason I give my honourable friend that answer is that both of them were announcements by Government in the throne speech in July of—whenever—'88.

We have only now been able to rebuild River House and its programming and make the formal announcement today. That was the analogy that I took. It was deemed to be a priority of Government and AFM to rebuild what the NDP was destroying, fix that, repair that, make sure that women's treatment programs were in place and at the same time embark upon the youth program. They were both announced at the same time. One is up and running. The other, the youth program, will be up and running in the near future as well.

**Mr. Ashton:** Well, we came out of Session in July of 1988, and this was announced for November 1989, and now in the "near future" we will see this.

This Minister seems to have a habit of doing this. I find it interesting and we will get into this when we get into the capital budgets that the reference is made to the Health Advisory Network as being the key element behind any decision in regard to three very important capital expenditures in the City of Winnipeg. This is the same Health Advisory Network the Minister spent \$58 out of last year out of a budget of \$500,000.00.

It seems the Minister likes to announce things. We have seen this same thing from the Minister in regard to the trust fund that he has developed. I do not know how many times the Minister has announced it, but we have seen he is now finally sitting down to develop criteria. I mean the Minister is consistent, consistent, I will give him that. He is consistent in delaying and making announcements and then making further announcements.

I think this Minister should get the recycling award for Manitoba, and if there is not such an award we should create one specially for him. I am going to suggest that to the Minister responsible for the Environment (Mr. Cummings), because this Minister has recycled more announcements than any other Minister in the history of Manitoba, and yet he still, as he is faced and asked very direct questions, does not deal with a very straight fact.

Let us ask him directly. I would hope we have had enough announcements on this. The Minister said, in the near future. Can the Minister indicate what that means?

Will we see this in place this fiscal year, which ends the end of March, 1990, or are we looking at the next fiscal year before we see any funds flow from this much ballyhooed announcement. I mean it was made a part of the throne speech, as the Minister himself pointed out, in 1988, July of 1988. I am surprised the Minister does not have that date etched in his memory, July 21, I am advised, this was announced by the throne speech. Presumably this was forwarded for inclusion in the throne speech at the request of the Minister himself. You know when this was announced and here we are the tail end of the '89-90 fiscal year, I think people could legitimately ask the Minister—we are dealing with a youth alcohol and drug initiative here. It is a major concern out there in the community.

I think they are going to ask, what does the near future mean? When are we going to see funds flow from this particular budgeted item, an item that was announced in the fiscal year 1988-89. When is the near future, Mr. Minister?

\* (1530)

**Mr. Orchard:** The near future is just as the words state, near future. I can get my honourable friend a Webster's and he can choose for himself and he can put his own words on it. In the near future there will be a program announcement. Mr. Chairman, I realize my honourable friend is a little bit frustrated. He does not like progress when he sees progress, because my honourable friend is a critic, and a carping critic at that, who does not understand the system.

My honourable friend sat around in a Government that was going to close River House. We have rebuilt that. It was formally announced today as part of Drug Awareness Week in the Province of Manitoba. I would have thought my honourable friends in the NDP who have used the words, the phraseology of how they care for women and women's services, would have had the decency to ask the question today in Question Period, what about River House? We were going to close it, how are you progressing on your promise to reopen it? My NDP friends did not mention anything about River House, because they do not want the women of Manitoba to know they were going to close down the service.

They do not want to tell Manitobans that Christie House has been renovated. A \$74,000 commitment to renovations now provides some of the most sophisticated out-patient services to women in Canada.



My honourable friend does not want to talk about Sun Centre in Brandon, because Mr. Evans, his colleague and his Cabinet, were going to pull and gut the administration of AFM in Brandon. We are now in the process of replacing Sun Centre as a treatment centre in Brandon to serve those clients of the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba. My honourable friend does not want to talk about that.

We deliver when we make commitments and we will deliver on the youth alcohol and drug program in the Province of Manitoba, because our record of delivery happens to be substantially better than any previous Government has ever been able to achieve in 18 short months.

**Mr. Ashton:** Mr. Chairperson, the Minister I know is an expert at filibustering his own Estimates. I asked him a very direct question and I think it is insulting to not the Members of this committee but to the people of Manitoba when he says look up a Webster's Dictionary. The Minister announced this in July of 1988, July of 1988. Now he tells me in November of 1989 to go look in a dictionary and try to decipher his muddled words. I notice he then gets off into various other tangents.

If the Minister would perhaps give the Opposition Critics a bit of a chance here, we will ask him some very pointed questions in terms of what has been happening in terms of the AFM. We will ask some very pointed questions in terms of the Health Services Commission. I do not think the Minister wants that. I think at every opportunity he would love to be able to fill the time on the assumption that he will be able to reduce the amount of time he actually has to answer questions in Health Estimates.

Well, if we have to perhaps ask questions and debate on the concurrence motion, that is our right. It was put in place I know at the request of Members of his Party when they were in Opposition. I suspect that in many ways they were anticipating perhaps the unfortunate day when we have this Minister who likes to on a direct question—I asked him, what does the near future mean. His answer for the record was what? Look up the dictionary. Then he gets off into all sorts of tangents.

If he wants to really look at it, Mr. Chairperson, the bottom line is that in this particular area the Minister has done nothing since July of 1988 to bring in this particular program. I think that is a sad comment, because as I said, the Minister likes to make announcements. The Minister has done nothing in this particular area. That is why I was asking him these very specific questions.

There are many people out there who would like to know, they would like to know the type of criteria they are going to establish, whether there is going to be funding available either on a pilot project basis or whether there will be continuing funding.

I find it interesting that the Minister a few minutes ago was dodging questions from the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) in terms of the federal initiatives as if the only particular reason there had not been any access to the federal funds in this important area was

because they did not want to rush into it. This Minister has announced his own fund and he does not want to rush into it.

As I said, the Minister is consistent but it is in a very, very sad way for this province. A few minutes ago he was almost blaming the lack of access in terms of the federal program on the fact that this might only be pilot project funding, it might not be long-term funding. He has his own program and he does not even know that. He does not have any criteria for it. He is only just getting around to it. Mr. Chairperson, that is absolutely unacceptable on behalf of this Minister.

If he wants to get into debates on health care policy I will be glad to get into it. I have said I will offer to debate him anywhere, anytime in this province. I really think that is perhaps what he should do, because I think the Minister instead of giving smug answers like saying, look it up in the dictionary, should be dealing with some very direct questions in this area. I want to know, and if the Minister wants to know why are the Member is asking questions, I will ask the Minister some questions, some further questions on AFM. I would like to ask him how many staff positions were cut in the current budgetary process and in which sections of AFM. A very straightforward question, and I think we deserve some straight answers from this Minister. How many staff persons were cut, how many SYs, and in which parts of the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Chairman, I will be pleased to provide that information directly to my honourable friend, but my honourable friend surely is not expecting me to allow him to go on his little diatribe and complaint. I realize my honourable friend got a real woodshed spanking for messing up the Capital Program that I gave him last night as a courtesy of the House. His Leader was very upset and was trying to find out who leaked it to the press, and he forgot to ask his critic for Health as to who did it. I understand that is of course the whole basis of my honourable friend's frustration in the Question Period and his tearing of hairs, ranting and raving, and his gnashing of teeth.

Mr. Chairman, I know my honourable friend is a little bit frustrated when I point out to him how they were—

**An Honourable Member:** Yes, but when you cannot tell the truth—

**Mr. Orchard:** Oh, my honourable friend, the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), is really now slipping off the parliamentary line. There is only one individual that I know of who in Thompson goes up to Thompson, speaks to the radio station and deliberately, knowingly, puts false information to the people of Thompson on the radio station. That is only one person I know who has done that, and if my honourable—

\*\*\*\*\*

**Mr. Chairman:** The Member for Thompson, on a point of order.

**Mr. Ashton:** The Minister knows the statements he made are unparliamentary. I get frustrated sometimes

Tuesday, November 21, 1989

when I hear statements that are made by Members, and I apologize to the committee if I expressed that. The Minister made statements, for example, about the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer). I can tell him as Health Critic for the New Democratic Party the first person I spoke to yesterday about the capital analysis, because it was important that it be brought to his attention, was the Member for Concordia. The statements the Minister made before were inaccurate.

I apologize to the committee if, in hearing that, in the heat of the moment I said anything to be even remotely unparliamentary. For the Minister now to turn around and talk about putting deliberate misinformation on the record, first of all that is not an accurate statement. Second of all, it is unparliamentary, and I think that the Minister should withdraw those comments and get back to what we are supposed to be doing in committee, and that is dealing with the questions.

I asked some very specific questions about AFM and staff positions cut. The Minister is not only being unparliamentary, he is being totally out of order by getting into something that was not asked and is not being discussed at this point in the committee.

**Mr. Chairman:** I thank the Honourable Member. You do not have a point of order.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Mr. Orchard:** Not only did my honourable friend not have a point of order, he must be suffering from a guilt complex, because I never indicated that he went up to Thompson and misled the radio station. I said I only know of one Member who did the same, and the next thing I know the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) is protesting. Goodness gracious, does he have such a guilt complex?

\*\*\*\*\*

**Mr. Chairman:** On a point of order, the Member for Thompson.

**Mr. Ashton:** First of all, Mr. Chairperson, it is always in order to draw to the chairperson of the committee any breach of our parliamentary procedure, in particular parliamentary language. I would once again raise that point, and if it is necessary to review Hansard, I would suggest it be done. I realize that we cannot remedy that in committee; that is properly taken by committee. In terms of procedures, raising a question of unparliamentary language is absolutely always in order. I would just like to bring that to your attention.

Second of all, it is not in order. The Minister's current comments are absolutely out of order. He is not answering questions related to AFM. He is a master at trying to put statements on the record and trying to slide them on the record without giving other Members a chance to prove just how ridiculous those statements are. I would point out we are dealing with AFM. I asked some very specific questions in regard to AFM.

I have no guilt complex. If anybody should be guilty I think it is the Minister for wasting the time of this

committee with the kind of personal attacks that we know he is an expert at but which do nothing to answer some very basic questions that were put to him. We are dealing with AFM, Mr. Chairperson. I would ask you to bring the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) to order.

**Mr. Chairman:** I would thank the Honourable Member and I would ask all Members to choose their words carefully.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Chairman, I cannot explain the genesis and the reasons behind my honourable friend from Thompson's emotional and erratic outburst. Only he knows who told the truth and who did not in Thompson. I apologize for my honourable friend if it has tickled his thin skin.

Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend from Thompson was not listening, because he seems to wish to leave the impression that nothing is happening in Government circles, in the community and in AFM regarding youth drug programming. I read out a number of initiatives that have been undertaken this year. Now my honourable friend flops around, throws his pen down as if they are not important. Well, the students that are involved in those, the parents of those students involved in those, think they are very important initiatives that build upon, strengthen the community, peer-group education counselling as I have tried to indicate to my honourable friend.

\* (1540)

Mr. Chairman, I think based on the success of those initiatives outside the youth drug initiative and the \$100,000 funding, we will find similar opportunities for success. I would love to have the program up and running, but that is not a reality I can present to my honourable friend today. It will be.

Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend asked us specific questions about positions. Four positions have been eliminated at the AFM. The four positions are: the director of Planning and Research; an audit co-ordinator position in Planning and Research Directorate; the reorganization of the Winnipeg Region with one manager and two supervisory positions being eliminated; and a building operations unit of Support Services Directorate was phased out. In addition to that, there has been a reassignment of two SYs from supervisory staff to operational positions. The net reduction is four.

**Mr. Ashton:** The question of staffing was raised in the Legislature. Why, at that time, did the Minister indicate there were no cuts in terms of staff in terms of program delivery when in fact I have the Supplementary Information for Legislative Review '88-89 Estimates in front of me and program delivery is reduced by one SY?

Why did the Minister indicate that there were no cuts in terms of Program Delivery in that section of AFM on a question I know from the Member for Kildonan

Tuesday, November 21, 1989

(Mr. Cheema), when in fact the information is contrary to that?

**Mr. Orchard:** For the simple reason that that is a management position in Program Delivery. The programs to people as staffed by individuals working directly with clients, there has been no reduction in the numbers of personnel at the AFM available to undertake that. There has been no reduction in the support funding, in fact there have been increased funding to the various funded agencies which provide direct client services as supported by the AFM. That is why that statement was made and is a correct statement.

**Mr. Ashton:** I have recalled the statement. The Minister is trying to elaborate on it now to get out of the fact that the question was asked in terms of program delivery. The Minister said there was no cuts in that area, and I was quite surprised at that, because in terms of my contacts that I had at AFM I knew at the time it was not the case, so I appreciate the attempt of the Minister now to correct the record on that.

I would like to ask the Minister though, I am looking at the current department, what the bottom line situation is. The four positions were eliminated. I would like to ask the Minister why those positions were not kept in those particular areas within AFM and not put into Program Delivery?

I would like to ask the Minister in particular why the actual resource allocation has been decreased because of those reductions in SYs. I am asking that because I know one of the concerns that has been expressed in terms of AFM—it is all right for the Minister to say, oh, well, these are management positions, they are not going to affect program delivery. But people are not so convinced of that because people are still going to have to perform those functions. I mentioned in terms of program delivery earlier, and there is concern that while it may not show up on the kind of memos that go back and forth at budget time that in fact program delivery will be cut.

I would like to ask the Minister why those four SYs which were cut from this area were not reallocated to AFM in other areas?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Chairman, in striking the budget for AFM a number of options were made available as X budget options, a process that my honourable friend should make himself familiar with because X budget options are requested and have been requested of various organizations across the Government system for opportunities to reduce the level of funding.

Those X budget options were offered to Government. Some of the X budget options offered to Government by the AFM were inclusive of reduced funding to service delivery organizations, which were unacceptable because that was treatment to clients and individuals, and one of the budget options were management staff. We chose the management staff so that programs to people could be enhanced.

Mr. Chairman, that X budget option exercise is not a pleasant one. It was not a pleasant one for the

previous administration where they chose an X budget option, and I know my honourable friend is not going to like me saying this, but I make no apologies to him. When the previous Government chose the X budget option of closing River House, the only women's treatment centre in Manitoba, they chose an X budget option to contain the budget of AFM, which would have reduced the level of service to women in the Province of Manitoba. Last year, we said, no. We reinstated it and enhanced it.

This year when X budget options were presented, the least offensive to program delivery were the management staffing positions as just described. That was a decision arrived at by Government in choosing one of the options for X budget reductions as presented by the board and management of the AFM.

I am not happy with making those kinds of reductions at AFM. No one likes to have the circumstance where you have to make tough decisions and reallocate and phase out staff because you are talking about people, but those decisions are a reality of Government, have been and will continue to be. We chose the route of management reductions rather than program to people reductions, I think a reasonable choice, a more reasonable choice than we inherited in 1988 and if my honourable friend wants to deal with that, we can deal with that too.

**Mr. Ashton:** Mr. Chairperson, in looking at the budget before us in the area of support services there has been a decrease because of the elimination of those two positions from the comparison of the adjusted vote from last year, the current budget. There has been a decrease in terms of program delivery to \$148,000 in terms of program delivery and it is \$66,700.00. The bottom line is the overall budget has been reduced because of those moves by \$212,000.00.

Now the Minister talked about difficult decisions. We have raised in this committee our concerns about such things, for example, last year as the under-expenditure in the Health Department of \$28 million. We have raised debate on the Fiscal Stabilization Fund and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is here and probably noted those comments, that we have ended up in a situation where money is being put away for future years rather than being spent at the current point in time.

\* (1550)

So the real question I think has to be asked and this talks about tough decisions. We are looking at a situation where the fiscal situation of the province, because of a number of factors, the mining industry increases in revenue, and particularly from taxes over the last number of years, have left us in a situation where we can establish a Fiscal Stabilization Fund but here in terms of the AFM we are seeing a cut in terms of those four positions, cuts that are not being rolled into the rest of this very important area but are being absorbed by general revenue and indirectly being put into this Fiscal Stabilization Fund.

Now I asked you a few minutes ago in terms of the youth alcohol and drug initiative which was announced

Tuesday, November 21, 1989

last year and has not yet been expended and I do get concerned. No one is suggesting there are not other initiatives in this particular field, but I do think the legitimate question has to be raised and it has been raised in discussion with myself as to why the Government chose to cut the funds for AFM in this particular area and not allocate it towards other needs in this very important area.

Why, for example, did the Minister not allocate that \$212,000 for additional staff that does program delivery, or in terms of an enhancement and perhaps moving this youth alcohol and drug initiative into reality? We could ask why the Minister has not taken that funding and put it aside to perhaps be used in conjunction with the federal funding that we know was available and the Minister has said he will not access.

Why is the bottom line in terms of AFM that we have seen a reduction in the allocation, why were these four positions not either put into other program positions in terms of delivery, because I still really believe that there will be a loss in terms of program delivery because of this, because the work will be done by other people in that particular department. That is the concern that has been expressed in terms of people I have spoken to, in terms of AFM.

Notwithstanding that, why was the decision not made to put that money into program uses in AFM when there is such a great need in terms of drug and alcohol prevention, detection, treatment? It is an area that is crying for need, especially in the drug area which is rapidly growing to be a major social program, particularly among the young people. Does the Minister not feel that was an error on the part of the Government and that money should not have been put into programs?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend in his unique way makes the exact case of action that Government took. My honourable friend says why did we not put the money into program delivery. That is exactly what is the result of this budget because I explained to my honourable friend, and I realize my honourable friend was not in Treasury Bench before, but he is an intelligent person and he understands budget process. Of the X budgets offered by the AFM, some of those options were inclusive of reduction of services to people. We chose not to accept those, leave the money in those and accept an option of SY reduction at the management level.

Let me take my honourable friend through it step by step because when we deal with Schedule 3 my honourable friend will find that there is a slight reduction in Support Services Directorate of \$7,400; an increase in Program Delivery Directorate of \$136,000; an almost level Provincial Executive because that is where the majority or a significant number of the staffing positions were eliminated. So despite salary increases which are a part of Estimates, the budget there remains relatively constant. The funded agencies received increased support. We can go to the last page my honourable friend was talking from, which I believe was reference No. 4, Appropriation 21-5, Program Delivery Directorate. My honourable friend might note that the FYs in the

managerial level are reduced by one, as I have indicated, management reduction. The professional technical, i.e., those delivering the programs are 123.5 SYs, the same year for year.

My honourable friend might note the administrative support remains constant. So a management position reduction was the reduction here, not delivery of service as I have continued to indicate. My honourable friend might note the \$300,000 commitment to Capital. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is for replacement of the Sun Centre in Brandon, a \$1.1 million commitment by Government, \$300,000 of which we expect to flow this year to renew the facilities to provide a better treatment regime in Brandon, services to people.

I know my honourable friend will want and he can attempt all afternoon to make the argument that what we are doing is just a terrible mistake. That my honourable friend is welcome to his opinion. I just want to tell my honourable friend that the reductions were in management, in programs in clients to the people of Manitoba delivered by AFM are not reduced. They are in fact enhanced as evidenced by some of the new initiatives that staff have undertaken in terms of work with the youth that I have already announced.

My honourable friend in his unique way has made exactly the case that Government decided to accept. Do not reduce services to people and programs to clients and if you have to exercise reductions, management is a much less onerous reduction to make without jeopardizing either the quality or quantity of services to client.

**Mr. Ashton:** The fact remains, Mr. Chairperson, and the concern has been expressed that these reductions in positions will be more than compensated by others who would be involved in other activities performing those functions. I think anybody who looks at any organization has to recognize that will take place under any circumstances, when one, as in this case, eliminates four positions.

Proof of the funded agencies, I raise this again. I raised this concern before that the Minister has not moved with the initiative announced last year. I have gone through in detail the documents the Minister is quoting from, and the money has not all been allocated for example for funded agencies. It is quite the opposite if one looks at the amount of increase in terms of funded agencies. It is substantially lower than the amount that was eliminated from these positions.

I think the more appropriate route to go and the Minister can mix in the Capital if he wants, I am quite aware of the situation with the Sun Centre. It is an 80-year-old facility, I realize the deteriorating condition, and I think when we are dealing with Capital needs, one has to look at the need for that sort of replacement. I believe that is the case generally whether it be in this area or in terms of the MHSC.

I do believe that the Minister, and this is once again in terms of discussion I have had with people who are involved with AFM and who know the system, will find that what will happen is it is not a zero sum game. It is not a situation where cutting these positions will not

have ramifications. Of course it will have ramifications to the individuals suggested. It is my understanding that at least a couple of these positions people are going to be demoted as a result of the budgetary decisions. I would appreciate if the Minister can clarify that. I think it will have ramifications in terms of the operation of the department.

Before the Minister tries to use the old "you make my argument" debating technique, which I think any of us could deal with in terms of that, I think the real concern in terms of AFM and drug and alcohol once again is the need—and I never said before there were no initiatives taking place. I expressed a great deal of disappointment though in the fact that the youth and alcohol drug initiative had not been put into place. I think that is a legitimate criticism, and the Minister would admit to that if he was to really face that issue head-on. It is the same thing I am dealing with in terms of this. The Minister can talk about, well, this activity has been undertaken or this capital expenditure. I believe that the reductions will have an implication in terms of service delivery.

I also believe that there should be a great increase in terms of the funding, especially for outside agencies. Whether it be through this \$100,000 initiative we heard about last year should be put into place, or whether it could be through an enhancement of that, if the Minister is going to make a decision, there will be problems with that I am sure of that. Surely that money should be allocated first and foremost I think to direct program delivery, particularly in terms of outside funded agencies to provide the improved services that we require. That is the criticism. There are a number of various criticisms in actual fact and that is why I raised it.

What I would like to ask the Minister is twofold: one, whether he will review the impact of these cuts in terms of positions and make sure that the problem I feel will develop does not develop, and second of all, whether if the Minister is going to be talking about these tough decisions once again, whether in the future he will commit that if there are similar decisions made that the money will go into direct either program delivery or funding of outside agencies, and I would say in fact almost on a dollar for dollar basis.

\* (1600)

There was an increase in funded agencies support last year, but it was not of the range I think is necessary. In fact the Minister talked in terms of program delivery, you net out the capital, you do not have an increase in that area. I do not think in terms of this Legislature that we should be dealing with capital and operating expenditures as apples and apples or apples and oranges. We deal with that on a consistent basis. Capital and operating expenditures are different.

I think that is something that the Minister should be quite aware of, and that is the fact that you net out the capital and there is no overall increase in the program delivery department. In fact what happens is the impact to the salary changes comes into place. I think that is also if you look at the outside funding

agencies there has been an increase, that is clear, but it has not been an increase of the magnitude of the money that the Government has saved by cutting those four positions, which by my calculations, and the Minister can correct me if I am wrong, is in excess of \$200,000.00. That money has not all gone into the funded agencies and if one nets out the capital is not gone into program delivery.

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Chairman, I fully appreciate that my honourable friend no doubt would have potentially some individuals within the management at the AFM who would indicate to him the loss of these management positions are going to increase their workload. Certainly, that is a given. When you have fewer management positions there is a greater commitment that the individuals remaining have to make.

Mr. Chairman, that may not be popular but that is a reality. It is a reality of the decisions that are made in Government from time to time. These are not exactly minimally paid individuals, these are reasonably paid professionals that we are asking to shoulder a greater load and responsibility. By and large, I believe they are professional and will do that, because they believe the goal of the AFM is to maintain a level of services to the clients, to the people, programs to people. If it means shouldering a larger load amongst a senior executive because of four reductions then so be it. That will happen.

I know my honourable friend will make the case forever and a day and we will agree to disagree. Our priority in this budget cycle was maintenance of the programs to the clients and to the people requiring and needing services from AFM. That may not be a decision that is acceptable to the Health Critic for the New Democratic Party. I accept that. I accept that because that is his job as critic.

When we were in Opposition we disagreed with management reductions in Brandon at Sun Centre. My honourable colleague, the Minister of Northern Affairs, Jim Downey, protested that and had that decision reversed that the previous administration was going to make. My honourable friend, the MLA for Kirkfield Park, Gerrie Hammond, as an Opposition MLA, disagreed with the NDP's decision prior to 1988 to eliminate River House, a decision they made which would have affected services to people. We reinstated that because our priorities are different from the NDP's priorities.

I have said to my honourable friend our priority is services to people. That is why we reinstated River House. That is why we enhanced the capability of outpatient service delivery to the women of Manitoba through Christie House in conjunction with River House. That is why when we were faced with X budget options, we chose management reduction rather than reduction of programs to people. I know my honourable friend has trouble with that, because that is not the decision he made when he was Government. They cut programs to people and left management in place. We chose not to do that. My honourable friend has every right to disagree on that, but I will take the issue of River House and the expanded opportunities for women's treatment at Christie House to any women's group my honourable

friend might want to debate that issue. My honourable friend can put before those women's groups of Manitoba the NDP decision to close River House. I will put forward the Conservative position and promise, delivered on today, of retaining River House and expanding Christie House.

We will see whether the women of Manitoba agree with the NDP policy of cutting program and services to women, or the Conservative policy of reinstating them and enhancing them. I will put that decision and that debate to any women's group my honourable friend wants to challenge me to do. Of course, that is not the kind of debate my honourable friend, the NDP MLA for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) representing his Party, wants to debate in public.

(Mr. Edward Helwer, Acting Chairman, in the Chair)

I stand by the decision that we have announced here. It is a reasonable decision. It is not a decision that any Government likes to make, because no Government likes to make reductions. Every Government would like to increase funding right across the board, but we were unable to do that. Our choice was reductions in management costs, maintenance of programs to people.

**Mr. Ashton:** For the record, the fact that, in terms of the various items, there was an increase, yes, in terms of provincial executive. The bottom line, in terms of support services, there was an overall decrease. In terms of program delivery, once again there was an increase only because of the capital expenditure netting out the capital, there was a decrease in terms of the bottom line, in terms of program delivery. In terms of the funded agencies, there was an increase that took place, as identified here, but not anywhere near in terms of the magnitude of the money that has been saved from these positions.

What I suggested to the Minister—and I can indicate that there has been concern expressed about the fact of those positions, and not by the people involved by the way. I think the Minister should not assume that. This is from other people who are very knowledgeable in terms of AFM, involved with AFM for a considerable period of time, expressed concern by them. The record shows that there has not been this reallocation.

I thought it was unfortunate when the Minister tried to deal in terms of the capital, because I am quite aware of the Sun Centre situation. I indicated, it is a facility that is in need of overhaul, but to mix in the apples and oranges of operating capital, I do not feel it is appropriate.

In terms of actual operating expenditures there has not been an overall reallocation in the funds expended. That is why I will ask the Minister again—by the way in terms of the debate, I have indicated, and I want to put on the record again, I will debate the Minister anywhere, anytime, on terms of health care issues, anywhere in this province. I do not think the Minister should try and suggest I do not debate him. I am more than glad to, anytime, anywhere.

In terms of this particular area, the fact is the money was not allocated, the money that was saved, Mr. Acting

Chairperson. If the Liberals want to join in with a challenge to the Minister of Health, I doubt if the Minister will take us up on the challenge, but if he does we could start as soon as Health Estimates are finished if the Minister wants.

I have a number of places I would like to start with, maybe Concordia Hospital. We will have a debate in front of the staff, board and patients. We could then move to the Municipal Hospital, Grace Hospital—oh, pardon me, we will get into that, we will set the schedule later. Actually we might even want to debate in front of the AFM staff here.

My list is growing here. This could be an interesting debate, you know, province-wide debate. We could parallel the Meech Lake Committee Hearings in terms of dealing with a very important issue across the province.

Be that as it may, I would ask the Minister, once again, if he would undertake to review the impacts of the cuts, and in future budgets whether he would undertake to allocate if there are going to be cuts in terms of staffing, to make sure that those funds are at least, in an equivalent amount, reallocated back into AFM so we do not end up with the current situation, where if you net out the capital expenditure there is a decrease in operating expenditure in every section except—pardon me, the provincial executive is up, it is marginal. I am not suggesting that is anything significant, it is up by \$2000.00, but in the other areas the amount is down.

The bottom line is, the money has been taken out of those various sectors. It has been reallocated towards capital, and unfortunately very little has been put into the funded agencies in comparison to the amount. In fact one dollar out of three has gone into funded agencies of the amount that was saved by these particular cuts.

\* (1610)

I think that if the Minister wants to get the service to people that he talks about, it should be at least of an equivalent nature. In fact I would suggest that the need is growing in this area and I would suggest that this is one area that we need funding put into place, because the record of AFM I think is an excellent one and there are a lot of growing needs, as I mentioned a bit earlier, in terms of the drug program.

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Acting Chairman, before my honourable friend gets too far down the path on his argument, I just want to make sure he understands the difference between last year's budget and this year's budget.

Last year's budget had a 27th pay period, which occurs once in every—how many years?—once in every ten years. Is it? Am I troubling my honourable friend from Thompson with this answer?

**Mr. Ashton:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, I was just talking to the Speaker about an important meeting that I have to attend. I apologize. I do not want to make comments on the record when the Minister has to talk to Members

Tuesday, November 21, 1989

of his staff or his department. I attempt to follow the discussions as fully as possible, but when the Speaker wants to discuss an important meeting which is going to take place in about 20 minutes, I am sorry, I felt it was important because it relates to the Speaker.

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Acting Chairman, before my honourable friend gets on the path that there is a significant reduction in terms of the program and does not understand and would inaccurately communicate that because it is not factual, I want him to understand that last year's budgetary figures contained almost \$337,000 of one-time not-recurring expenses.

Those were made up of a 27th pay period which happens approximately once in every ten years. We had to fund that last year. We do not have to fund it this year. That is a \$230,000 reduction in the salary lines year over year for exactly the same number of people and exactly the same service delivery. So in fact that money, instead of going to a 27th pay period, is going to service enhancement.

In addition to that, there was retroactive pay of almost \$95,000 last year, one time non-recurring. So that last year's budget was \$95,000 higher. What I am telling my honourable friend is that the bottom line is higher this year in terms of actual program delivery because there is \$337,000, 27th pay period, retroactive pay, one time non-recurring, last year's budget, not recurring in this budget. As I have said to my honourable friend earlier, he exactly makes the argument for me, because all of the dollar reductions in the management positions have gone to programs for people.

Now I realize my honourable friend does not like the answer. He is constantly saying he wants direct and straight answers. I have just given him the most direct answer I can involving \$337,000 of funding in salaries last year, which is not this year, not in this year's Estimates, because it is one-time 27th pay period, retroactive pay, and my honourable friend sits there and shakes his head because he does not want to believe it.

So when I give my honourable friend the straight answers that he so pleads for he does not want to accept them. I cannot help that for my honourable friend. I reiterate, the management reductions in salary have resulted in stable programs to the people. There has been no reduction in the programs to the people, contrary to what my honourable friend will try to create in his argument for the reasons I have given him this afternoon.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, my term has come finally. I have heard the comments from the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) and from the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard).

The Minister of Health is saying that the program delivery at the level of the patients or the client has not decreased and that we have eliminated two positions. One is an extremely important position, director of research.

How can the Minister of Health justify eliminating a position which is very crucial for the delivery of any

program, and then say that no, that part is not important, but just the delivery of the care at the client level, which will be definitely impacted for any program. Why does the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba have to be different?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Acting Chairman, let me share with my honourable friend the rationale behind that. There were seven and a half positions in Research and Planning at the AFM administering a budget of some \$10 million for rough figures. I contrast that with the program delivery of the Department of Health and the commission wherein the Research and Planning Directorate, and I am going to have to rely on numbers from memory, but I believe we have 12 or 14 positions there for a budget of \$1.5 billion. If there was an ability to free up a management personnel, I believe that is an appropriate position to go to in terms of what I perceive to be an imbalance in the capability of research and planning for a \$10 million budget at AFM, an important function but accomplished for a \$1.5 billion budget by 12 to 14 people in the Ministry of Health.

I realize my honourable friend will not find the decision acceptable, and I accept that we will have to agree to disagree. That decision was one that we chose to make in terms of the reduction in management staff so that we could maintain the ability to serve people.

**Mr. Cheema:** The Minister is giving an example for the Manitoba Health Services Commission and he is comparing two different programs. This AFM program is entirely different from that. It is very crucial and he understands that this program is delivering to the needs of youth, parents, clients and a number of areas of major concern. Now especially with the new law against the drinking and driving, there is going to be a great impact on this program because there will be a large number of drivers who will need the use of this program.

Can the Minister of Health tell me, how can he justify comparing the Manitoba Health Services Commission with the AFM to cutting these positions?

**Mr. Orchard:** My honourable friend makes what would appear to be a reasonable point, missing the issue, with all due respect. Research and planning is not a necessary activity for the Impaired Driving Program because the Impaired Driving Program is one that has existed with some maturity in the AFM for a number of years. That program by and large is a self-financing program established with the clients of that program. I agree there is the likelihood of increased clients because of the new driving law, impaired legislation, but we have the ability to deliver those impaired driver programs on a recovery basis from the clients.

It is not as if we have to create a program; a program exists which is effective. It does not need a great deal of research to develop that program because it is a mature program, part of the AFM services for a number of years now. It does not need to be researched to be delivered. It is readily available right now.

**Mr. Cheema:** That was just one of the examples but clearly it has been shown that for any program delivery

**Tuesday, November 21, 1989**

---

at the client's level you have to have good management. By eliminating a few positions at the management level, and at the highest management level, director of research, it certainly does not satisfy me. The Minister has to give us more argument other than what he has given comparing the Manitoba Health Services Commission and AFM and telling that the delivery at the client level is not affected.

How can he justify cutting these positions when we do not have adequate time to even assess what is going to be the effect on the delivery at the level of clients. It is a simple question.

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Acting Chairman, I will give my honourable friend a very simple answer. It will not affect the ability to deliver programs to clients nor will it prevent the AFM doing research and planning because it is one position and there are a number of positions still there. Now, I realize my honourable friend disagrees with that, so did my honourable friend, the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), but when they went through the X budget options they decided to reduce program to people. They were going to cut River House. We know what the NDP position is as a political Party, as a Second Opposition Party in the House. They would maintain the management and they would cut program services to people. My honourable friend is saying that he wants to maintain these positions in management, the director of Research and Planning. Can I then conclude that the Liberal Party policy is like the NDP Party policy where they would cut programs to the people?—because those are the only two conclusions I can come to.

\* (1620)

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, this is a very, so to speak, unacceptable statement from the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) that I am indicating that a program should be cut. That is my main concern, how you are going to deliver the program at the client level when you are cutting the management positions. Rather than answering my question, he should not be putting things on the record which are untrue.

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Acting Chairman, I accept my honourable friend's rebuff, but I have simply said to them that the reduction of the four management positions does not compromise delivery of program to patients. My honourable friend can agree to disagree, but one thing my honourable friend is saying is he disagrees with the reduction of management. That must mean the Liberal Party, because we know the position of the NDP, must tell us then if they would not reduce the services to people which my honourable friend I think just said, because he was offended by the statement, I accept that. Then that means my honourable friend would put more money in.

Is that where my honourable friend is saying the Liberal Party position is, that you would fund it, fund more, put more money in? My honourable friend from time to time has been responsible in this House saying we know that money does not grow on trees to the effect. Is he now saying that this is where he would resource to a greater degree?

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, if creating any position or maintaining any position which is extremely important for the department, I think no person with a right mind would refuse that. This program is extremely important and these are the positions at the senior level and they are responsible for the delivery of health care ultimately, and that is what I am saying simply.

Can the Minister of Health tell us now, with the new drivers' law against drinking and driving, how are they going to cope with the rehabilitation program?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Acting Chairman, as my honourable friend may be aware, we have the ability through the existing program to handle that identified impaired driver load. My honourable friend has to appreciate that those are paid for by the clients, so that is an in and out budget item and as service demand increases, naturally more staff are often required, but then so are the revenues from those in the program, so that the program self-finances.

Here is where I think my honourable friend's specific question is, is what about individuals who go in for treatment of a severe drinking problem and it is identified through the Driving While Impaired Program. We have the ability to deliver services to an increased number.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, can the Minister tell us what is the normal waiting period for someone who would need rehabilitation services in Manitoba?

**Mr. Orchard:** Non-residential care immediately, residential care can fluctuate with a waiting time depending on time of the year and in circumstances up to three and possibly even four weeks for residential.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, can the Minister of Health give us the breakdown for the rehabilitation services outside Winnipeg?

**Mr. Orchard:** Residential services, Brandon through Sun Centre, Ste. Rose.

**Mr. Cheema:** The waiting period.

**Mr. Orchard:** Oh, waiting periods.

**Mr. Orchard:** At the three direct funded programs at Thompson, Ste. Rose and Brandon, outside of Winnipeg there are no waiting lists, there is almost immediate entry into the program. Although we would have to confirm it, we expect that The Pas and Rosaire House would be in a similar circumstance.

**Mr. Cheema:** I am simply giving a suggestion and questioning the Minister of Health that with the new law there will be an extra load of services and he should probably direct his department to have a program in place so that the other clients who need these services do not have to wait.

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Acting Chairman, I accept my honourable friend's caution but let me indicate to my



honourable friend that what we are projecting for this year—now, first of all, I will give you the actual numbers. From '88-89 we did a total of 2,583 assessments, of which 85 went to treatment, either residents or non-residential. Now we are projecting an increase in the number of assessments, but we are predicting a decrease in the number of individuals who would be going to the treatment program.

I am saying to my honourable friend that the increased assessment does not necessarily mean that more people would be accessing particularly the residential treatment program.

**Mr. Cheema:** That statement may not be completely true because there will definitely be some percentage of those individuals who will need rehabilitation services and that has yet to be seen. I think it will be a good idea to prepare the department in terms of how to deal with the overload for the rehabilitation services.

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Acting Chairman, if I may, I think that the AFM has done exactly that and prepared for this. There is the ability to handle some additional impaired drivers with the current staff complement. We have trained staff in a backup position if you will, to handle any increase in the Impaired Drivers Program with four SYs available to bring in as required. So there is a substantial amount of ability to deal with even a fairly sudden increase in demand for service.

**Mr. Cheema:** During the last year's Estimates we asked the Minister of Health a question in regard to the chemical dependency unit at the Health Sciences Centre. At times there has been a difficulty expressed by a number of primary caregivers that access to that program is not that easy because of the shortage of space and shortage of resources. Has the Minister of Health developed a plan to expand the program if required?

**Mr. Orchard:** With the indulgence of my honourable friend, I think I would feel more prepared to deal with that when we deal with the Manitoba Health Services Commission because that program is funded through the Health Sciences Centre and I would be able I think to provide my honourable friend with more answers because we will have a little bit of lead time before we get into that.

**Mr. Cheema:** One of the objectives under this program was the introduction of an intensive day treatment program at Brandon. Can the Minister of Health indicate if that program is functioning?

\* (1630)

**Mr. Orchard:** We have targeted an implementation date of January 1.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, can the Minister of Health tell us what kind of resources they have put in there and the allocation of staff, and what will the impact be of that program in terms of relieving the services in the Winnipeg area?

(Mr. Chairman in the Chair)

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Chairman, there is a day program in Winnipeg that is operational. The day program is an intermediary as one would expect between the residential program and the out-patient services. The implementation of the day program in Brandon will be an enhancement to the service availability.

As I say, January 1 is the anticipated implementation date and it will be an additional service in Brandon. We are not expecting an impact from Winnipeg, because day program clients in the Winnipeg program would not access the Brandon program as I think one could understand. It will not have any impact on the Winnipeg program.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, one of the objectives was the completion of a one-year comprehensive training program model for an AFM counsellor. Has that been completed?

**Mr. Orchard:** Yes.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, can the Minister of Health tell us what is the tradition of this program and if this is a unique program in Manitoba?

**Mr. Orchard:** Yes. Mr. Chairman, it is unique to Manitoba. No other province is offering a similar program. It is fully funded by AFM and offered by the University of Manitoba. As well as the AFM staff accessing the program, Family Services staff and funded agency staff have the opportunity to access the program.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, can the Minister of Health tell us what is the total cost allocated to this program and where that money is given out from the AFM budget?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Chairman, the cost to the AFM, when I say it is fully funded by the AFM, that is for our staff. Child and Family Services, naturally they pay their staffing costs, we do not. It is \$40,000 a year and it is part of the program budget of Program Delivery Directorate.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, to provide that \$40,000, we do not have an extra allocation of resources as such. Can the Minister of Health tell us where that \$40,000 is coming out of the Program Delivery Directorate, which line?

**Mr. Orchard:** From a number of lines, Mr. Chairman, involved with a reallocation of resource, for instance, from transportation or travel and other areas of the program.

**Mr. Cheema:** I just wanted to make sure that this money is not coming from the direct delivery program from the clients. If there is a need, then this money should be reallocated so that the program at the client level is not impacted. Can the Minister of Health tell us if they were supposed to develop a program, a

comprehensive curriculum in chemical dependency for physicians, has that program been completed?

**Mr. Orchard:** Seventy-five percent developed and some parts of the program are being field tested, if you will, with physicians.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, I think it will be extremely important for all the primary caregivers to have the information available to them so that they can deal with the clients, especially up north in certain places where they are the first caregivers and it takes maybe six to eight hours just to have other services available. We hope that program is delivered as soon as possible. I think that will go a great way to help not only the patients but also the professional caregivers.

Mr. Chairperson, my next question is, there was a review of the residential treatment program and that was conducted last year and some of the recommendations were supposed to be implemented this year. Can the Minister of Health update the information?

**Mr. Orchard:** I am informed that the recommendations of the review have been accepted and staff have been trained. All staff as of December 31 will be fully trained with the exception of Polaris Place in Thompson where we did have a staff shortage and we are going to be delayed in that training program there, but by December 31 that will be fully implemented.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, could we also have a copy of those recommendations today if it is possible?

**Mr. Orchard:** I do not think we can do that today but we can make sure my honourable friend gets that.

**Mr. Cheema:** Under reference No. 3, under the Program Delivery Directorate, again there is a cut in one position at the managerial level and there is also—I think that is the only one position. Can the Minister of Health tell us what is the specific position which was eliminated and how can he again justify, at this level, for the program delivery to say this will not have an impact at the client level?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Chairman, as discussed extensively with the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), the position is in the managerial line, the professional/technical, and bed support remains constant. Those are the people who are the program deliverers. Managers are not, they manage the programs. We have been through it and I really have nothing else I can add to help convince my honourable friend.

**Mr. Chairman:** Shall the item pass—pass; Support Services Directorate, \$1,212,600—pass; Program Delivery Directorate, \$8,330,100—pass.

Funded Agencies \$1,837,700—the Member for Kildonan.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, can the Minister of Health tell us how they are monitoring the use of funds by all the agencies which are funded by the AFM?

**Mr. Orchard:** The use of their funds?

**Mr. Cheema:** Yes.

\* (1640)

**Mr. Orchard:** Annual budgets and then annual budget verifications after year end, annual audits, and the requirement of quarterly financial reporting from each of the agencies are the three methods.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, can the Minister of Health explain what is the co-ordination between the Department of AFM at the executive level and the external funded agencies, and how they communicate with each other and what are the support services available from the AFM to these agencies?

**Mr. Orchard:** My honourable friend will appreciate that they are independent agencies and we provide often only a portion of their total funding. They have funding from other sources as well and the communication is at the highest level with Executive Director Tim Duprey dealing with the executive director of the funded organizations.

**Mr. Chairman:** Shall the item pass—pass. Gross Program Costs, \$11,568,100—pass; Less Recoveries, \$1,014,800—pass.

Net Program Costs \$10,553,300—pass. The Honourable Minister.

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Chairman, before we do the appropriation resolution, I neglected at the start, because I guess I got into a scrap with my honourable friend from Thompson (Mr. Ashton), I neglected to introduce to the Members of committee: Tim Duprey, the newly-appointed Executive Director of the AFM; Gerry Dragan, the Director of Program Delivery; and Randy Jakul, with the AFM; and thank you for your informed contribution to Estimates.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, I just want to add my comments. We appreciate the executive director and the other members of the AFM for their excellent work and coming and listening to us and if there is anything we can do, say open up a position, they can call us any time.

**Mr. Chairman:** Resolution 69: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$10,553,300 for Health, The Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1990—pass.

No. 6. Manitoba Health Services Commission: Provides medical, hospital, personal care home, pharmacare, ambulance, air ambulance and northern patient transportation services and develops long-range planning.

The Honourable Minister.

**Mr. Orchard:** My honourable friends, I know that we passed AFM, but I neglected, again because I was

maybe arguing too much with my honourable friend, the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), but I would like to give my two colleagues who are here—the Premier already has his, so I have only got two copies, but for the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr), and the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema), the new brochure that AFM is putting out from the Womens' Centre on Substance Abuse, "Gaining Control." It is a very, very progressive document, with a very progressive program behind it. I would like my honourable friends to have that.

Mr. Chairman, before we begin on the Commission Estimates, I would like to introduce Frank DeCock, Executive Director of the Manitoba Health Services Commission; Ernie Moore is here today; Jack McKenzie, the distinguished gentleman with the grey hair; and the other distinguished gentleman, Ken Hominick, the Director of Planning.

**Mr. Chairman:** Item 6. Manitoba Health Services Commission, Administration \$19,990,800—the Member for Kildonan.

**Mr. Cheema:** Certainly we welcome the members of the Manitoba Health Services Commission, and I can certainly tell them this year it will not be half an hour. We will take longer than that. They should probably take a few days off from their regular jobs. We will not give the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) the opportunity this year to hammer us in the House that we took only half an hour last year.

**Mr. Orchard:** Let us make a deal. We can take 16 minutes and I will not say a word.

**Mr. Chairman:** Shall the item pass—the Member for Kildonan.

**Mr. Cheema:** Can the Minister of Health indicate to us how many positions are vacant at the senior management level?

**Mr. Orchard:** Yes. We can provide that to my honourable friend. One vacancy, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Cheema:** What is the vacant position? Can the Minister indicate exactly what is the role of that position?

**Mr. Orchard:** That position is the assistant associate executive director position which was previously filled by Mr. Frank DeCock who has resumed the role of executive director. The executive director role was filled, if I remember correctly, jointly by the Deputy Minister of Health. In effect, we have a vacancy of a position but the same number of people there. Is that understandable?

**Mr. Cheema:** No.

**Mr. Orchard:** Well, the executive director position was filled by the former Deputy Minister as a conjoint or combined position of executive director of the Manitoba Health Services Commission and Deputy Minister of Health. When that was ongoing the Deputy Minister

was executive director of the commission, Mr. DeCock was the assistant associate executive director, a position that is currently vacant now that Mr. DeCock has assumed the duties of executive director at the time I brought in from the department Mr. Frank Maynard to be the Deputy Minister.

So, we had two people for three positions before, one position filled conjointly by the Deputy Minister. Now we have two people filling two positions, same number of people—(interjection)—No, no, we had two people in three positions before. Now we have two people in two positions with one position vacant, but we have the same number of people.

\* (1650)

**Mr. Cheema:** Can the Minister of Health tell us when that position will be filled?

**Mr. Orchard:** In January of this coming year.

**Mr. Cheema:** Since the Manitoba Health Services Commission is responsible for the major spending for health care in Manitoba and management at the senior level are responsible to a large extent to deliver all those services, can the Minister of Health tell us what is the role of the Manitoba Health Services Commission at the Health Advisory Network?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Chairman, in terms of the steering committee of the Health Advisory Network, I had to be reminded, we do not have a board commission member on the steering committee, but there is a commission board member on every task force of the Health Advisory Network to provide that liaison on the individual issues with the Health Advisory Network and the appointed members thereto.

**Mr. Cheema:** The Minister is saying they have a member on each and every subcommittee but not on the major steering committee. Why has the Minister chosen not to appoint a member from the Manitoba Health Services Commission on this steering committee which is extremely important as he has repeatedly put on the record that the Manitoba Health Advisory Network is going to be responsible for major decision, advising this Government? How come the Minister has ignored this major section of our health care system to be a part of this major committee?

**Mr. Orchard:** There are board members of the Manitoba Health Services Commission on the task force. My Deputy Minister is the only civil servant on the Health Advisory Network Steering Committee.

As I indicated last year, we never got into it this year. I will indicate again that when we established the Health Advisory Network, we did something that was absolutely unique as far as I know in any jurisdiction in Canada in that we established an advisory network in which civil servants were not the majority members that is inclusive of the steering network where there is only one of 14, that being my Deputy Minister. The Deputy Minister is the Deputy Minister for the department as well as the commission so that he is able to represent

both at the steering committee level of the Health Advisory Network.

To assure a good working liaison on the task forces, there has been membership of the board of the Manitoba Health Services Commission on individual task forces. Again, even on those task forces, we do not have a majority of civil servants on those boards. We have civil servants, but they may be sole appointment or one of two depending on the size of the subcommittee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend is saying for the exact same reasons I am saying, it is an important group. We deliberately, and I deliberately, and Government was fully cognizant of this, set it up without majority membership of civil servants on it. I openly admit the risk to Government in doing that because Government then has no control over a) the decisions, b) the speed of the decisions, one can only urge, but you do not have any control of it. That may be a disadvantage because from time to time, I am criticized for no activity and my honourable friend, the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), said we only spent \$58 last year. Well, I am not concerned about that as long as they do their work effectively and represent the interests of Manitoba.

There are risks in terms of not having control of the committee but then the advantage which I wished to achieve, and still believe can achieve, is that the Health Advisory Network cannot be said to be simply an arm of Government. That their recommendations will be viewed as, as good a recommendation as Government may well be able to access. It takes it away from the partisan political decision-making. So that is why in the steering committee one civil servant, my Deputy Minister.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, I think it is a very interesting phenomenon the Minister has developed. He is trying to avoid the risk of putting a Member from the Manitoba Health Services Commission on the Steering Committee, but at the same time you have appointed different people on the subcommittees. The major decision, as you have said during the second day of Estimates, any decision from the Health Advisory Network is not binding on the Government. So you are securing the position for the Government, but not taking care of the whole process which you have started as a Health Advisory Network.

The principle of the Health Advisory Network is to advise the Government for a major decision. I find it very interesting that you do not have a person from the major organization of Manitoba Health Services Commission on the Steering Committee. I think it is just one way of avoiding the problems in the future. I think you are trying to achieve—I do not want to end the week with Tuesday evening with animosity here, but I think you are trying to achieve a political goal rather than a realistic approach to the whole issue.

I think the appointment of these individuals, at least one person on the major Steering Committee, is extremely important for any major decisions coming out of the Health Advisory Network. That will definitely

have the Government at least be somewhat responsible to accept those decisions, because if those decisions do not meet the political will that may not be acceptable. So where do you draw the line?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Chairman, I have one person on the Steering Committee of the Health Advisory Network and that is my Deputy Minister, the person who brings every single funding request to the ministry and to Government. That is a pretty important individual in the Ministry of Health.

Mr. Chairman, I said that the recommendations of the Health Advisory Network are not binding on Government and will not automatically be accepted. Surely my honourable friend is not saying to us that Government ought to accept recommendations from commission reports that are set up to study issues and automatically commit themselves to accept every single recommendation when the group making the recommendations does not have the responsibility of raising the funds to pay for those recommendations.

Naturally we are going to provide the best, we are going to seek the best advice and we are going to try to follow those recommendations, but no Government, including a Liberal Government, would set up any commission, even if it was controlled 50 percent by civil servants, and say, we are going to follow every single recommendation. He would not do that as Government. He would be irresponsible to do it, because the committee making the recommendations does not have to then turn around and offer up their Finance Minister as a sacrificial lamb when they double the taxes in the province.

My honourable friend surely is not saying that there is something unusual about Government having the right of refusal on any recommendation made to it. Surely my honourable friend is not saying the Liberal Party would establish Royal Commissions, because my honourable friend's Leader in the last election campaign said we are going to establish a Royal Commission on Health.

Now what if that Royal Commission came out and said to the Liberal Party and perchance they won the election and hence to the Premier, his Leader the Premier if that eventuality had come about, and the Royal Commission reporting a year and a half later said, health care ought to be 50 percent higher in funding. Would the Liberal Party have implemented that? If so, from whence would the resource have come?

Your Royal Commission, I will guarantee you that your Leader would not say that she would automatically implement as the Government every recommendation by a Royal Commission she was going to strike into health care. Let us not try to leave the impression that there is something unusual here.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, something is unusual, because we have seen today the Capital budget has been tabled and three major decisions for Winnipeg hospitals you have left up to the Health Advisory Committee, the Extended Treatment Recovery Committee, and that decision is not binding. How do

you justify the role of the committee then. If that position is acceptable to the Government that is fine. If the report comes which is not acceptable particularly then you could easily say, well we do not like this report so we are not going to accept it. What is the major role of all these committees if they are not going to have any major impact on the decision-making?

\* (1700)

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Chairman, we are dealing again in that wonderful world of "if" that the Liberals live in. We have not even received a report. I am simply saying that in general terms Government is not bound to implement every recommendation made to it. It never has been in the past, never will be in the future, regardless of whether it is a Royal Commission as promised by the Liberal Leader, the Health Advisory Network as established and operating in our Government, or is the Health Services development study or whatever the committee was that was struck by the previous administration. No Government binds themselves automatically to recommendations from any committee they establish.

One hopes they get reasoned decisions that are within the bounds of implementation. I cannot prejudge what the Health Advisory Network and the task force sub-committee is going to recommend to me. I simply do not know. I am saying that I am not going to make the commitment that my honourable friends in the Opposition Parties lust for from Opposition at Grace, Concordia and Municipal without the advice that I asked from the Health Advisory Network.

Surely my honourable friend has to agree that is a most reasonable approach, that if you set up a group, an expert group to study something, that you would await their recommendations before making decisions. My honourable friend surely is not saying to me that we should move ahead without that advice.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Chairperson, I am giving a chance to the Minister to clarify. There is a major concern that the major decisions are being referred to the Health Advisory Network and we do not want that kind of scapegoat when the major decisions are made. When the credit has to be taken then the Minister of Health should take the credit. When the decision then the Minister of Health is not going to accept, then you could say the Health Advisory Network is not doing a proper job. That is a major concern.

**Mr. Orchard:** Again I simply say, I know it is a major concern but it is a concern of that Liberal land of "if." It is in the future. Let us argue about the decisions when they are made. No decision has been made and I will stand by, as I have done for the past 18 months, decisions made by myself and this Government in health care, because I think we have made substantially good decisions throughout the system and I am proud of them. I will stand by any future decisions made by myself and the Government. We can debate the merits of them as we will.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hour being 5 p.m. it is now time for Private Members' Hour. Committee rise.

## SUPPLY—ENVIRONMENT

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Mark Minenko):** Call the section of Committee of Supply to order, please. This section of the Committee of Supply has been dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Environment. We are presently on item 1.(b)(1). Shall the item pass—the Honourable Member for The Pas.

**Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas):** Mr. Acting Chairman, I am pleased to have an opportunity to say a few words about the Department of Environment. I regret that I was unable to be here yesterday evening when the Minister's opening statement was made, but I understand that our Leader covered all the points that we have of concern about the Department of Environment. There are a few things that I would like to touch on.

Yesterday, I was unable to be present because I had made a commitment quite sometime ago, a personal commitment to take part in a retreat. I guess it is at times that we need those kinds of retreats to renew ourselves, and yesterday afternoon was a good example of why we do need to take time to refresh ourselves because when the Estimates process was on, the Minister of Co-operative Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Connery) got up and put some statements on the record dealing with my housing situation.

My first reaction was to come up here and get into the gutter with him and start calling him down and telling him about some of the things that he has done as a businessperson and some of the other things he has been involved in as a person. I thought it over and decided not to because I think that the public has a low enough appreciation for what politicians are without us dragging each other down in this House.

I regret that the Minister of Co-operative Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Connery) would raise an issue of that sort, but I want to assure the Minister that the place that I reside in is my home. If he is critical of the type of facility that I live in, then I apologize. I think that he feels that everybody has to be living in a quarter-of-a-million dollar housing unit, and I do not think that this is what my constituents are living in. I know that the house that I use as a residence in The Pas is much better than many of my constituents use, and that is my place of residence when I go to The Pas. That is the place that I reside in and I do not think it is fair that he would make statements of that sort.

I guess it is times like that I think that we need to shy away from the opportunities to get into the gutter and get down with the Member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connery) and call Members of the Legislature down. I think that what he has as an opinion of who should be Members of Government is that everybody should be a businessperson, and in order to be a representative of this House, I guess everybody would have to have earned some public funds in a venture dealing with onions and then we will have some first hand experience of what we should do as Members of the Legislature to be able to represent our constituents well.

I think that of the 57 Members in this House that there are people from all walks of life, I think that is

**Tuesday, November 21, 1989**

---

the strength of our Legislature when people bring different experiences to this Legislature. Therefore, we are able to relate to areas of concern in a different way. I think it is unfortunate that the Member for Portage la Prairie would choose that way to participate in this House and speak about someone when he is absent - (interjection) - The Member says it is not surprising. No, I guess it is not.

The one thing that I would like to say is that I give the Premier (Mr. Filmon) credit. The Premier saw that with that particular Member, the Member responsible for the Environment, they were going downhill pretty quickly. I guess you have to give the Premier credit for saying that that man had to be removed from that position and put someone in who is a little more concerned about the environment than the Member for Portage la Prairie. It is unfortunate that the Premier would not look a little further down the road and remove that person completely from the Cabinet. I think the comments he made yesterday about slandering practically everyone in this House, I think it is not the proper place for a subject of that sort to take place. I think the Premier should remove that person completely from Cabinet.

I would like to talk about a few things in the Department of Environment. I know that this Minister has been a great improvement over the previous Member that was responsible for the environment. There are some areas that I have that I am concerned about, one of the areas was the Rafferty-Alameda. There was a report that came out from the federal Government telling us that some of the difficulties there were with Rafferty-Alameda and why we should be addressing those concerns. The Minister went to a meeting in Souris and he supported the concerns of the federal Government and he said that we would fight very strongly to have a complete environmental assessment carried out before there was approval given, before Manitoba signed approval to go ahead with that project.

Unfortunately, they were hollow words because when the time came for the federal Government to bring forward a licence, the licence was approved for the construction of Rafferty-Alameda to begin, the Minister did not utter one word of defiance from the Province of Manitoba. I know that right now that the Canadian Wildlife Federation and the farmers from Saskatchewan who are concerned about Alameda are taking it to court. I would hope that the Minister would take this opportunity to have some backbone and stand up and support the Canadian Wildlife Federation and people in Manitoba who have concerns about the Rafferty-Alameda and how it will affect the quality of our water and quantity of our water and have a serious look at what statements he did not make in Souris and support those statements at this time. I think that down the road we are going to be affected, and I think this is the time that the Minister has an opportunity to get involved in that subject.

\* (1440)

One other area that I would like to deal with is the Clean Environment Commission. I know that they have had hearings dealing with Repap and that they were

lengthy hearings and they were given some extended time for some of the MKO and some of the other organizations to come forward and make presentations dealing with Phase 1 of the proposal to proceed with the reconstruction.

I would hope that now that Repap has come and asked for the entire project to be looked at, Phase 1, Phase 2, and the forestry proposal that I would hope the Minister would take the opportunity to call those hearings. I think that this is the time that we can address this subject and have the Clean Environment Commission address those subjects even if it takes more than the winter months to hold those hearings. The sooner we get at it, the sooner we are going to be able to give the proper licences for that corporation which wants to have the whole project approved before they begin the construction.

I think that is a sensible approach to take to have the whole Phase 1, Phase 2 and the forestry proposal addressed before they move on it. I would hope that the Minister would take the opportunity to ask for those hearings to be held.

I know that the Minister has brought forward some legislation dealing with other parts of the environment and I have to give him credit for the strong initiative he has taken. The Ozone Layer Protection Bill is a strong Bill and I have to give him credit for it. He has moved on it. We had brought one forward in the House, but I think that the legislation that the Minister brought in goes beyond where we were and I give him credit for bringing that forward.

One of the other areas that he has done an excellent job in is the area of waste reduction. He has brought forward a Bill which I see he has done a lot of work on and I think that the White Paper he has distributed for discussion on this very important subject is also a good paper. If he would have the courage to move ahead on most of those areas, then I think that I would give him credit because he would have more courage than I believe he has.

The only unfortunate part is with that Waste Reduction Bill, I had hoped that he would have the courage to put that into effect as soon as it is passed rather than leaving it to regulations because regulations have a way of being put aside and not brought forward for a long period of time. So I would hope that the Minister would reconsider and bring forward some of those recommendations as soon as the Bill is passed rather than leave it sit for a long period of time.

I know the City of Winnipeg was touched on yesterday and there is some legislation coming forward but again it is too long a period of time. We have had an opportunity to study what the difficulties are when it comes to waste disposal. We do not need another two years to study to come up with some kind of a report of what can be done. We should be moving on that much more quickly than we are.

I think that the Assiniboine River and the Red River are at this time being polluted to a point where it cannot be tolerated any longer. The sooner we move on cleaning up those rivers, then the better off we are

**Tuesday, November 21, 1989**

going to be as a society. I think there have been some excellent recommendations made in the New Democratic report dealing with the environment and how the waste can be handled in the City of Winnipeg. I would encourage the Minister to read those reports and see what part of them can be implemented by his department.

I noticed there is an increase in staffing in two areas where it deals with public relations. I know when we were in Government this Minister was a Member of Government that often accused us of hiring too many apple polishers. Well, I think that this is an area where you have hired apple polishers as well. It is an area that is not going to be helping the public and I see that you have increased the number of enforcement officers but I think those four additional positions could have been put towards the enforcement as well.

There are several other questions that I want to raise during the process but I will just stop at this time and have the Minister respond to some of the comments that I have made.

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Acting Chairman, first of all, perhaps I should take a couple of minutes to respond on Rafferty-Alameda. I have been prodded a couple of times by both Opposition Parties last night and now again, so I suppose maybe I should try and clarify something for them so that they understand the situation that Manitoba was placed in.

We went to the hearings and both of the Members present supported the position that we took there, asking for a full environmental impact study of the projects and their impacts. After the federal Government had done the review that was court ordered and made the decision that they were going to re-issue the licence, Manitoba was faced with the reality of a valid licence having been issued to Saskatchewan.

I suggest that if both Opposition Parties are reminded that the only thing one should do is to continue to fight in court when there is a matter in which you are not completely satisfied, then I suggest there are a lot more problems in the offing if that is what they want to push this Government to do. We do have to deal with the reality of the licence that is out there. Whether we agree with how it was acquired, we made a very strong case in my opinion.

There are other ways of dealing with it that we expect will provide the protection that Manitoba will need. Number one, the balance of the environmental assessment work will be done on the Souris River. The federal Government has agreed to do that and that will provide the base line upon which operating regimes for the Souris-Alameda Dam site projects can be put in place. Manitoba, North Dakota and Saskatchewan are working, as we speak, on putting together a working understanding on how we will deal with the overall operation of the basin.

The simple fact is that we need international co-operation, both federal Governments to be involved, to have an international agreement. That seems to be a process by which progress is slow and ponderous,

and we can criticize the federal system we have here. But frankly, the federal system on the south side of the border would be even more difficult to access and have changes made, so I believe that the three jurisdictions will have to reach their own agreement.

What everyone is ignoring, and what I hope the two Opposition Parties would give some consideration to, is the fact that Manitoba has not signed off of the international joint agreement, and the quantity of water that Manitoba receives has never been finally decided on in relation to the Souris River. That is the ultimate lever that Manitoba has to deal with water quantity and of course as we deal with quantity, that has some direct impact on quality.

\* (1450)

We have in place procedures to make sure that we get some base line data along with the work that is being done on the assessment of the Souris River from Lake Darling North on the water quality of the river to make sure we have all of the base line data that is necessary to protect our interest when we start dealing with the operation regime involved in the dam sites. Manitoba was never satisfied with the end decision that was given in this case. The Members are both fully aware of that but they have chosen to ignore it as a matter of fact, and I have some concern about that. If they do not want to be part of the solution, then obviously they want to be part of the problem.

Mr. Acting Chairman, The WRAP Act was referenced by both Opposition Parties in their comments last night. I would indicate that the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak) along with the Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) have both indicated that they feel there needs to be some rapid movement in the area of waste recycling and reduction, but both of them by implication or by direct comment have indicated that, No. 1, The WRAP Act has not enough teeth in it or, No. 2, I may not have the guts to implement it.

It does not take much guts to implement something that has no teeth in it, No. 1; so if it has no teeth, it should be easily implemented. On the other hand, I wonder how many months in jail somebody should spend for throwing a can in the wastebasket instead of into the recycling. We are talking about waste reduction and recycling; we are not talking about handling of hazardous waste and major concerns that are dealt with in this Act.

I can tell you that as I have said on numerous occasions, when meeting in relation with The Environment Act and other pieces of Legislation for which I am responsible, including dangerous goods handling and transportation, that I much prefer and this Government would much prefer a co-operative action taken along with the industries that are involved to be able to comply with what is needed to achieve the goals rather than to simply have draconian ability to impose fines and jail sentences. While we might argue that the fines associated with The WRAP Act are not high, that can certainly be adjusted.

If we somehow think that to put somebody, an executive of a corporation, in jail for six months is not

a pretty good way of getting the attention of a corporation that refuses to co-operate, then I suggest that the people of Manitoba will be very happy not to have either one, particularly, the Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) as a future Environment Minister, because this is the kind of thing which the public has constantly had concerns about and lends credibility to the statement that the freedoms of men and women are constantly at risk when legislators meet.

I guess I would put the Opposition on notice that I hope when they talk about providing amendments to this Act that they will give due consideration to what they may wish to put forward. We have spent a considerable amount of time working on this Act, and I do hope that we are left in a position where we can work co-operatively with the people of this province and the industries involved in order to achieve the goals that are laid out. In fact, that is how the Act is structured so the Government of the Day and the industry involved can meet joint goals and deadlines to achieve the desired results in terms of waste reduction, so that we can get down under 50 percent by the year 2000. I will leave my comments there, Mr. Acting Chairman.

**Mr. Harapiak:** I wonder if the Minister could address the Clean Environment Commission's hearings dealing with Repap. Is he going to be moving with haste to call in new environmental hearings to deal with all phases of that operation, as Repap has publicly stated that they want to move in that direction?

**Mr. Cummings:** It is certainly my intention to put forward the applications when we receive them from the corporation. That is no different than what we often have happen in relationship to the commission whereby we have considerable discussion regarding desired licences. Until we have the applications and the information to support those applications in hand so we can issue guidelines and then get on with the hearing process, my hands and the hands of the commission are in fact tied.

I have certainly no desire—in fact I would compliment the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak) for raising the question in the manner that he has because it seems to me that we can answer the concerns that are out there. The corporation has indicated it is certainly their intention to offer answers to the concerns that are out there and get on with dealing with the applications that they put forward.

The Member I am sure is contemplating, well, does this mean that it will all be done as one hearing, or will we continue to do it in two different stages? I would suggest that may very well depend on the manner in which we get the information forward so that we can deal with it expeditiously, and I think the operative word is to deal with it in an expeditious manner and make sure that we, in conjunction with the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), have a clear understanding of what is involved and be able to put the question before the public through the Clean Environment Commission, and let the corporation put it before the public and be prepared to deal with the concerns that are raised so that what I consider one of the truly sustainable development industries that we deal with in Manitoba—

and being a farmer I have no qualms about referring to the fact that where we have growing and renewable resources that we are dealing with, if there is anything that can be deemed to be a sustainable development it should be this kind of a development.

I certainly appreciate the comments of the Member for The Pas because it certainly agrees with my line of thinking that we will move to deal with the requests when they come forward, as expeditiously as we can.

**Mr. Harapiak:** There was obviously some meetings between Repap and the Ministers responsible for Repap. I am sure that the Minister of the Environment would have been involved in those discussions because they have delayed the construction. They have made the announcement that they will not be proceeding this year because the Clean Environment Commission has not handed down their decision as of yet. How far away are we from having a decision handed down by the Clean Environment Commission on Phase 1, and was the environment a subject of discussion when Repap came and met with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) and said that they would not be proceeding until the spring of 1991?

**Mr. Cummings:** I was not present when Repap met with the Minister of Finance, but obviously when you are dealing with the forestry industry and new aspects of the forestry industry, environmental concerns have to be taken into consideration. I think the Member for The Pas is very supportive of this project, and I think he deserves as clear a possible answer as I can give him. The fact is that the environment department is the regulatory department. We are responsible for getting the regulatory work done and making sure that the issuance of the licences is done in compliance with the best possible expertise that we have available to us. If that should happen to include getting international information from time to time, we do that as well.

As indicated from Day One by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), by the Premier (Mr. Filmon), and by myself, any development is subject to environmental process and at no time was there anything within the deal that was struck that would preclude the necessity of complying with environmental licensing. You cannot, by a business deal, bargain away your regulatory responsibilities and legislated responsibilities, and we did not do that.

(Mr. Richard Kozak, Acting Chairman, in the Chair)

The Member, by implication, leaves on the record that he feels that I have had face-to-face negotiations with Repap about their environmental licensing. I can tell you that I have not negotiated face to face regarding licensing. What we have is a situation where the corporation brings forward its applications and the department deals with them in the normal ongoing manner.

We obviously have some great interest in getting these licences in place but environmental negotiations, if you wish to term it in that sense, are not something that we bargain away. We have a responsibility and I believe that we can discharge that through the normal process.



**Tuesday, November 21, 1989**

---

I do not make a practice of meeting with people who are applying for licences, but I make it as easy as possible for them to access the information that they need through the department in order to get on with that licensing process.

\* (1500)

As for the CEC commission, I guess I would be anything less than candid if I said that I was anything other than surprised that it took as long for them to make a recommendation on this licence as it has. But I have to indicate to you that should in and of itself give some confidence to the public because it indicates, I think, that they have been allowed to use due process and make sure that they have carried out their duties as they see fit before they make a recommendation on this licence.

Again, I would repeat, in terms of future applications for this licence, as soon as we receive those applications it is my intention to direct the department to deal with them as expeditiously as possible. However, ultimately the speed upon which they will proceed within the normal context of environmental hearings will depend to a significant degree on how soon and how complete the information is that we receive for an application and how that would fit into the licensing process that can be used for the particular application.

I think we are all aware when you are dealing with something that is a growing and living product that you are dealing with, such as trees and forestry, obviously even a forestry licence that is issued should and can be modified from year to year making allowance for infestation of pests, fires such as we had this year and those sorts of things.

In fact a licence vis-a-vis forestry becomes a reflection of the fact that it is dealing with a living and changing resource. I believe that if there is one industry in this province, albeit a very major one, that we can license eventually with some great degree of satisfaction that it can operate on a renewable basis in this province, this is one of those licences.

**Mr. Harapiak:** I want to make it quite clear to the Minister that I in no way indicated that he should become involved in the negotiations and discussions dealing with the environment. I just thought that because of the delay in the announcement, they were not going to be proceeding until 1991. I thought that they might have been coming forward with some information at that time because when they made the announcement they seemed to be indicating that they wanted to proceed with haste to review the entire project so they could get on with it. I want to indicate to the Minister who raised the fact that I am supportive of this project. I have never said anything but that I was supportive of Repap's presentation to the Government.

We were involved in the discussions prior to us losing Government. I thought Repap was a very responsible corporation who has done an excellent job of dealing with the environmental issues in Wisconsin. I had an opportunity to travel to Wisconsin and see their operation first hand. I went beyond the tour that was

being offered by Repap because I know that they give the normal public relations tour. I went out of my way to speak to people outside of that tour. I did not hear a negative comment towards that corporation while I was in Wisconsin.

I think they take very seriously the role of a very responsible corporation, and I think that they have carried it out successfully. When they set up their operation in The Pas again, they reassured everyone that they would be meeting all of the regulations that are in place, both federal and provincial. They would not be breaking any. They would be setting an example of how a corporation should work. I think that they were moving in that direction. You have mentioned the Clean Environment Commission. I think that they did do an excellent job in addressing all of the needs of people concerned.

I am wondering if the Minister is considering at all giving funds to intervenor groups to try and have a more complete environmental assessment carried out when you are dealing with a big corporation like Repap. Will the Minister consider providing intervenor funding as has been done in the Province of Ontario where intervenor funding was supplied for the location of a hydro line? After the public became involved, they brought some new information to light and that hydro line was moved to an area where there would be less environmental damage caused.

I think there is room for the general public to be involved but unfortunately the general public does not have the funding to put together a good presentation and hire and bring into place the experts who have the expertise in the area of environment. Will the Minister consider providing some funding for intervenor groups when you are dealing with a major corporation of this sort?

**Mr. Cummings:** At the present time, and I am not contemplating amendments to allow for intervenor funding, I would point out that the system that Ontario uses, as I understand it, allows for intervenor funding to be provided by sending the bill to the applicant and to the proponent. It also requires the opposition or those who wish to intervene to apply under some kind of an organized process. I take from that it means that not everyone who comes forward and wants to make a complaint is going to automatically end up being funded.

We have a situation here where I believe we have a large number of competent people who are required to apply their skills to the assessment of the application by Repap or any other applicant, but this is one of the major hearings that obviously we are talking about today. They deal with the application on a very technical level and are able to give the assessment that is needed.

The same applies in forestry where we have a large group of people who are working on behalf of the citizens of Manitoba to make sure that the assessment is done correctly and to make sure that the required protection is put in place.

There is one other comment that I would like to put on the record regarding some thoughts that the Member

has regarding why Repap did not proceed with construction this fall.

Obviously they had pledged themselves not to proceed without proper licensing. There are a number of things that they probably could proceed with, but again they have made the decision that it was not prudent to proceed until they had this licence in their pocket.

I would suggest that one of the problems that has influenced boardrooms across the country—and I have no reason to say this in relation to Repap as I have not handled direct discussions with them myself, but I will say it in a general context. We only need to look at what happened in Alberta where there was a miscommunication, if you will, between the Province of Alberta and the federal Government. A very violent public reaction to a number of applications that were in front of the Alberta authorities for the development of their boreal forests have caused the whole process to get bogged down and in fact be brought to a stop.

While I believe our process is sound and will not be subject to that type of a challenge, I think that if you were sitting in a corporate boardroom and looking at the bottom line and the overall possible profit or loss situation in relationship to worldwide operations that you would look at a decision such as that which came down in Alberta. We had the federal authorities blatantly or pointedly saying they would not allow to operate the type of applications that were before the Alberta authorities: threw millions and possibly even billions of dollars worth of investment into question in boardrooms all around the world.

\* (1510)

Environmentalists in many cases celebrated but I really wonder, when we talk about sustainable development, whether or not that was a dark day or a good day for the realistic and reasonable development of resources.

I believe Manitoba has a sound system and should not be challenged with this and that is why I am optimistic that we will be able to provide licences that will be acceptable to the public and acceptable to the corporation. This development will proceed, but I do not for one minute want to underestimate the impact of the unfolding problems in Alberta.

Interestingly enough I would say, to the benefit of the type of agreement that the Province of Manitoba made with Repap in the taking over of the old Manfor site, the amount of public money that is involved and the type of arrangements that were struck are extremely beneficial to the people in Manitoba. We said that in a stand-alone situation.

When you turn around and compare them to what is happening in Alberta, a the massive interjection of public funds into the whole forestry issue in Alberta, then I have to question what is going through the minds of Mr. Getty and his colleagues in terms of throwing taxpayers' dollars at the industry in order to get it in place.

We have here a company that is prepared to put its own money largely on the line. It will end up in jobs

here for Manitobans that will not cost Manitobans, will benefit us far beyond the call for jobs. It will benefit us in the investment that the corporation will bring into this province. Still in my opinion it is very environmentally sound given the early presentations they have made. I hope we can get on with the process and licensing so they can proceed with the plans that they have in place.

It sounds like one could stand here and blame the federal authorities or you could blame the Alberta Government, unfortunately, it is a mixture of two or three things that have created an environment out there, that I would have to point out to anyone who wants to listen, it means that boardrooms everywhere had shudders go through them when they saw what happened. High interest rates today probably concerned the investors in Alberta as well.

It is an example that where we, as Manitoba, have to be extremely careful in the process that we use to make sure that we do not have this interjurisdictional problem brought upon us, federal land, federal waterways, those kind of things which we take for granted as not being a problem if our process is not put forward in the proper way. We would be subject to the kind of intervention—and that is the kind of intervention we want to avoid.

**Mr. Harapiak:** Mr. Acting Chairman, I do not want to misinterpret the Minister's words, but I think that in this instance the federal Government should be praised in the position they took when dealing with the environment and the way the mills were being proposed in Alberta. I think there were no environmental hearings, and I recognize they do not have the process in place that we have here in Manitoba, but it is good for the environment as a whole that the federal Government did step in place.

I am sure that boardrooms across the world did step back and wonder how is this going to be affecting our operation. I am sure that this probably had something to do with Repap saying, hey, we had better get all of our approvals in place before we sink a pile of money into Phase 1 and then we may not get the approval for Phase 2. So I think it made sense for Repap to be asking for the whole project to be looked at as one complete project.

I would like to say that is the viewpoint we brought forward in the first place. If the Minister would have followed our suggestions, he would have looked at the whole process at one time and then we could have been halfway through that process already. We could have been completed by the spring of this year for sure and then we could have been proceeding with the construction of that.

In this case, the federal Government needs to be praised for having the courage to stop those projects in Alberta. It is unfortunate they did not have that same type of a commitment when it came to dealing with the Rafferty-Alameda project because I think that they did not have the courage in that particular case where they made a deal on some other part of needs in Saskatchewan and the federal Government's needs,

Tuesday, November 21, 1989

so they made a deal in order to proceed with Rafferty-Alameda. I think in that case they failed, but in the Alberta case they moved in a proper way.

So I would hope that the Minister would, as soon as they get the word from Repap, and I would hope that the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings) or the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) would contact Repap and see how soon they can get started with bringing the information in because I am sure that when they have asked for it they must be already preparing the information to get started with the full project. So I hope that the Minister will be moving as quickly as possible on that and calling for an environmental assessment when he gets that information.

There is one more question that I had, Mr. Acting Chairman, while we are still dealing on the subject of Repap. I am wondering how aggressive the Minister is going to become in the whole area of procurement, because in the United States it is making a massive difference in the use of recycled paper when the federal Government is saying that a certain percentage of the materials that we purchase are going to be recycled paper.

I know in talking with Repap—and I do not know the technicalities of getting involved in a mill of that sort using recycled paper—that in most sets of instances when the Government has said it is going to be requiring a percentage of recycled paper that corporations very quickly move into the production of recycled paper. How aggressive is the Minister going to become?

He says the Government cannot make much difference, but I would suggest to you that the Government is a major difference. If the Government used recycled paper in all of the paper they required, then the mills that are supplying the needs in Canada would very quickly move in that direction.

It is unfortunate that we cannot buy recycled paper in Canada at this point, we have to import all of our recycled paper. More and more corporations and groups are starting to use recycled paper because they have realized the benefits that exist for the environment and for waste disposal sites not being utilized to as great a degree as they have. There are many, many benefits by utilizing paper in recycling. How aggressive is this Minister going to get to deal with that subject?

**Mr. Cummings:** I always get a little twitchy when somebody starts talking about procurement, but in this particular case I can tell you I will get quite aggressive because the Government has every intention of using our ability to purchase, to influence the market where it is deemed to be advisable.

The Member raises a point about, in my opening remarks, where it indicated that Governments—the wording was probably a bad choice of words because what it referred to was in percentage of total volume is where Government is not possibly the huge player in the market, but the simple fact is that as Governments change the procurement policies they can provide a base market for certain operations that may want to get into the area that they are supplying. For example,

it is difficult to buy recycled paper for certain purposes right now, but as the Government increases its purchases there will be suppliers out there who will start looking more aggressively to get the supplies in place so that they could produce the recycled material.

(Mr. Allan Patterson, Acting Chairman, in the Chair)

The same thing is true in the area of other purchases where we can buy materials that are more environmentally acceptable. The fact is that by providing a base market, the Government may very well have quite a major impact on the availability of a product. The issue becomes after a while whether or not Governments should pay a substantial premium to acquire a certain product. I think there is a balance that has to be struck between what we are prepared to pay over and above what would be the best market bid in order to acquire the environmentally friendly material that we would want for our own use.

The short answer is yes. I anticipate that we will be quite aggressive and I would ask the Members of the Legislature to wait for the Premier's announcement on a procurement policy for this Government. I think they will be pleased.

\* (1520)

**Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley):** Mr. Acting Chairperson, I was sorry to hear some of the comments earlier by the Minister with regard to Rafferty-Alameda and dealing with the reality of the matter and the reissue of the licence, the licence that was originally quashed by a federal court order.

I would suggest to the Minister that the activity carried out this spring and summer by the federal Government, which was a series of public information meetings and opportunities for people to make comments whether they be representing various Government agencies or members of the general public, in no way met the requirement as put out in that court order. What we have before us is—

### POINT OF ORDER

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Patterson):** The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern and Native Affairs):** Mr. Acting Chairman, on a point of order, I think it has been tradition when committee is held in the House that Members do stand to speak. Maybe the Member has a sore leg or something, but I do think it has been tradition as long as I can remember. I wonder if the Member would be prepared to rise just to respect tradition in this Chamber.

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Patterson):** Yes, I thank the Minister.

**Mr. Harold Taylor (Wolseley):** Mr. Acting Chairperson, I would suggest to the Member for Arthur there is some concern of tradition on this matter and he might also then deal with the matter of clothing worn in this

Tuesday, November 21, 1989

Chamber which applies to -(inaudible)- in the face of -(inaudible)- jackets and ties, et cetera. Are we in committee or are we not in committee?

**An Honourable Member:** We are in committee.

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Patterson):** The Honourable Member has not been recognized. His microphone has not been on.

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Acting Chairman, it is my understanding that when the House is in committee, jackets do not necessarily have to be worn, but I do not think it is something that we need to make an issue of in terms of whether or not we normally stand in the Legislature when we are using this as a committee room.

If we are going to break with that tradition, then I think we should do it consciously; otherwise, let us continue with the traditions of this House. If the Member somehow takes umbrage to me removing my jacket, I will put my jacket back on if he is willing to stand.

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Patterson):** Yes, the point of order is taken. Will the Member for Ellice stand when he wishes to speak? I am sorry, my correction, the Member for Wolseley.

**Mr. Taylor:** Thank you, I will rise, and I will request that the staff provide lecterns because I prefer—yes, Mr. Acting Chairperson, I will go along with the matter of rising. I find the traditions rather inconsistent. I also find the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) rather small on the matter. I will request though that staff of the House bring a lectern in because I prefer to read my notes up at a higher level and that is one of the reasons for my comfort at sitting.

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Patterson):** The Honourable Minister of Environment, on a point of order.

**Mr. Cummings:** On a point of order. I think this is probably one of the less auspicious moments in the Legislature. Traditionally, the Premier or Leader of the Opposition have the lecterns brought in. The rest of us use books or whatever is handy to elevate our reading material. If the Member wants to take a five-minute break so he can get some books from the library, I will be glad to oblige him.

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, I do not believe I am at some obligation to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Cummings) as to whether he will allow or not allow whether I have a lectern or not. What I am saying is as a Member of this Assembly, I am requesting one because I prefer to have my notes at a different level. If he is taking umbrage at my attitude that is too bad; I will continue in my questioning while that is undertaken by staff of this House. Thank you very much, and I would request that the staff take that action at this time.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Mr. Taylor:** Now the point I was trying to make before the Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) got so petty on the matter is that the issue is dealing with Rafferty-Alameda and the lack of action on behalf of this Government. The fact is that the Minister has said that if the only action we can take is through the courts, that is unfortunate. I would agree with that. It is unfortunate from time to time that you have to do that sort of thing.

The fact of the matter is this Minister and this Government were prepared to take no action. No action whatsoever on going against the second decision of the federal Environment Minister to issue a licence on Rafferty-Alameda. The fact is that while the Minister is saying the right things about—these are related matters to the licence—a management scheme of things on how to manage this Souris River Basin, post facto is he has no data base today on how that river system works in the pre-dam context. Because of something as basic as that, I would suggest it would be better to hold the project, develop the data base, get the other protections in place that are needed including the flow assurances, including the quality assurances, and a determination of what the likely damages should be so that there could be a scheme of compensation also put in place.

For the Minister just to make light of the fact that the only thing to do would be the negative aspect of going to court, and that is a terrible thing, I think belies the seriousness of the matter and the fact that no recourse, no other action was taken by this administration other than to do as I suggested earlier, roll over and die.

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Acting Chairman, I assume that the Member would like me to rise to some sort of an argument on this issue. If he feels that this Government rolled over and died, I hope he will convey that to Mr. Bouchard and give him apologies for the bruises at the same time.

**Mr. Taylor:** Yes, I am rather askance, Mr. Acting Chairperson, at the Minister's lack of caring on this matter. Maybe he would like to take this opportunity to enunciate to the committee of this House and to Manitobans just what he did do after the unfortunate reissuing of this licence without protections in place for our province.

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Acting Chairman, there have been a number of activities that have been going on and are still going on in relationship to the protection of the Souris River Basin. But I can see this debate is probably not leading to any very intelligent discussion, so perhaps I will simply get on to the same vein.

It seems to me that the Member for Wolseley demonstrated the amount of concern that he and those that he represent have for the sensitivities of the people in the Souris River Basin. When he attended with me at the hearings in the southwest corner of the province, and I believe I quote correctly from his statement which

kind of left me sitting there with my jaw hanging down when he said, when we received this information in Winnipeg we knew that it was not acceptable.

I think that indicates a certain degree of disdain this Member, and those who he represents perhaps, has for those people in rural parts of the province who have some other opinions about how is the best way to deal with our fellow jurisdictions, including North Dakota, on these issues.

One of the problems that the federal Government could not address and which we now believe we have addressed is completion of the environmental impact studies on Lake Darling North which was where the gaps were in the licence or prior to the licence being issued. That is now being addressed. The operating regime is being addressed through the tripartite agreement. The ultimate protection that we have will be through the IJC. I challenge the Member to indicate if he believes that anything more than that could be accomplished by spending another two years in court waiting for a decision from a judge in eastern Canada perhaps to decide whether or not this project had been properly assessed.

\* (1530)

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, well, is this not interesting? In late June, I and the Member for The Pas (Mr. Harapiak), the Environment Critic for the other Party, flew down with this Minister and the Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey), the Minister of Northern Affairs, to speak to one of these public forums on our concerns.

At that time this Minister stated, and it was a reversal of policy but my hat is off to him and to his Government for having the wisdom to change the original position of the former Environment and former Natural Resources Ministers. At that meeting this Minister of the Environment called for a full environmental impact assessment to be carried out complete with public hearings. Well, there has not been one; there has been no hearings. I do not recall seeing any advertisement about this process going on in the province. The Minister refers to the lack of information from Lake Darling North. But Lake Darling North to what, the International Boundary, because I would like to know what the heck has been done in this province?

There are reaches of the Souris that do exist in this province from the boundary up till it flows into the Assiniboine River. What was done according to our Act or what was done according to the federal Act on that reach of the river? I would suggest probably not very much.

Also, this Minister seems to be accepting now the very poor EIS that was done in Saskatchewan, the fact that they did not use historical data bases. They very conveniently left out the dry years in previous decades, although this information was available and on record with Environment Canada, the very department that is involved in the process. The fact that the data bases were not used properly and the fact that there were methodology faults, methodology faults so gross in the Saskatchewan EIS that the Army Corps of Engineers,

the partner consultants from North Dakota, faulted it in their own work.

(Mr. Richard Kozak, Acting Chairman, in the Chair)

The Minister has not answered how that aspect has been addressed, I guess it is because it has not been addressed unless he is going to enlighten us this afternoon.

Also, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency faulted very major shortcomings in the Army Corps of Engineers tune that was produced and said that they had not looked at all sorts of things, including proper impacts on the fishery, problems with silting in on the rivers, problems with pollution in the rivers, et cetera. Now that work was not corrected either. Maybe the Minister would like to answer that, but we do not have the corrected work done in Saskatchewan, we do not have the corrected work done on the original length of the river which was studied in North Dakota.

We have, the Minister suggests, some work done from Lake Darling North to fill a missing gap in North Dakota, yes, but it was not done under the provisions of anything that like legislation in Canada which required a public hearing context complete with advertising and all the rest of it, nor did we have the section in Manitoba done yet, nor we did we have a systems wide impact done by the federal Government, so maybe the Minister could clarify our understanding if I am wrong on any of those points.

**Mr. Cummings:** The comments that the Member makes are essentially correct. The work being done from Lake Darling through to the Assiniboine River will be done, we have that assurance. The problem that the Member does not address is if the authorities on the American side were as concerned as they were, and I do not question the reasons for their concern and the genuineness of what they said in the issuance of those concerns, but they were unable as well to stop the flow of American funds to support this dam.

**Mr. Taylor:** Possibly the Minister is aware of the fact that there was an order given to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to take corrective action on their study and it was enunciated quite clearly. The probability is if that work were done properly and corrected in the EIS, as carried out on the American length of the river, it would have taken about 10 months to do, and to do properly.

I would ask the Minister if he is aware of the fact that the very serious objections of the U.S. EPA were pushed aside, and pushed aside quite frankly by the threat of the removal of funding for some very key and very pet projects of that very EPA. Is aware he of that, that there was Senate pressure by very senior and influential senators involved in the appropriations process for the different departments? The department affected was the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

**Mr. Cummings:** I do not think it is the best of forum for me as Minister of the Crown in Manitoba to be passing judgment on political actions that were taken in the adjacent jurisdiction unless I have absolute proof

**Tuesday, November 21, 1989**

---

that is correct. The Member makes some interesting challenges. If he can prove it, then I invite him to do so.

**Mr. Taylor:** Well, the Minister asked a question about why the American objections seemed to have disappeared. I gave the Minister that answer. It is not the first time that it has been conveyed in this House and not the first time it has been conveyed to this Minister.

If he wishes he could have verified the voracity of what I bring forward. It is not a secret particularly among those interested in environmental concerns. I would ask the Minister, given the 22 conditions or clauses to the newly issued licence on the Rafferty-Alameda Dam, which of them give him most concern and which ones his department are taking action on in this post facto context and would he elaborate on those to the committee, please?

**Mr. Cummings:** I do not have a copy of the licence in front of me, but I could make some broadly based comments. If he wishes to have detailed comments clause by clause, I will have to wait until I get the agreement in front of me. There are clauses within that agreement that provide some comfort to the Province of Manitoba in development of water regimes.

The licence, we did acquire one concern that we had raised and raised consistently with the people of Saskatchewan, was regarding the adding of ground water to the reservoirs. That has been stopped. There were more than one or two aspects of this, which we had clearly requested, which we now feel we have some comfort in. I do not have the clauses in front of me in order to respond specifically. If he wishes to pursue it, after I get the licence, he may.

**Mr. Taylor:** I am just not sure if the Minister is going to give us a little more information here.

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Kozak):** Does the Honourable Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) have a question?

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, I was under the impression the Minister was conferring with his officials for further information.

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Acting Chairman, what I indicated was that we do not have a copy of the agreement in front of us. There are clauses there that I indicated some of the aspects of it. I have ascertained that I believe it was Clause No. 13 that obligates Saskatchewan to become involved with the other two jurisdictions in establishment of the water regime. If he wishes to go through it clause by clause, I would ask him to wait until we bring the agreement into the Chamber and then we could do something.

**Mr. Taylor:** Yes, Mr. Acting Chairperson, that would be quite acceptable if the agreement can be brought in with sufficient copies of other Members of the House come into the committee. They would also be able to avail themselves of that if the Minister would agree to

provide the additional copies for the convenience of other Members. I think that would probably be the best way to go about it.

On a specific question to the Minister: has he an answer on how he will determine the system that is in place today on a pre-dams context? We do not at this point have the data base necessary on all lengths of the river, regarding flows at different times of the year, the condition of the water and that sort of thing; when the dams will be in operation a year from now; how that data base is to be developed. Normally when one sets in place a management system, it is based upon an existing context and then a new context.

In this situation, we will not have the data base of an existing context. We will only have part information and then we will have to catch-as-catch-can on what are the impacts from those dams and those altered flow regimes and that sort of thing. I would be interested in hearing how the management authority, which in itself I happen to have a lot of sympathy for that sort of a context. I just think it is going to be shackled by the fact it does not have sufficient information in which to operate properly and may take many, many years for it to develop, in a post facto context, necessary operating information.

\* (1540)

**Mr. Cummings:** As is so often the case in many of these situations, essentially, a number of years worth of data are already in place on both sides of the border. Putting together the assessment and the information, provides an environmental assessment base. We have an interdepartmental report that put together a lot of that a year ago. Essentially on the American side we believe that there is a large body of information that has been put together over the past number of years.

When I refer to the fact that we were working on additional water quality, I referred to the study. There is one specifically I was thinking of a study that we put in place this summer that was carried out by the University of Manitoba whereby some very specific studies done on the development of growth within the water that have to do with flow regimes and temperatures. What they will be doing is doing some modelling and it is not in fact what you had referred to as specific impact studies of the river basin. What we will be able to do to bring together the base information is to collect the large bodies of information that are out there now and put them into an understandable form so that they can be used as a basis upon which we will build our case for the quantity of water that we expect to receive in the future.

There is one issue that I will give the Members of both Opposition some credit for, but I suspect I can give it in a back-handed manner. The truth is that they may have backed into it, more than clearly defined it, in terms of how they have some legitimate concerns regarding this issue and that is the period of prolonged drought that we are presently suffering which has done two things. It has demonstrated the problems that you can have in that river basin when it is dry. It has also demonstrated the severe problems that people have

Tuesday, November 21, 1989

in that basin when the weather is dry. The two in some extent seem to be diametrically opposed.

As long as we have this continued drought, and believe me I am one of these from this Legislature who understands what the drought is doing as much as anyone although I am not in the Souris River basin. I can tell you that where I live the older people in the community say that they have not seen this kind of a drought, even during the Thirties, and so the fact is that there are some very significant impacts out there.

That leads to two situations. Number one, unnecessary pressure in some cases from those who are concerned about lack of moisture, and the converse, those who see what can happen to the river if it does not get enough water going down it. The water flows are designed in relationship to percentages of available flow and whether there is a dam or not. Those flows can only flow what water is available.

Ultimately we are all going to pay for the problems that could be associated with the dam. We will also all have a responsibility to deal with the fact that the waters in the Souris River basin are largely committed right now once you get past flood level. We can have all the water we want, but unfortunately during a normal year the authorities upstream from us could give it to us all during flood season, and I guess the Members make some valid points about the fact that we had to deal with a licence that we were not satisfied that all the work was done ahead of time.

I believe as a Government we have taken responsible action to make sure that as many of the gaps as possible are filled in, in order to protect the future of this river. We in Manitoba have a real stake in that river because it is the driest corner of our province traditionally.

In fact the water flows that we have are simply not sufficient today, but we know that we are entitled to more water when we have a manner of controlling it. We cannot control it at this stage and as we are able to establish what our total needs will be, as a percentage of the flow in the river, and what we are entitled to under normal international agreements, you can rest assured that we will use the levers that are available to us for the IJC to get that water. Secondly, you will have to appreciate the fact that here is a river in 1989, going back probably a decade already, when the normal water flows within the Province of Manitoba were already fully committed.

**Mr. Taylor:** The Minister is quite right about the impacts of the drought in the last couple of years. He also is correct in saying that in normal context the capabilities of the Souris River are pretty well tapped. I am not sure if the Minister is aware of a conference, specifically on the Red River basin, which includes the Souris, that was held last week down in Grand Forks. It was hosted by an organization called the International Coalition for the Land and Water Stewardship for the Red River Basin, which has representatives from North Dakota, Minnesota and Manitoba on it.

The theme of that conference was just the very point the Minister brought out. Water, too much and too little, was the theme of the conference, and we brought in

speakers from all over the continent, including representatives from the provincial Government of Manitoba. I say, we, because I am on the board of directors of that organization and was asked in to do so a year ago because of my work on rivers issues over the years.

The whole problem of at one moment having flood context and the next minute having real drought is one that is not easy to deal with, but the answers are not always just in building concrete structures either. That is part of the problem that I personally have with, easy, grab a hold of, physically visible solutions.

The Minister earlier made reference about some sort of disdain I or Members of this Party may have for the people of southwest Manitoba. I would suggest that nothing could be further from the truth. We are more than a little sympathetic at the problems that they are having down there. We are also more than a little concerned with the sort of sell job that has been done down in that part of the province by the Member for Arthur (Mr. Downey) in suggesting that, first of all, there was a problem and then there is no problem. Then he was against an EIS. Then he is for an EIS.

I would suggest that there has been one heck of a lot of political rhetoric. Very, very little factual information has been brought forward by their local provincial representative, and I think that is sad testimony. I am not suggesting that has been the case of the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), however, because I happen to agree with what he said when he was in Melita in late June.

I would ask a specific question of the Minister, however, in that we are aware that while the normal situation is to have 50 percent of the flow of a river given to the province from which it is flowing and 50 percent will flow across to the next jurisdiction. That is the normal pattern in Canada and it is the pattern that was put in place in 1959 by the then Diefenbaker Government federally to change what had been the traditional situation on the Souris River as it flowed from Saskatchewan to North Dakota.

Would the Minister address the fact that Saskatchewan is on record, publicly, as saying that they do not think that the 50 percent, of which they have by the 1959 Apportionment Agreement, will be sufficient and the probability is that they will have to make a request for 60 percent? Could the Minister address that and say what Manitoba's reaction would be to that very request?

\* (1550)

**Mr. Cummings:** Well, Mr. Acting Chairman, I will not state Manitoba's position prior to having seen what request might be put forward. I think that is a rather dangerous precedent to become involved in. I suspect that was one of the reasons that Saskatchewan wanted to put ground water into the reservoir as well and Manitoba's entitlement, as far as we are concerned, is not going to be frittered away. We have a good working arrangement with North Dakota today whereby they have been more than fair with the Province of

Manitoba in voluntary releases above what the agreement is today. Of course, that raises the question of whether or not Rafferty-Alameda puts pressure on North Dakota that will then not allow them to be as liberal as they have been up to now.

It is not my position but, again, it is very dangerous to reply to a hypothetical situation. When we are talking about entitlements, we are also talking about gross volumes and not monthly volumes. There are a lot of implications in what the Member has just asked, and it would be most inappropriate to put a bargaining position on the table, other than to say that there is no way that I can envisage Manitoba's entitlement being changed.

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Acting Chairman, it appears that the Minister was not aware of this position that was put forward last year by Saskatchewan. In all fairness, given that circumstance, I can only then ask him, will he raise it with Saskatchewan to clarify their position? Are they prepared to stay with the 50 percent, or are they at this point actually putting a 60 percent apportionment on the table? I think it is a very serious matter and given although we have a licence in place to permit construction to recommence on the Rafferty-Alameda dams, we have a whole series, almost two dozen conditions, some of which are still being actioned or studied or put in place. I think it would be appropriate to ask Saskatchewan now that question and could I have a response, please, on that matter.

**Mr. Cummings:** First of all, any request that Saskatchewan may want to put on the table should not in any way have an impact on what we are entitled to. When we are talking about a transboundary river, such as this, of course, that request will be in relationship to any arrangements they may make with North Dakota. Ultimately, as the end receiver, Manitoba will have an interest, but our entitlement should not be affected, and that is an obvious position which we have taken from Day One in terms of any of this development. The argument has always been generated into quality as well as quantity and, of course, the two are related. But quite simply, we have never foregone, and have no intention of foregoing, until we are prepared to make a final disposition upon what the uses of Manitoba might be for the Souris River, and what our requirements are.

**Mr. Taylor:** The Minister earlier said that given normal contacts, basically there is no extra water in the Souris and I think most people would agree with that. We could do with more flow in the Souris River.

But the point is Manitoba has given up in the past its rights to water on the Souris. If one looks at the amendments to the International Apportioning Agreement of 1942, or if one look, more recently, at 1959 in which the Roblin administration of Manitoba did not fight the federal Conservative administration, a very direct parallel 30 years earlier to what we have today, that is how we lost water, No. 1, and that is how we in Manitoba lost absolute guarantees, because we do not have absolute guarantees now.

The Minister makes reference to the situation with North Dakota and North Dakota being a co-operative

neighbour and I think that is exactly what it is, a very co-operative neighbour, but it is not obligated any longer by international agreement, in absolute terms, to give us water any longer because there is an out on the agreement. The out, as of 1959, is notwithstanding drought conditions because in the drought condition context it is at the option of the upstream jurisdiction.

So that is what we lost 30 years ago, and what my worry is, and why I raise this question to the Minister at this time is Saskatchewan has openly talked about a potential shortfall of water on the Souris, in Saskatchewan, to fill the Rafferty and Alameda dams once built. Given that admission one wonders why the project is going ahead but, in any case, they have said we may not be able to survive with the 50 percent and have this regime of dams and all the things that supposedly are going to be done with them work properly, therefore, we may need some extra water.

So all I have requested is, will Manitoba raise the issue with Saskatchewan so that it is on the table, so that we do not have a repeat of what happened 30 years ago?

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Acting Chairman, there are a couple of things that need to be put on the record in relationship to this. Manitoba has taken its responsibility for transboundary waters quite seriously. There are two departments that have to work hand in glove in respect to this—that is Natural Resources and the Department of Environment. That is why we have set up the Boundaries Water Office under Mr. Clarkson, and it is their responsibility to make sure that they are closely and consistently on top of these issues to make sure that both Ministers are properly informed of what is going on.

Manitoba has not given up permanently its entitlement to 50 percent. If you look at the 1959 Apportionment Agreement it is called an Interim Agreement. Until we sign off the International Joint Commission Agreement then we still have a right to determine what our ultimate proportionment of this water is going to be. I have encouraged the Member to remember that.

The other thing is he referenced, on perhaps a lighter vein, Mr. Acting Chairman, he referenced the fact that he is sitting on the Red River Basin Committee and the proper terminology I do not remember at the moment, but it is the same group which this Government just recently provided a \$12,000 grant to in order to support their operations and very shortly thereafter the Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) was appointed. So obviously a co-operative mood in the Legislature is still well and alive.

\* (1600)

**Mr. Taylor:** I am hoping the Minister was not suggesting that they needed the money for me in anyway. I see he is laughing so I will take it as strictly a light hearted comment.

(Mr. William Chornopyski, Mr. Chairman, in the Chair)

**Mr. Taylor:** The comments earlier by the Minister about the study by the University of Manitoba this summer



looking at the summer flow situation, looking at algae growth in the river and other sorts of things, it was suggested could lead to some modelling exercises that could give some of the missing information.

Will that exercise be sufficient to provide the missing information on the Manitoba reaches of the river that is going to be necessary for the management of the Red River Basin Authority and, if not, is there any other way that they can see their way clear to generating in the short-term information that will be of direct operational benefit in the near term?

**Mr. Cummings:** It is not designed to specifically, in relation to filling information gaps, it is intended but intended to gather information that can be used in addition to what we presently have. From that information the impacts of still water and temperatures can be examined.

Interestingly enough the Member references the fact that he is not a supporter of the quick and ready and very high profile obvious solutions to water retention. If he wants to get into a philosophical argument about what is good in the long term for rivers in this province and for long-term water supplies across the province, I would suspect given that comment that he probably will fully support the fact that we believe that one of the more cost-efficient ways of providing water retention and long-term water supplies across the province is with a number of smaller projects—some of them may be low level dams, some of them could be simply classified as weirs, which is another type of restriction in the water flows—but frankly I suspect that he would support the direction that we are moving through with Natural Resources.

I would hope that he might want to discuss that issue with Natural Resources because it is very positive in relationship to the long-term drought proofing of this province. Unfortunately, far too often the only time people recognize the value of these types of projects is after you have had a series of years such as we just came through. Even on the Red River, I believe that some of the things that we have seen happening last year and again this year in relation to significant water supplies for some of the communities south of Winnipeg are going to have to be addressed on an emergent basis if things continue to move the way they are. Some of these navigable waterways are going to have to be re-examined on how we treat them because there may be other priorities for which the river could be used.

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairperson, being very much a supporter of drought proofing exercises, the point I was making is that dams are not the only solution. They are just one of a whole series of solutions and the Minister makes a little aside about aquifers. There is nothing wrong with using an aquifer, hopefully their recharge rate over a decade is going to be the same as the extraction rate otherwise we have a serious mining going on. That is the thing to guard against because otherwise we will be just like those people in the southwestern U.S. that had amongst the largest aquifers in the whole world, and they have depleted three-quarters of them over this last century without a hope of recharge. Some of those recharges would take tens of thousands of years.

The idea of weirs, when one looks at the Gladstone Plumas area and the dryness in that area, one has to say building that system of hundreds and hundreds of miles of high class ditches without weirs on them, why? Why not restore the wetlands, especially where it is marginal farming at best? Why not build more shelter belts and not just around the homesteads and the farm buildings but out in the middle of the fields so they will catch water and they will catch snow? Those are the things we have to look at and small structures are often going to be better than the larger ones but not exclusively so.

One of my concerns on this exercise that we have on Rafferty-Alameda is the potential need for a number of smaller structures in the Souris Valley with maybe the need brought forward and exacerbated by the Rafferty-Alameda dams, and who is going to be paying for them? You and I and every other Manitoban as opposed to the proponents, or at least partial payment by the proponents of Rafferty-Alameda.

That leads to the question to the Minister is: what is being done to determine the range of impacts complete with costs that are likely to be attributed to these dams project in Saskatchewan over the 50-year life of the licence so that Manitoba can realistically require compensation assuming the projects will not be amended and ameliorated?

**Mr. Cummings:** I believe the Member is referring to the clause referred to damages. It has been left open ended purposely so that it is not a limited clause. If we can identify it through the process that we are embarked upon with the federal Government areas of potential damage, then that will be the basis upon which we will deal with them.

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairperson, is the Minister saying then by that statement that he would expect within this year to have full information on potential impacts and potential costs and therefore potential compensation that could be expected in Manitoba within this next year after working with the feds?

**Mr. Cummings:** Well, the first objective would be to make sure that potential damages were mitigated rather than reimbursed. In terms of getting the information together, yes, that work will proceed fairly quickly.

**Mr. Taylor:** Yes, Mr. Chairperson, I would just like to compliment the Minister for giving the right answer, it is two years too late. That is exactly right, mitigation as opposed to compensation. He is right on, he is right on. His predecessors, however, did not do that. That is exactly right, you want to amend the design to minimize those impacts. Therefore, you are minimizing the compensation. We are under construction and the design is not able to be changed.

Has the Minister requested that the problem areas in the EIS conducted by Saskatchewan be corrected? I am referring specifically to the hydrology and aquatic life modelling that was conducted by that province and was cited in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers as amongst the most serious problem areas in the Saskatchewan study.

**Mr. Cummings:** I am very pleased to see that the light has come on on the other side. For a while I thought maybe the light was on but there was nobody home. The fact is that I believe, if I understand what what he is referring to, that those will be Saskatchewan's problems. No matter how much we might want to see them dealt with or environmental people both in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and North Dakota might want to see them dealt with, they do fall within Saskatchewan's responsibility. Our ability to do anything about that is obviously limited, but in terms of what would happen in Manitoba, we will deal with that with our own information and then proceed from there.

I am really pleased to see that the Member now realizes that we have consistently referred to the fact that mitigation of problems is more important than simply paying the damage.

\* (1610)

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairman, the Members in the Liberal Opposition sure do not need any lessons on this issue. We were the ones that raised this in July and August of 1988 when we had the First Session of the Thirty-Fourth Legislature, and to suggest that we did not know about mitigation, we were the ones that put it on the table. The Minister of the time quite frankly nothing less than stonewalled this. All we were going to get was more water and better quality water and there is not going to be any problems and we are going ahead with drought proofing Manitoba especially southwest Manitoba.

Notwithstanding if that is all going to be Manitoba taxpayers' dollars going out to doing it as opposed to some of it being out of Saskatchewan and North Dakota's deep pockets because they would be some of the cause of some of water shortages on the southwest part of the province, I do not think we need any lectures on that. What I did ask the Minister was, would he ask that Saskatchewan consider redoing certain sections? Obviously, you are going to be able to get only the quality of information that is on the table today. There are downstream impacts from that work on North Dakota and on Manitoba. That is pretty obvious; that is the way the river flows.

The question is, certainly it is Saskatchewan's responsibility, but you are only going to get the quality of information you would like depending on how much effort you make. If the effort is not going to made, i.e., there is not going to be a formal request, there is not even going to be a discussion amongst officials, certainly you are not going to get any answers. The question I put to the Minister is, will he ask the question, so that Manitoba's interest can be shown, our concerns, and the fact that we feel that there is a lack of information or a lack of quality information. I would request that he put the query in to his counterpart in Saskatchewan so that maybe we can get a little better quality work out of that province.

**Mr. Cummings:** I have had a number of meetings with the Saskatchewan Minister of Environment. The Rafferty-Alameda is a sore point between these two

provinces for quite some time. The fact that Saskatchewan has maintained for a long time that they have done everything that has been required or requested is the position which they still assume.

While I may not be satisfied with that answer, I must be frank with the Member to indicate to him that short of and in fact no matter what I do and I cannot figure any particular action today that would embarrass the Saskatchewan Government into providing any more information or any different information other than what is required under the licence and the argument will probably go on for generations as to whether or not Saskatchewan had completed all of the work that was deemed to have been necessary in connection with this project.

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairperson, the Minister is suggesting that he is not even prepared to address a piece of ministerial correspondence to his counterpart of counterparts. I would suggest there is another counterpart, because the Minister responsible for Saskatchewan power would also be involved in this seeing as the Souris Basin Development Authority reports there. To those two Ministers, if he is not even prepared to send a piece of ministerial correspondence saying what our concerns are here in this province and what we would prefer to see on the table in the way of information, improved information than what is there today, then I am saying he is copping out.

**Mr. Cummings:** I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Member has had some success over the last 18 months on beating away at the Rafferty-Alameda drum, but there has been an enormous amount of communication and concern expressed back and forth between these two provinces, and I could quite easily have stood up and said, sure, we will do it. However, I told the Member what I anticipated the result would be. He does not have to like it any better than I do, but unfortunately that is where we are sitting.

**Mr. Taylor:** I can see the lip-service environmentalists are hard at it again. Next question: the Minister made reference to the fact that there is groundwater being taken into the Souris system and that is quite true. In fact, I was able to point out, through telephone research that I could do from Winnipeg, that there were eight unlicensed wells pumping some extremely poor quality water out of the ground near Macoun, Saskatchewan, which is a little bit west of Estevan, wells I might add which never had any environmental impact assessment work done on them at all and which, although requested for licensing by Saskatchewan Power some three and a half years ago, almost four years ago in fact, were never licensed when they were dug, when the pipeline connecting them—I believe it was some 16 miles to the boundary reservoir, the existing reservoir adjacent to Estevan, and then the water began to flow. There was no EIS done for any of those steps and there was no licensing in place when that tainted water started flowing into the reservoir.

The comment was, out of Saskatchewan in defence later, well, the water never comes out of that reservoir. We all know that is not true, because there are periodic

discharges from that reservoir, and the water is also taken across the river to—this reservoir is not on the river, it is on a creek that goes into the Souris—it is brought by pipeline across the river and into the existing generating station and is periodically discharged from there as well. I would like to know what the Minister's response and the Minister's action has been in dealing with Saskatchewan on that matter.

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Chairman, that dam is not normally discharged into the Souris, and the Member is raising a concern that we raised during the discussion on this dam site, that we did not want groundwater additionally feeding into this river basin. The indication that I received from Mr. Bouchard was that Saskatchewan was vehemently upset with the fact that was not to be allowed under the licence that he ultimately issued, so I do not see it as being an issue.

**Mr. Taylor:** Mr. Chairperson, the groundwater is into the boundary reservoir. That reservoir does discharge; it has a discharge mouth right into the Souris, the mouth of the creek, and a couple of times a year it does discharge. It does not do it daily, but it does it two or three times a year. The water does discharge out of the thermal generating station into the river; the water is there now.

Also I might point out that we have an existing situation prior to the construction of the Rafferty Dam right nearby, in addition the pipeline that I mentioned that is tapping those wells at Macoun and bringing this tainted water in, has a connection to go into the Rafferty. It is not pumping yet but the connection is in place. What assurances do we have that there will not be a post-facto connection, maybe a different environment Minister and a request by Saskatchewan Power, who will be the operating authority for one, in conjunction with the Souris Basin Development Authority for a licence amendment? That is what it physically has been set up to do, feed Boundary now and feed Rafferty later, and one only has to look at the pipes to see that.

**Mr. Cummings:** Well, Mr. Chairman, perhaps this is the same as the charges that we had regarding Namew Lake from the third Party in the Legislature where they brought information to the House that discharges were going illegally into Chocolate Lake down a pipeline that was in place. We even went to the extent of having one of our technicians go and swab the inside of the pipe to find out if there had been discharges down the darn thing.

The licence under Section 12 does not permit groundwater discharges into the reservoirs Rafferty and Alameda.

**Mr. Taylor:** The Saskatchewan Water Corporation, which is the body in Saskatchewan responsible for water use licensing, water extraction and the conveyance of water, admitted that there had been no EIS done on those wells. They admitted that there was no licence in place when the water flowed, and the water, as far as my information goes, is still flowing into Boundary and therefore is still entering the Souris from time to time. What has the Minister, if anything, chosen to do

with the fact that we are already getting that water in a today context prior to Rafferty-Alameda?

\* (1620)

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Chairman, I indicated under Section 12, groundwater discharge will not be used to augment directly or indirectly the improved reservoirs. I would wonder if the Member for Wolseley (Mr. Taylor) has thought about the fact that there are dozens of irrigation wells in this province that are pumping out of aquifers, that there have not been impact studies.

The first environmental impact study that was done on a major well site in this province was the one on the West Lake Project. I find it strange that he wants to debate environmental problems in Saskatchewan when we have legitimate environmental concerns that should be debated in this Legislature about the effects and concerns within the boundaries of the Province of Manitoba. He chooses to continue on this line of questioning, and I am certainly prepared to continue and answer any of the questions that he wants to bring forward but I would have thought there would be lots of issues within Manitoba that he might want to get onto.

**Mr. Taylor:** I can certainly assure the Members of this committee, including the Minister, that there will be many issues within the boundaries of Manitoba that are of environmental concern to us on this side of the House.

The fact of the matter is we have got tainted water entering the Souris from time to time now, which river flows eventually here into this province. It sounds to me like the Minister may be willing to parrot back about Clause 12 of the license as it refers to Rafferty-Alameda, and I am talking about an existing context, one that has been going on for the last nine months.

The issue is tainted water in the boundary reservoir and tainted water into the existing thermal generating station both on the banks of the Souris River. Unless the Minister is prepared to enlighten us in some other way it would appear that he is just prepared to accept that sort of a situation which sort of puts a lie to the fact of what the former Minister of Natural Resources was forever wont to crow about, whether it was here in the Chamber or out in the hall in the scums or in press conferences and it was more water or better water. I would suggest we have a harbinger here of what is to come and it will be less water and poorer water.

**Mr. Cummings:** I think the Member chooses to perhaps deliberately ignore the fact that Manitoba has recourse to this licence at any time that we feel that it has been breached and one of the reasons, I would assume that the Saskatchewan authority pumps into the boundary reservoir is when there is a shortage of water, because I cannot conceive of any other reason why one would take ground water to supplement a surplus reservoir.

Therefore, there are no discharges out of that dam when it is using ground water for cooling purposes and if there seemed to be ground water getting from that

site then I would think it is something far different than from what I understand is going on there.

**Mr. Taylor:** I think that is exactly the case and what the Minister has just said is because of what he has been led to believe, what actually has happened and we have eye witnesses that have seen the discharges, since the connection was made it is really unfortunate but it would seem to be that we have a case again of Saskatchewan trying to pull the wool over Manitoba's eyes, and they seem to be so hepped on this whole thing of getting those dams in place at any cost that unfortunately there seems to be somewhat of a bending of the truth. We have seen it in the way that Manitoba was excluded earlier from negotiations in which there were illegal bipartite negotiations going on at a sovereign state level between Saskatchewan and North Dakota and which Manitoba was excluded and the Minister makes a joke about the fact that it was illegal.

What I say about that is illegal is this, both the law of Canada and the law of the United States requires specific sanction and authorization of direct bipartite negotiations in any context. It was not given in either case. You can check the record on that.

The Minister made reference earlier to the fact that the 1959 agreement on apportionment was called the Interim Agreement. That is quite right, that is the correct title of it. However it has been in place for a little over 30 years now and that is what still is and nobody has suggested reopening it other than Saskatchewan to take more water.

I, for one, would recommend to the Minister that he not depend on the good offices of the International Joint Commission to in any way bail Manitoba out on a matter of making the 1959 agreement not interim, because for us to take a matter to the IJC requires the authorization of the federal Government in its concurrence first case. We certainly have not seen much evidence lately of this federal Government being prepared to refer anything of concern on international waters to the IJC, whether it be the Red River in recent times or whether it be the Souris or any other matter.

I think that the IJC has done some good pieces of work at different times along that boundary and I, quite frankly, have been a student of its work since its inception in 1910 but we have not been the beneficiary in recent years of anything they have done, and I would suggest that it is not in the cards for Manitoba to successfully request that we go to the IJC through the good offices of the Mulroney Tories because they do not want the IJC meddling in anything, particularly when there are other deals to be done with Saskatchewan.

Those are my questions for the moment on Rafferty. If the Minister has a further wrap-up response, I would be very interested in it, otherwise we could go on to other matters.

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Chairman, the Member referenced the fact that he did not think the present Government would support a reference to the IJC. By 1998 when Manitoba applies to Prime Minister Filmon for support in this IJC, then I suspect that we will get a good hearing.

**Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill):** Mr. Chairperson, I would ask the Minister if he could use a moment under this particular line in the Estimates process to bring the Assembly up to date as to what action his Government is taking with respect to the proposed Island Falls Dam by Saskatchewan Power, a dam which of course will affect a number of communities in northern Manitoba, most particularly the reserve communities of Pukatawagan and Brochet, and the Metis community in Brochet and Granville Lake.

As the Minister is aware, a number of years ago this issue came to a head, at least for the time being, when it was indicated to the provincial Government that Saskatchewan Power did in fact intend to construct another dam a little way downstream from the existing dam. At that time the licence for the operation of the original dam had expired. The communities asked the provincial Government and the federal Government both to assist them in preparing some sort of analysis as to the impact the original dam had on their community and their lifestyle and their economic development, as well as a number of social problems which they believe resulted from the construction of that dam and its impact on the communities.

I happen to share that belief that in fact there were those sorts of social problems, and also to attempt to determine what new effects might occur as a result of the construction of another dam in that area. There were a number of hearings that were conducted by the Water Commission, through the Province of Manitoba. That process seemed to be unfolding relatively well until Saskatchewan Power indicated that they were not prepared to participate in any way or manner whatsoever with that series of hearings which were being held in the communities I just referenced earlier. They were of, as I understand it, the legal opinion that they did not need a licence in order to construct this new facility.

That is where the issue lay for a bit of time and now with the construction commencing it has again been brought to the attention of the Government. The bands are again asking the provincial Government and the federal Government to provide them with some assistance in trying to quantify past damages and mitigate against future damages that could occur from a new dam.

I would ask the Minister if he could provide us an update on the status of that request and what action his Government is taking in response to it.

\* (1630)

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Chairman, this project has a rather, I suppose, long, and I might describe sordid history, and one which I am becoming a good deal more familiar with in recent months. To update the present situation, I have had now three meetings with the new Minister of Environment from Saskatchewan: two face-to-face meetings, one meeting by phone, one lengthy phone conversation.

Myself and my Deputy Minister flew to Saskatchewan to meet directly with Minister Hodgins shortly after he

became responsible for Environment to seize the opportunity to tell him that as a new Minister perhaps the Saskatchewan Government had an opportunity to reconsider its position vis-a-vis this dam, and the fact that they felt that they could proceed without environmental impact studies.

I met with him as well at the First Ministers' Conference and I received assurance from him that he wanted to meet very shortly with the people of the affected areas. Last Thursday, I guess it would be, the 16th of this month, Minister Downey and myself along with support staff went to Thompson to meet with representatives of the various communities and told them of the fact that Minister Hodgins would attempt to meet with them in the very near future.

We chose a tentative time frame. We agreed to work with them to develop an agenda for that meeting and will be working through the Minister of Northern Affairs' office to have that meeting convened, to make sure that Manitoba has an adequate agenda when we meet with the Minister.

As I have told Saskatchewan on numerous occasions, we anticipate some positive action in regard to this issue or Manitoba will be forced to take some rather dramatic action to make sure that the people of the area receive adequate recognition for the problems that they have in relationship to the control of the water on Churchill River.

Obviously, there is more than just this dam site that the people of the area have concerns about. The control structure on Reindeer Lake is also of great concern and they believe needs to be dealt with at the same time. The fluctuations on that lake need to be dealt with at the same time as we are dealing with the licence for the dam on the Churchill River.

That is exactly where we are at today, but I would anticipate that we are within a couple of months at least, or sooner, of having a pretty clear idea of where Saskatchewan and Manitoba will eventually saw off on this issue. I am not totally optimistic Saskatchewan will agree to the concerns that we have raised, but I was encouraged by the fact that the affected people, particularly those on the reserves, have acquired a considerable amount of information and backing from some of the federal departments. The fact that the dam site probably will need a federal licence under the Navigable Waters Act is an issue that is going to have to be addressed by Saskatchewan. Depending on how they address that in conjunction with the federal Government will dictate the direction which we will go from there.

**Mr. Cowan:** I thank the Minister for that overview of the current situation. There are some specific questions though that I think require some answering and perhaps I will place them one by one.

The first question would be, can the Minister provide us as to a status report of the actual construction of the new facility? At what stage is it in its construction? When is it anticipated that certain significant portions of it will be completed, and what ongoing contact does he have with the Saskatchewan Government or

Saskatchewan Power Corporation to maintain a watching brief on the construction of that particular operation?

**Mr. Cummings:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the specifics of the timing of the construction, I do not have nor is it necessarily germane to what we are trying to do here. The impacts on the people of the area need to be dealt with and how Saskatchewan deals with that dam site is of some considerable importance. Whether it proceeds or not will rest largely with how we are able to deal with the issues surrounding the Navigable Waters Act and the effect on federal lands. I would anticipate that under the discussions that I have had with Mr. Hodgins that he will not be doing anything. He said that he would make sure that everything was on the table in terms of discussions when he met with the Manitoba communities.

**Mr. Cowan:** Well, I would suggest to the Minister of Environment that the timing of the construction of the facility is in fact germane to the entire situation and more particularly to how Saskatchewan Power or the Saskatchewan Government can be forced to deal with not only future problems that may result from the new construction but also past problems that have resulted from the previous construction. Those are debts which are outstanding that have not been paid.

The reason the timing becomes important is as long as Saskatchewan can proceed along with the construction and maybe even complete the construction before the other matters are dealt with, we then lose a lever day by day and ultimately the entire lever on being able to stop the construction.

The Minister says that he is really putting all of the eggs of the provincial Government into one basket and that basket, if I understand him correctly, is that this will most likely require a federal permit or federal licence under the Navigable Waters Rivers Act. They would be the ones that would be providing the go-ahead for this project. I think to do that relies too much on an outside party. I think that because the dam in the past has and a new dam will affect Crown lands in Manitoba that the provincial Government has a certain responsibility as well.

I am not suggesting that it would be the only Party that has a responsibility and I think that is a responsibility that is shared with the federal Government. There should not be a total reliance upon the federal Government because we have learned in the past that sometimes they do not always come through in the manner in which we think is the appropriate way to proceed with the interests of Manitoba in mind. They do not always have common interests or shared interests with us.

There is a responsibility on the part of the provincial Government, certainly to the Metis communities, northern affairs communities, but also to the reserve communities to ensure that their livelihood, that their land, that their culture, that their economic development is protected and where it has not been protected in the past, compensation is made available to them that may be due to them.

Tuesday, November 21, 1989

I would ask him if he agrees that the timing of the construction is indeed a crucial component of this entire situation just from the perspective of once that dam is complete or very nearly complete we lose all of our bargaining power.

In the past Saskatchewan Power and the Saskatchewan Government have shown themselves unwilling to bargain or to review this issue in an amicable fashion. They have withdrawn themselves from any discussions. They have said that it is not their responsibility. They have said that they do not need a licence and therefore, if one is going to force them to discuss the issue, one has to have some sort of lever which they can exercise from time to time. I would ask him from that perspective, is it not important that we know the timing of the construction and what is happening in Saskatchewan on this project?

**Mr. Cummings:** Well, I think if the Member indicates that it is the singular most important thing that we need to watch at the moment in terms of physically what is going on, obviously that is the most obvious thing. I do not think Saskatchewan will be very anxious to once again see the spectre of a partly built dam being ordered stopped by a court order. I believe that the people of this area both on the reserves and in the communities have a fairly large card that they have just drawn in relationship to the fact that some of the federal departments are starting to show considerable interest in what is going on there.

\* (1640)

Manitoba has now I think demonstrated to the Province of Saskatchewan and to the people of the area that we are prepared to facilitate in the best way that we can the resolution of this problem. The ultimate resolution of it, as I am sure the Member will appreciate, one cannot predict where we will ultimately end up but we know where we want to end up, and that is the recognition of the problems that they have in that area. The recognition of the immediate problems adjacent to the dam site are one issue; the larger issue is even the control structures that go into providing the water that will eventually be redirected into the Churchill River.

I have to indicate, as I did at our meeting the other night with the people of the district, and when I say "district," it is a large area really, that Saskatchewan will probably be very reluctant to enter into that discussion. They have indicated very strongly, and I concur, that we need every lever that we can use in order to determine what the ultimate outcome of this will be.

Whether or not we are talking about something that will bring Saskatchewan Hydro to the table, with the same spirit of co-operation that Manitoba Hydro is starting to demonstrate in Manitoba here regarding impacts, or whether we are going to end up in another nasty situation with the Province of Saskatchewan, I have chosen to give Grant Hodgins, the Saskatchewan Minister, a reasonable time to appreciate the problems that he is wading into. I do not care what political stripe he would be from, I think that is only the reasonable thing to do. He committed himself to meeting with the

communities and very shortly after that meeting we are all going to know where we are at, including Saskatchewan.

**Mr. Cowan:** I listened to the Minister's words carefully, and I want to read back to him one sentence that does not give me very much comfort, nor do I think it would give residents of the area very much comfort and, as a matter of fact, I think they will find somewhat disconcerting. I tried to copy it down as verbatim as I could and I think I have got, if not the exact wording in place, at least the overall intent. The Minister said that they hope to, and here is a quote: Facilitate in the best way we can the resolution of this—and I am not certain of what he said—situation or problem, both could be interchangeable. That is a very nice general, generic sort of statement of commitment, but it does not go very far and it does not provide very much detail.

I am not suggesting that the Minister phrased his words in that way so as to obscure the commitment, or to hide the detail. I want to give him an opportunity to flush that statement out a bit as we determine what are the very best ways that he believes might be used, or facilitated in order to resolve this problem.

Is he prepared to provide the communities—and when I say communities in this instance and hereafter, I mean both the reserve communities and the Metis communities, with financial support which will enable them to more fully document the difficulties that they have experienced in the past, as well as to mount a legal action, which is their right and their responsibility on behalf of the constituents they represent, against Saskatchewan Power, against the federal Government, against the Saskatchewan Government and perhaps even against the Manitoba Government in order to ensure that their rights are protected in this particular situation and also to ensure that they receive fair compensation for the damages that have been wrought against them in the past by this project.

**Mr. Cummings:** I suspect the Member for Churchill knows the answer to this already, but being the astute politician that he is, he probably does not ask any questions, or at least most times he does not ask any questions that he does not already know the answer to.

We offered support to the reserves and to the communities, including legal support, to prepare themselves for this meeting with Mr. Hodgins. I will reiterate here that far too often what has happened is that we have allowed these types of situations, albeit this has a lot of unique aspects to it, but in negotiations over the years too often northern communities, in some cases I would believe it fairly applies to the reserves as well, however, through the federal Government, where Governments have ended up funding consultants. The only thing that happens is that nothing happens, the consultants end up being fairly well employed and paid and the people for whom they are working are not necessarily well-served.

We agreed to provide staff support, including legal support, for this initial meeting with Mr. Hodgins. We

have indicated, both the Premier and I have indicated before that we are prepared to provide information and support on the technical side and through the delivery of this service through staff, at least what we have in the immediate future we believe we can address their concerns and help them in the best way possible.

**Mr. Cowan:** Well, the Minister indicates that they are going to be providing support to the communities, and then he very quickly indicates that support is going to be legal support, and I took from his answer—

**An Honourable Member:** Including legal support.

**Mr. Cowan:** Okay, he mentions from his seat, including legal support, and I will come back to that. I take from his comments that they will not be providing financial support in order for the communities to obtain legal support of their own but will be providing legal support from within the Government system itself. I may have gone a step too far in trying to interpret what he said, but I took that to be the case from his more general denigrating comments about consultants, generally.

He indicates that if they were respectable, well, those comments may have been respectfully stated, but that does not mean that they were respectfully intended. I heard what he said and I can indicate to him that others before him have said the same thing, but in the end the question became one of who controls the mechanisms by which one undertakes a legal challenge or the mechanisms by which one undertakes research.

The communities have generally, although not in all instances, but generally stated their position as being one of wanting to control that process. It is very important. If you have a lawyer who is spending partial time on a particular issue and is being directed as to how they set their own priorities by another body—and that is how this was in the past, I am not saying that it worked well or did not work well—there is a concern on the part of the original parties, the communities, that perhaps they are not getting all that they should from that individual. That is not a concern that individual is not giving all that he or she would like to give, but just that they may not have the time or the energy based on their other obligations and responsibilities to give as much as should be given to the issue that is of most importance to the communities.

That is the first bit of clarification which I believe is important. Is this legal support contained within the Government system and being seconded? If the communities were to so desire after having tried that process to have obtained outside counsel which they could more directly influence and more explicitly direct to dealing with this problem, would the Government be prepared to provide them with financial resources to do that?

The second question flowing from the Minister's answer involves the other part which he was less detailed with respect to and that is the "including". He said that they are prepared to provide support to the reserves including legal support.

He later on in his comments mentioned that they were prepared to provide information and support on

the technical side. I am not certain as to exactly what he meant by that, but I would then ask them if that is the entire package; in other words, the included information and support on the technical side, or is there money available as well for the communities to undertake some independent research in this area if they felt that was necessary?

\* (1650)

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Chairman, we do not go to that meeting to put a package on the table. We went to that meeting to get and receive information. We felt we had some pertinent information for the communities. We felt that we had an obligation to demonstrate that we were prepared to work with them and to have a Minister of the Saskatchewan Government be prepared to meet with them directly. I felt that we had at least some limited success in putting forward their case.

We did not offer them a package per se. We however agreed to work with them under the means that I just referred to and that the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) referred to, to deal with this meeting with the Environment Minister from Saskatchewan. As this situation begins to unfold, if you will, or pick up some speed subsequent to that meeting, I would suggest that Manitoba Government is doing a credible job of dealing with the issue as it unfolds.

The bands did not specifically request financial support as I recall it, but the communities felt that they were needing some support in the form of direct dollars. As I want to reiterate, we did not go there to offer a package. We went there to deal with the people of the communities—or not deal with, but to meet with and to both give and receive information and have a better feel for how the people of the communities wanted to proceed with this. Beyond that we have not set any hard and fast conditions, but again I would reiterate that too often we have a situation where we fund researchers or consultants depending on what you want to call them, and they end up with the money and the people who should be getting the consideration in the long run end up with the shaft.

**Mr. Cowan:** I would ask the Minister if that was a respectable shaft or if that was a denigrating comment about consultants. I think the more he talks about them the deeper he tends to travel along that rut. I do not want to bring him down any further into a philosophical debate on consultants because I think it is one that could last for quite some time, as illuminating as it might be. We are under some time constraints here. Perhaps there is a better time and place for that.

I do want to give some advice though, and the Minister can take the advice or leave the advice as he will. I do believe it is important on behalf of my constituents to provide the Minister with the benefit of whatever insights I have been able to garner over the years around this particular issue as MLA for the area, and as a Member of a Cabinet that had to deal with the Saskatchewan Government on what appears to be nearly the same terms as the present Government is finding itself forced to deal with them.

I want to make that point first. The Minister said earlier in his comments and again I am quoting as accurately as I can. Saskatchewan in his mind will be "very reluctant to enter into that discussion." That discussion being discussion about the impact of the power station and the control station as well on the communities of Pukatawagan, Granville Lake and Brochet. He said at the same time just following that, the Government will "need every lever it can use." That is the point I was trying to make before in my comments that one of the levers that is available to the Minister is the actual need of Saskatchewan to construct that power station and to maintain control of the regulation of Reindeer Lake.

Once the new facility is constructed there is no more need, so the lever disappears. The one thing that we were able to stop as a Government has now been completed. So we have no way of trying to impose upon a reluctant partner a need to discuss because there is no need for them to change anything, having already accomplished the change which they had set out to accomplish in the first instance. It is very important that the construction itself be monitored.

I understand that the Minister has a sense of confidence that this issue will not go unresolved just because of construction starts because, as he indicated earlier, Saskatchewan does not want to, and I quote, "have the spectre of a partially filled dam again."

They may not want to, but I think in that instance they found even although they had to suffer through some temporary hardship, they were able to carry on with their project. They were most likely able to carry on with the project as fast as they did because it was partially started. Once something is partially started, there is always an urgency to complete it. Therefore, if any studies take place, or any injunctions take place, or any legal research takes place, it takes place under an arbitrarily imposed, an artificially imposed time constraint by the other party.

They are saying, well, we now have construction partially started, time is wasting, money is wasting. We are now going to have to complete that construction, and that argument does hold some sway. So better to remove that argument in the first instance and strike in this instance, even before construction is very far along the completion phase.

The Minister indicated earlier as well that in a couple of months or sooner, to quote him, a pretty clear idea of where Saskatchewan and Manitoba will saw off on this issue will be obtained from the meetings with the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings). Those couple of months could be very costly months if construction is proceeding during that period of time.

What I would suggest to the Minister is he perhaps report back at the next meeting of this committee as to what the exact status of the construction is at this particular time, because I do believe it is quite germane. I think the Minister will come to that conclusion as well that it is quite germane to the issue.

The other bit of advice I want to give the Minister is not to rule out, and matter of fact to look more

positively upon requests for financial assistance from the communities themselves, the non-reserve communities. That is not to say that they should not provide assistance to the reserve communities, if they request as well. I think a package could be developed that would accommodate both, but the reserve communities are going to get some financial assistance from the federal Government.

The non-reserve communities look to the province for that same sort of financial assistance. Their interests are melded in a lot of ways, but they are not always exactly the same. Therefore, I think it is important that both parties be allowed the opportunity to state their interests in the most forceful way possible, and that sometimes requires some financial assistance.

I see my time is up, Mr. Chairperson, so I will leave it at that, but this is an issue that perhaps the Minister can come back to the next committee with more information regarding.

\* (1700)

**Mr. Chairman:** The hour being 5 p.m., and time for Private Members' Hour, committee rise and call in the Speaker.

## IN SESSION

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

### COMMITTEE REPORT

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

**Mr. Parker Burrell (Acting Chairman of Committees):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same and asks leave to meet again.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye (Mr. Pankratz), that the report of the committee be received.

**MOTION presented and carried.**

### DEBATE ON SECOND READINGS

### PUBLIC BILLS

#### BILL NO. 2—THE LANDLORD AND TENANT AMENDMENT ACT

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), Bill No. 2, The Landlord and Tenant Amendment Act; (Loi modifiant la Loi sur le louage d'immeubles), standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns). Stand?

Is there leave to have the Bill remain standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources—the Honourable Member for Ellice.

**Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice):** It certainly gives me pleasure this afternoon to speak on this particular piece of legislation. It is a very important piece of legislation.



This legislation was brought forth by my colleague, the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux), in response to a need which has certainly been identified by landlords and by tenants in regard to the need for mandatory conditional reports.

We have seen, Mr. Deputy Speaker, actually a significant amount of progress in the whole area of landlord and tenant affairs, if one goes back some 10 years in the Province of Manitoba. We have certainly seen very little legislation from the beginning to move toward some legislation which certainly indicated the significance and the need for regulations and rules in regard to the affairs of landlord and tenant. This particular legislation is a very important one, certainly a very important one for the Liberal Party, and as I speak personally, a very important one for many of my constituents.

I think what is important to remember is that this legislation has been brought forth before the Government brought forth their legislation, The Residential Tenancies Act. As we compare the two, granted there are some very good things in The Residential Tenancies Act, but in fact what we do not see in that particular Act, and what in fact Bill No. 2 does point out, is that there is a need for condition reports to be done by the landlord and by the tenant. This is not something that should be elective. This is not something that should be only done if maybe the tenant pushes for it or only done if the landlord so chooses. This is something that should be contained within the legislation, contained within regulations so that it is done.

Now we know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in the area of landlord and tenant affairs, we have a wide variety of tenants who occupy premises, and we have a wide variety of landlords as well. We have seen a number of advocacy groups which have sprung up, tenant groups, advocacy groups who felt the need to band together and to work together, because they have been very concerned about some of the conditions of some of the housing particularly in our City of Winnipeg. I speak about the City of Winnipeg because that is my constituency when I am talking about downtown Winnipeg.

Certainly, housing has been an issue that has been a major concern to many people particularly in the low income bracket. Those concerns in regard to housing, although this particular legislation moves towards addressing some of those needs, we certainly have a long way to go. We have a group of individuals who will be holding a vigil in a week or so, a group of concerned individuals, a group of United Church ministers, a group of Anglican Church ministers who have actually asked politicians and consumer groups to ban together and to hold a vigil to talk about the housing concerns in our City of Winnipeg.

I think that the legislation that the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) has put forth shows a move towards recognizing some of these housing concerns. He addresses some of the particular issues in regard to the housing concerns in Winnipeg, and that particular issue being the need for mandatory condition reports for landlords and for tenants.

Now there are a number of reasons why this particular Bill, this amendment, is very important. We know that the majority of landlords are responsible. We know that they would use conditional reports as a matter of course when they are renting to tenants, because most landlords would see conditional reports as a benefit to themselves and to the tenant involved. We have to operate on the principle, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in fact people operate businesses in good faith. They would want to do what would be most reasonable and would be to the best interest for themselves as a business and what would be also for the best interests of the tenants whom they are renting to.

We are not saying that in fact the majority of landlords would not use this conditional report because in fact history has shown us that it is in common usage. There are a group of landlords out there who in fact do not use conditional reports because they see it to their advantage to not use those reports. They see it to their advantage because in fact the premises which they happen to be renting are in a shamble. So that for them to do a conditional report, the tenant is then made far more aware of the inadequacies of that particular premise. It is not to the landlord's advantage at all to fill out a condition report.

We have groups of individuals who are out there looking for housing accommodations. I think we have to consider the context of which some of these people are looking for accommodation. They are oftentimes low income, they may be the working poor, they may be on social assistance, they may have a number of children, so they are looking for accommodation that would not only be shelter for themselves but they are concerned about their family as well. They are in a stressful situation because they are looking for shelter, they are looking for some place to live. What is available to them?

Now I will always recall the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) telling us that the people who are low income, or particularly in social assistance, that we do not tell people where to live and they can live anywhere they want in the city.- (interjection)- Well, the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) asks why I will always recall that? I recall that statement because it was very profound to me that a Minister could be so ill-advised and so unaware of the facts and the issues affecting low income people and housing in this particular City of Winnipeg.

It was very, very clear to me that again the Government did not recognize the very real housing crisis that do face individual families. I think that theme has been followed through again with this Government when they have failed in their new legislation to again look at mandatory conditional reports. So it again has been incumbent upon the Opposition to present a Bill which would talk about mandatory condition reports.

\* (1710)

Now getting back to these families who are looking for a place to live, shelter for themselves and shelter for their families, what options and what choices do they have available? Certainly they have a limited

amount of housing that is available to them because their income dictates that. They must look in a certain part of the city where the prices are reasonable, as opposed to the suburbs, because we know inner city housing prices can be lower sometimes than the suburbs. In fact, when you look at the quality of the housing in comparison to the price, they may be very high and very escalated. The choices are very limited to these families, so they find whatever housing is available, and they may know that it is not a good deal.

When they enter into a contract with the landlord, they may know that they are paying too much. In fact, if Social Assistance is paying the housing cost, even the Social Assistance officials probably recognize that the money that is going to these landlords for these slum dwellings really should not be, and in fact they are overpriced.

There are very few choices, Mr. Deputy Speaker. This tenant who is under stress, who has a family to look after, is not going to approach a landlord and say, well, I demand that there be a condition report filled out, because this particular tenant who is asking for a place to live, knowing that their choices are limited, feels under a lot of pressure and knows that the ball is not in his or her court, the ball is with the landlord, because it is the landlord who has the options. The landlord knows that he can rent to family No. 2 and family No. 3, because he knows there is a housing shortage. He knows there is a housing shortage of accommodation that is reasonably priced. The landlord does not have a difficulty, so it puts the tenant into a very untenable situation, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

We find that in a number of these situations there are no condition reports that are filled out, and there is no understanding, there is no written contract of the actual condition of that particular premise when the tenant moves in, so then what happens, should the tenant move out or should the tenant feel forced to move out because the conditions may be intolerable, there is no written account or record of actually what the conditions were of that particular premise.

It is the tenant against the landlord should there be a dispute. We have found that many of the disputes that end up in what used to be called the Rentalsman's Office in fact were disputes about the conditions of report, about damages or probable damages that were done to premises and that these disputes were very difficult to arbitrate, very difficult to solve, because in fact there was no written record, there was no conditional report upon the signing of the lease or upon that particular tenant taking occupancy in that particular premise, because oftentimes there may not be a lease either. It may be a month-to-month lease. We do have situations where that does occur.

I think it is very important to also note that we in the Opposition have discussed this issue with consumer groups, we have met with the housing concerns group who are very, very clear that they support the fact that there should be mandatory condition reports in regard to landlords and tenants. They are very, very clear on this. They were concerned, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in fact this new legislation of the Government, which certainly one might call fairly comprehensive, did not

have this particular aspect written in that particular Act.

The housing concerns group represent a wide variety of consumers, a wide variety of advocates, a wide variety of individuals who represent social service agencies. This group represents the people who have the pulse on what is going on with housing issues in the City of Winnipeg, and they are concerned, because legislation from the Government does not indicate any need for mandatory conditional reports.

That is why we have put forth this particular legislation which says there must be conditional reports. We also have agreement from some landlord groups as well who certainly recognize the value of having conditional reports and have no difficulty at all in that being a mandatory piece of legislation.

We have consulted with consumers, we have consulted with advocacy groups and social service agencies, we have consulted with landlords, and there is some agreement out there, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that there should be mandatory use of condition reports.

I do recall that the Government side of the House has oftentimes made comments about why are we bringing forth this legislation. It should be noted that it was the Liberals who brought forth this piece of legislation in regard to landlord and tenants affairs, and it was on the Order Paper before the Government had their legislation that was available in regard to Residential Tenancy Act.

We were being pro-active, which seems to be a word that the Government likes to use oftentimes. I do question whether in fact if they understand what the meaning of the word pro-active is. We were pro-active, we were progressive in bringing forth this piece of legislation, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

We now have seen, we have had an opportunity to look at this Government's piece of legislation. Yes, it has many good qualities, and I will have no difficulty in speaking on that Bill when the time comes, but what it fails to do, and what our legislation does do, is that it talks about and it calls for mandatory use of conditional reports.

This is an important Bill, and it is one which is supported by the consumers of the service, by the housing concerns group and by the people of the City of Winnipeg. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

**Mr. Jay Cowan (Churchill):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I do not intend to speak at length on this particular Bill, because I think we will have an opportunity to actually see the policy which is suggested by this Bill become Government policy when we go into committee to debate Bill No. 42, The Residential Tenancies Act.

I believe at that particular time there will be enough opportunity to debate the specifics of condition reports and how they might be put into the legislation to protect the interests of both tenants and landlords, because they do protect the interests of both if they are put in place in a proper fashion.

I do want to first acknowledge the fact that this Bill was brought forward as a Private Member's Bill by the

Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux). I think he will be the first to agree that if we can incorporate what is anticipated by this Bill into the major Bill before us, The Residential Tenancies Act, we will have accomplished that which we all seek, and that is to make condition reports a mandatory part of the process of renting accommodation in this province.

We want to see that happen because condition reports, as the Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray) indicated, can play a very useful role in protecting the interests of not only tenants but protecting the interests of landlords where there is a dispute as to whether or not damage that may be present in a particular apartment or dwelling being rented by an individual was there previous to the current individual renting it or not.

\* (1720)

The condition report is really just a checklist that the landlord along with the tenant can go through in the premises themselves, where they can hopefully agree upon the condition of the premises and where they can document their review in writing so that if at a later date there are any questions as to when a particular bit of damage may have occurred, they can go back to the condition report.

I would suspect that in 90 to 95 percent of the cases the condition report itself would be detailed enough and would be descriptive enough that they would be able to make a determination, or at least an impartial third party would be able to make the determination as to who really was responsible, or at the very least make the determination as to whether or not the current renter was responsible for the damage which was being discussed at the time of the tenant's departure or a new lease coming into effect.

There are some technical points on the Member for Inkster's Bill that require a bit of improvement, and we will be recommending amendments in the committee stage, as I indicated in my debate on Bill No. 42, that would hopefully incorporate the general thrust of what the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) has brought forward—he in fact may be recommending the same amendments—but at the same time make it a bit more workable.

In the Bill that is before us, the tenant cannot have an agent fill out the report for him or her. I think that is a fault with the Private Members' Bill as brought forward by the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux). I think it is a gap that perhaps was unanticipated, but one that could be easily rectified by just making the legislation, or the final amendment when it is brought forward, permissive to the extent that either the landlord or the tenant could have an agent on their behalf fill out that report.

That is a fairly important point, because as the Member for Ellice (Ms. Gray) indicated, there are housing concerns groups and interests groups out there that could assist tenants in filling out the reports to ensure that the reports were done as well as they could so as to avoid future controversy in the future. Those groups could act as agents on behalf of tenants or to

the company tenants when they were filling out the reports in the presence of a landlord.

Legislation that was brought forward—I see the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr) looking somewhat perplexed at my comments. I just indicate to him that the legislation as I read it did not allow for agents. I do not have it directly in front of me. I am going from memory and it has been some time since I have read it, but I do recall that it said the landlord or an agent, and then it said the tenant.

I would just provide some advice to the Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux) that when you incorporate a landlord or an agent into one part of the legislation, and you do not allow for the same agent to be a part of the process by legislation, implicitly at least if not explicitly, you are saying that the landlord has a bit more power than does the tenant in this particular instance. It is something that I am certain was unanticipated and is easily rectified. All you are going to have to do is make certain that the wording is consistent so that in fact both the landlord and the tenant enter into the process of putting together a mandatory condition report on an equitable basis. I am not being overly critical, I just wanted to make that point. It is one which I am certain the Liberals will agree is a positive contribution to the intent of mandatory condition reports.

Why should we have mandatory condition reports though? If I understand the Government correctly, by the exclusion of mandatory condition reports in Bill No. 42 they find some fault with the concept. I will tell you why I believe that specifically to be the case. Bill No. 42 is in large part, although not entirely, modelled after a draft Bill which the Minister of Housing (Mr. Ducharme) would have found on his desk when he assumed office over a year ago.

That draft Bill had been developed through a process of consultation with housing groups and with landlords and with others who are interested in housing issues, and with the bureaucracy, and that legislation, that particular piece of legislation which was in a fairly final draft form, did include a requirement for condition reports. Because that legislation flowed so much into the new legislation and was incorporated to such a great extent into the new legislation, one can assume that those areas that were left out or those areas that were added that were not in the previous legislation are in fact areas where there was a difference of opinion between the previous administration and the present administration, the previous administration and the Liberals, as I understand it, being in favour of mandatory condition reports and the present administration, the Conservative administration, not favouring them.

Why would they not favour them? I have had some discussions with a number of Conservatives on this particular issue, and they tell me that they do not favour them, because sometimes they feel the process could be manipulated by a landlord who wanted to do so in an unscrupulous manner, although we all know that most landlords are in fact very well intentioned and abide by not only the letter of the law but the intent of the law and would not do so, but legislation is around, because not all of any one group in society are entirely

in favour of certain legislative initiatives, and therefore without the legislation they might try to avoid or to subvert the intent.

What the Conservatives have told me is, they are concerned that there might be a small portion, but a portion nonetheless, of landlords who would attempt to manipulate the condition report, and they could do so if they were not dealing with a tenant who was as sophisticated and as knowledgeable with as much experience as they have in housing matters, and that might well be the case, because you do develop a certain ability that comes and follows from experience and studying an issue in detail as landlords must do. So, in order to ensure that those few unscrupulous landlords do not manipulate the mandatory condition report, they are suggesting that it not be made mandatory, that it be voluntary.

Well, we know that if it is voluntary those same landlords, whomever they might be, would in fact not have a condition report or would manipulate any condition report that they did bring forward, so the tenant in that instance would have no protection or would at the very least have the same amount of protection that they would have under mandatory condition reports where they were manipulated by an unscrupulous landlord.

In essence, by having the condition reports mandatory, what you are doing is protecting the other landlords, the vast majority of landlords and the other tenants from differences of opinion that need not arise because no one took the time to fill out a report in the first instance.

I assume that they would want to fill out a report, because they want to abide by the legal requirements in not only the legalistic intent but the philosophical and the policy intent of the legislation, but they would not have filled out a report for one reason or another because they were not mandatory. Making them mandatory ensures that those reports will be filled out.

All you are doing by not having mandatory condition reports at the very best is preserving the status quo for unscrupulous landlords, but at the very worst I think you are denying the benefits of condition reports, whether they are mandatory or not, to the vast majority of landlords and to the vast majority of tenants. For that reason, it would probably be better to have them mandatory than not.

Even if one accepts the premise that there will be those landlords who will manipulate the reports, one can overcome that particular issue in two ways. One can overcome that problem firstly by having a very broad-reaching and persuasive education campaign for tenants, which would advise them as to why condition reports are important to them personally, how to fill out those condition reports and how to ensure that they are not manipulated in the completion or the review of those reports at the different phases of their tenancy.

That is something that we will be encouraging the Government to do in any instance, something which I believe any Government would want to do to ensure that their legislation, which they worked so hard on

and they have done a fairly credible job in this instance, is well used by the people whom it was intended to serve. We would think that educational campaign, that educational component of the overall thrust of the Department of Housing would be there in any instance, but that is one way to resolve any problems that might result.

The second way of course is to go back to what I spoke about earlier, to ensure that tenants can have agents available to them to help them fill out those reports and also to help them negotiate the result of those reports when they leave their tenancy, so that those agents would be available to them to ensure that the reports were filled out appropriately in the first instance and would also be available to them to ensure that those reports fulfill their intended purpose in the final instance, that is, when they were being reviewed at the end of a tenancy.

\* (1730)

I think that mandatory condition reports are indeed something that should be incorporated into the legislation, not onto themselves alone but incorporated along with an educational component and access to resources that would allow tenants and landlords to fill out the reports to as great an accuracy as they can.-(interjection)- Well, the Member for Fort Rouge (Mr. Carr) says he has a hunch that there will be. I have a hunch that there will certainly be mandatory condition reports. I am not certain that there will be the educational campaign, and that is why -(interjection)-

Indeed there will be mandatory condition reports, I believe. I do not want to pre-empt the decision-making powers of this august body, but I think that there is a will and an intent to see that mandatory condition reports do find their way into Bill No. 42, and that they find their way into Bill No. 42 in a way where they can be equitably used by both landlords and tenants on a fair and equal basis. I am concerned about the educational component that should go with those reports, and that is why I am spending some time during my comments today to dwell on the fact that educational component is required.

The Legislature will have very little influence outside of whatever persuasive powers we can exert upon the Government through speeches like this and others to force the Government to implement a mandatory educational campaign, because it will require funds be expended by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, and that of course is the prerogative, the sole prerogative of the Government unless it is a negative vote and we cannot incorporate new funds, we can only take away existing funds, and since the funds are not there, and if they were we would not want to take them away in any event.

Our particular circumstance here is somewhat clearly defined and very limited. We are powerless in essence to impose an educational component on the Government. We are only by way of speeches such as this able to try to convince them to do so.

We would also like them to take a look at ensuring that the housing concerns groups, and I am using the

term in a generic sense, not referring to one specific group or one specific coalition of groups, do have some support available to them to ensure that this legislation is not only passed through this Legislature as is required for it to come into force, but is also implemented fairly, efficiently and quickly out in the field itself, which is also required for this legislation to come into force.

Again, we have very little power over the Government with respect to that particular area, but we do encourage them to provide whatever resources they can. Having said that, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I know my time is very limited now, I will reserve the rest of my comments for debate at the committee stage and at third reading with respect to mandatory condition reports, at which time I expect many Members of this House will join together to provide a very persuasive argument for such.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** By leave, the Bill will continue to stand in the name of the Honourable Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns).

#### **BILL NO. 4—THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC AMENDMENT ACT (2)**

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake), Bill No. 4, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act (2), (Loi no 2 modifiant la Code de la route) standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard).

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have spoken, but let me indicate that if there are any other Members of the House that would like to speak on this, I know Mr. Orchard (Minister of Health) would be prepared to leave it standing in his name. I am sure the Honourable Member for Assiniboia (Mr. Mandrake) would like to see continued debate on this Bill. He is discussing it right now as a matter of fact.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Is there leave to have the Bill continue standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard)? (Agreed)

#### **BILL NO. 10 THE BEVERAGE CONTAINER ACT**

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Springfield (Mr. Roch), Bill No. 10, The Beverage Container Act, (Loi sur les contenants de boissons). Is there leave to have the Bill remain standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer)? The Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

**Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation):** Who can resist, Mr. Deputy Speaker, an opportunity to debate some of this exciting legislation that we have before us?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the reason why I feel compelled to make a few remarks on this is because I think to some degree there is merit in this legislation, because

The Beverage Container Act in terms of the intent to some degree is to help clean up a lot of the bottles, containers that are being dumped at the present time on our highways and side roads and parks and wherever the case may be. I think that is something that people have been concerned about. In fact, it was my intention at one time being in Opposition to bring forward a Bill of this nature along the same lines.

What intrigues me about this to some degree is that we have at the present time under the Highway program, a joint arrangement with the 4-H clubs in the province that every spring we have these 4-H clubs that go out and do the pickups along the highways. In fact, I just had a meeting recently with the 4-H club organizers again to reaffirm that next year we would have the same type of program and possibly look to expanding that program.

Maybe for those Members who are not aware of it, if they drive on the provincial trunk highways and PR roads in spring on certain weekends—and usually it is relatively early, but that is the time when we can have the kind of supervision that we require for this kind of a project—we see all the clubs getting out there in conjunction with the Highways Department and picking up all the litter in the ditches. The cost to the department is not that substantial. I think the budget last year had provision for \$60,000 to do that, but it does for the club members, it gives them an opportunity to get involved in the clean-up and raise funds.

I think it is very meaningful that this kind of activity takes place, invariably aside from the revenue it has generated. I had the opportunity last year to drive out along the highways and meet with many of the youngsters and the 4-H'ers as they were gathering up the garbage along the ditches. The Highways people with their trucks are along there, we distribute the bags, they pick it up and bag it and put it on the side, and staff picks it up.

Usually it happens on a Saturday. What happened the one year when we had a lot of wind and normally staff were not around on Saturday, or with limitations, they did not necessarily pick it up that day and by Monday we had some bags laying around over the weekend and created some criticism and concern.

\* (1740)

However I feel very encouraged. I think it is a very positive program that we have there, and as I indicated before, I have encouraged an expansion of this program. Most certainly when the 4-H'ers do that it costs a lot less money giving the clubs \$60,000 than if we would do it with departmental staff. What we are trying to do with this Bill is try and encourage people by way of compensation for containers, that if they could get a refund I understand—I hope I read that correctly—if they bring back bottles, containers, that they get a refund, and that will encourage them to bring it back instead of throwing it out the windows.

What I like about the 4-H Program is the fact that many of the youngsters when I talk with them, as you do in this job, and it is not that easy a job, but when I talk to them they start having a concern about people who throw things out of the windows.

In fact, they had a couple of young girls there as they were busy picking it up. They were frozen and they were sort of wet—it was a miserable day—and somebody drove by and flicked out some garbage. They were really upset about this. It has developed in our young people's attitude about concern about keeping our roadsides clean, and it is working well in that direction.

Ironically, and this was sort of cute, another car comes along and again throws something out, and the youngsters yell at the car. They went to pick up whatever it was and somebody had thrown out a \$20 bill to compensate them for their pick-up. They did not mind that kind of a throw-away. (interjection) Generally—

**An Honourable Member:** That had to be a Liberal.

**Mr. Albert Driedger:** No, it was not. Mr. Deputy Speaker, there was some comment made here that it was a Liberal who did that. This was in southeast Manitoba and there are not too many around, so I doubt whether it was. I doubt whether it was a Liberal.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think the principle of the Bill, I can support that because what we are doing is, by offering monetary reward for return of bottles and containers, it will help alleviate the littering along the roads and parks, et cetera.

Of course when you implement a program of this nature, we have to look at the impact that it will have on who is going to be paying it. Are we going to be paying more initially for the product as we are buying it, not saying that is necessarily bad, but somewhere along the line the system has been set up? I believe Alberta has a system like this in place where they compensate for liquor bottles, other bottles, and I know of some cases in my area where somebody took and gathered as many bottles as he could—you know he was going to Alberta anyway. He had his whole trunk and boxes filled and took a whole load down there and cashed them in there, and it covered part of his gas costs. So I am not necessarily concerned that we would be paying for bottles from out of province and stuff of that nature, but I think there is some rationale in this.

When we bring forward a Bill of this nature I think it is important though that we make the proper contact and consultation with the people that are involved. I am not talking about the people who do the pickup and do the cashing in, but the retailers. There should be an understanding with the manufacturer of—who are obviously going to be involved, the distilleries, the drink people, the manufacturers, so there has to be an understanding in place so that we do not impose something on the general public that would create concern, and it has to be planned in such a way that it has to be implemented properly.

I think the worst thing that can happen, and it has been raised many times in this House, if we pass legislation and it is not well thought out legislation, then it cannot be implemented properly.

I, along with some of my colleagues, have made reference from time to time about scofflaws, where you pass legislation and you have difficulty applying the

legislation, and I would want to make sure that in a case of this nature that I have not—I do not know to what extent it would affect the Highways Department, but certainly it affects the consumers, and I do not know if the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Connery), has had a look at this, but I think it is important that we debate it.

I think there are certain programs that we have in place right now where you get a certain refund on certain items that you return, and I, of course from a selfish point of view from being the Minister responsible for Highways and Transportation, would like to see something come forward where people are not going to take and litter in the ditches, because I think it is always an unseemly sight when you drive down the highways and you have all kinds of junk and litter in the ditches, and invariably I think the majority of people are relatively concerned. We like to keep our highways clean, our country looking good, but there is always the individuals that by and large do not care and create a problem that way.

It likens me to the time when I had the opportunity to have a holiday in Mexico. In fact, we drove from here to Acapulco by way of motor home. It took us a long time, too long really. In fact, it was a lengthy trip, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Out of the 21 days, we were 14 days on the road and seven days in Acapulco, but when we travelled into, and I wanted to make reference to that just so I stay on the subject here, when we drove into Mexico and we saw the terrible amount of waste that was laying around on the side roads, it was just phenomenal, it was actually—I do not know.

I am sure other people have had that experience, and I would hope that we, as Canadians and as Manitobans, are proud of our country and our province, and we should have concern about making our country look good. I think tourism is an important part of it.

I think the whole legislation or this kind of concept all lends itself to try and make Manitoba a cleaner and better place to live, a nicer place to come.

So, without having gone into the details of the Bill, I would indicate that I think that kind of legislation, if it can be applied properly, that I would have no difficulty supporting it in that sense, but I want to caution again that I think that it is important that we make sure that it is something that we can apply properly, that we do not have what I refer to as scofflaws, something that is going to be, where we pass it here because it is sounds good and it is a nice thing to do and then we have trouble implementing it.

So I want to caution Members that before we do this and make this a law, that we make sure that the implementation of it, that the people who are going to be involved in it all have a say in it, so that when we do it that we can make it work to the satisfaction of not only us here by passing it, but to the people of Manitoba as well.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** By leave, Bill No. 10 will remain standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) and the Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer).

**BILL NO. 13—THE MANITOBA  
INTERCULTURAL COUNCIL  
AMENDMENT ACT**

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles), Bill No. 13, the Manitoba Intercultural Council Amendment Act, and on the motion of the Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), that the question be now put, is there leave to have the Bill remain standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Health? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for St. Vital (Mr. Rose).

**Mr. Bob Rose (St. Vital):** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am pleased to be able to put a few brief comments on the record today in regard to these most important aspects of this Bill that hopefully will correct the flaws of the present direction of the Government.

I think it is a very appropriate Bill and one that makes sure that the multicultural community of this province is on the right track and is given enough authority to do their own thing.

This is truly, of all of North America, a multicultural community that we have, and one of the leading ingredients that we have had in this great province is the rich and widespread cosmopolitan make-up of our population in Manitoba and it was since that way from the beginning when my forefathers, the Scotsmen, and the French people visited this province and started to settle it. Since that time there have been large numbers of people from every corner of the globe to live here.

I think that all Members will agree, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that their diversity of skills and their diversity of talents, their unique characteristics have been indeed shaped this province, and particularly this city, into a very unique position in North America, if not the world. That is why I am proud to say on my licence plate that you will see the designation "Winnipeg, your world next door".

\* (1750)

I think we should be very proud of Winnipeg. I am very proud of Winnipeg and Manitoba to carry around wherever I go such a licence plate on the front of my car, same one as the rear ones were—the front licence plates unfortunately were eliminated. I make sure at all times it is clean. I think that is a responsibility of the police, otherwise I do not know the reason for a licence plate is if it is not kept clean, because the Neighbourhood Watch people, the police, and whatever, cannot see it. So whether we need legislation or not, I think it is very important that we make sure that licence plates are readable.

Also, while I am on the subject of licence plates, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I might say I am disappointed that the NDP Government made it such a bland licence plate we have and take the red lettering off and what have you. I find it also interesting that the Tories take such a delight in this Bill, this Bill No. 4. I see now that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) is becoming the ninth eager Tory to speak on the Bill. Yet the Premier gets up and says that we are wasting time on this Bill.

They have outspoke the Bill four to one by anybody else which shows they see some merit. I would be surprised that they do not eventually end up supporting this Bill, because they, as well as I, know that licence plates should be—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation, on a point of order.

**Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation):** Could you assist me in telling me which Bill the Member is speaking to?

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Bill No. 13.

**Mr. Albert Driedger:** I see, I was under the impression it was Bill No. 4 he was speaking to.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Transcona, on the same point of order.

**Mr. Richard Kozak (Transcona):** The two Bills, Mr. Deputy Speaker, both address the question of pride in our province and I can well understand the confusion of the Minister of Highways. However, we maintain that the remarks of the Member for St. Vital (Mr. Rose) were indeed relevant to Bill No. 13.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** I would thank all Honourable Members for their advice and I would caution the Honourable Member for St. Vital to stay close to the subject at hand.

**Mr. Rose:** Mr. Deputy Speaker, I apologize for my pride in Manitoba overflowing.

**An Honourable Member:** You do not have to apologize for that.

**Mr. Rose:** I might say that, yes, it is Bill No. 13 and the Minister of Highways (Mr. Albert Driedger) might well remember that as his unlucky number. That is the number of seats, if they keep up how they are going, they are going to end up with in the next election if they are lucky.

In relevance to this Bill I have been now and I have already alluded, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to the fact that this is truly a multicultural province and that we should all, particularly those in public life, take pride in it not only, but participate in the events. It has been unfortunate that in the last three major events that I have been that were of a multicultural nature, that no Members of the Government saw fit to be there. I can only guess—well, the Minister of Highways wants the relevance to the Bill, but he wants to natter while he is at it, so he cannot have it both ways.

I think that it might be that in the last multicultural event that they were missing out that maybe they found that their priorities were more to take their blue van over into Assiniboia and find out what the people are complaining about in regard to the Tory Government, rather than taking part in an event like this. If that is their priorities, fine and dandy, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Liberals will be there and we will represent the

province and make sure that these new Canadians or even established Canadians of ethnic origins have a chance to mingle with us and we can more understand their way of life and system and any difficulties or problems or ideas that they may have for the future. We will carry the load in that respect and they can continue their silly attitude of running around when there is not an election in sight calling on the people in St. James. I hope that they hear the complaints that we hear lately.

Getting back to the point, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the real points that outline in this Bill that we find it is important to have the autonomy of the ethnic community to have the right to do their own governing, that is the council, that certainly they should have the right rather than it being injected on them by the Government, to be able to elect their own president of that council.

Certainly of equal importance which the Government seems to deny is the ability of them to have an executive secretary that is employed by the Manitoba Intercultural Council rather than injected by the Province of Manitoba. We must have an employee of that organization who understands the multicultural community, understands their concerns, is close to it and speaks out for that community rather than injecting crass politics in the will of the Government from above, like Big Brother.

I think thirdly that our Honourable Member, my colleague for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) is advocating—and I think it is really important because control of the funds is control of an organization. The Government, because they found an excuse to take the authority away from the Manitoba Intercultural Council and said from now on we will be the ones—they said this in May—who will say where these funds will go.

I think that is wrong-headed and indicates just how much lack of respect that this Government has for that multicultural community. This is the people's money, the people of Manitoba's money, it is the lottery money and I think that in the past and in the future these people have indicated, and will continue to indicate, that they know how to disburse the funds properly.

I am sure that if they had the chance to look into other Government agencies and perhaps things closer than that, whether they be Government or political Parties or what have you, that their accounting is every bit as good as is done in other segments of the community. This was just a cop-out by the Government to remove that authority from the council and to inject their political influence, their power. I think that whether this is arrogance or ineptitude, I do not know, but it will sure continue to show up in the election results when these people have to choose which candidates they will vote for.

I think that this control of funding and allocation of funds should be left in the hands of a council and the executive. If the Government is concerned about control other than political control—and I think their real agenda is political control of the organization, I think the finances are only secondary but certainly they have the right to look at the books of the MIC and audit them at any particular time. I think it is very important that an organization that represents several groups in Manitoba like this that they do have autonomy, that they are not subjective of centralization of power from the Government and indeed by the disbursements of funds, that they are able to practise a hands-on approach to their organization to further demote the multicultural efforts in this Province of Manitoba.

I have an ongoing pride because I can see that this element that we have is very important. It is going to be, in my estimation—if it is not already there—one of the real strengths of the Manitoba mosaic. It has already been demonstrated by the establishment in 1970 of Folklorama that has now grown to 41 pavilions, two weeks. I think there are something like 20,000 people who volunteer and there are three-quarters of a million visits. If I can be corrected by the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Ernst), I think there are 150 bus loads alone of people who enter this city during Folklorama and the ensuing tourist dollars, in particular the American dollars, that we get from that.

The Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) might also be interested to know that in that time there is something in the nature of 20,000 perogies—just to mention one ethnic food out of many, many—that are consumed in the pavilions during that period.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we are experiencing in Canada a drastic drop in birth rate and this means to maintain our level of productivity in this country we will have to count a great deal on immigrants. Therefore, our multicultural community can do nothing but grow. I noted at one recent gathering that from St. Vincent in the Grenadines, that 66 percent of the population of that group of islands are under 16 years old. I am sure they will be educated and looking for a home, and Canada for instance should welcome them. I am sure they will come to Winnipeg and Manitoba where they already an established entity and mosaic—

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am interrupting the proceedings of the House according to the Rules. When this matter is again before the House, the Honourable Member will have two minutes remaining.

This House is now adjourned and stands adjourned till 1:30 p.m. tomorrow (Wednesday).