



Third Session — Thirty-Second Legislature
of the
Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

DEBATES
and
PROCEEDINGS

33 Elizabeth II

*Published under the
authority of
The Honourable D. James Walding
Speaker*



VOL. XXXII No. 33B - 8:00 p.m., THURSDAY, 31 MAY, 1984.

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**Thirty-Second Legislature****Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

Name	Constituency	Party
ADAM, Hon. A.R. (Pete)	Ste. Rose	NDP
ANSTETT, Hon. Andy	Springfield	NDP
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BANMAN, Robert (Bob)	La Verendrye	PC
BLAKE, David R. (Dave)	Minnedosa	PC
BROWN, Arnold	Rhineland	PC
BUCKLASCHUK, Hon. John M.	Gimli	NDP
CARROLL, Q.C., Henry N.	Brandon West	IND
CORRIN, Q.C., Brian	Ellice	NDP
COWAN, Hon. Jay	Churchill	NDP
DESJARDINS, Hon. Laurent	St. Boniface	NDP
DODICK, Doreen	Riel	NDP
DOERN, Russell	Elmwood	IND
DOLIN, Hon. Mary Beth	Kildonan	NDP
DOWNEY, James E.	Arthur	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert	Emerson	PC
ENNS, Harry	Lakeside	PC
EVANS, Hon. Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
EYLER, Phil	River East	NDP
FILMON, Gary	Tuxedo	PC
FOX, Peter	Concordia	NDP
GOURLAY, D.M. (Doug)	Swan River	PC
GRAHAM, Harry	Virten	PC
HAMMOND, Gerrie	Kirkfield Park	PC
HARAPIAK, Harry M.	The Pas	NDP
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HEMPHILL, Hon. Maureen	Logan	NDP
HYDE, Lloyd	Portage la Prairie	PC
JOHNSTON, J. Frank	Sturgeon Creek	PC
KOSTYRA, Hon. Eugene	Seven Oaks	NDP
KOVNATS, Abe	Niakwa	PC
LECUYER, Hon. Gérard	Radisson	NDP
LYON, Q.C., Hon. Sterling	Charleswood	PC
MACKLING, Q.C., Hon. Al	St. James	NDP
MALINOWSKI, Donald M.	St. Johns	NDP
MANNES, Clayton	Morris	PC
McKENZIE, J. Wally	Roblin-Russell	PC
MERCIER, Q.C., G.W.J. (Gerry)	St. Norbert	PC
NORDMAN, Rurik (Ric)	Assiniboia	PC
OLESON, Charlotte	Gladstone	PC
ORCHARD, Donald	Pembina	PC
PAWLEY, Q.C., Hon. Howard R.	Selkirk	NDP
PARASIUK, Hon. Wilson	Transcona	NDP
PENNER, Q.C., Hon. Roland	Fort Rouge	NDP
PHILLIPS, Myrna A.	Wolseley	NDP
PLOHMAN, Hon. John	Dauphin	NDP
RANSOM, A. Brian	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Burrows	NDP
SCHROEDER, Hon. Vic	Rossmere	NDP
SCOTT, Don	Inkster	NDP
SHERMAN, L.R. (Bud)	Fort Garry	PC
SMITH, Hon. Muriel	Osborne	NDP
STEEN, Warren	River Heights	PC
STORIE, Hon. Jerry T.	Flin Flon	NDP
URUSKI, Hon. Bill	Interlake	NDP
USKIW, Hon. Samuel	Lac du Bonnet	NDP
WALDING, Hon. D. James	St. Vital	NDP

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 31 May, 1984.

Time — 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - ENVIRONMENT AND WORKPLACE SAFETY AND HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: Committee, please come to order.

We are still on item No. 2.(a)(b) and (c), (1) and (2) in its category - the Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, I had been in the process, and the Minister was giving me an answer, and my question is and was: Is the government in favour of the cottage development?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The member would like me to say specifically, am I in favour of the cottage development? At this point in time, I don't know what the cottage development consists of because that is, as far as I know, not a question which has come down through the negotiation process to any specific resolve, to any specific degree between the parties involved.

I think what I can say on this issue, I have given it some serious thought and I know that it is an important issue, it is a complex issue, it is one that I personally am very concerned with. I know that it's been dragging for a fair bit of time. I know that your government prior to this, in the previous term, had struggled with this particular issue. We are currently struggling with this particular issue at this point in time. I feel confident and hopeful that progress is being made for a number of reasons.

First of all, the committee involving all parties on this issue is meeting on a regularly scheduled basis. There is a meeting next week. Secondly, as the member herself has mentioned before, there will be FEARO hearings which are going to give cause, I believe, to all the technical data revolving around this issue to surface.

As I said already, the parties involved are meeting and I believe they are meeting in good faith. I believe it would be really, I think, unethical on my part to sort of scuttle the negotiations that are going around, that are taking place among the parties involved in this issue, by taking a specific position in regard to any of the components of this issue which it does not boil down to a single component.

But the overriding concern is the quality of the Red River. We have, in the Department of Environment in the Province of Manitoba, specialized staff with skills and knowledge that can analyze the consultant's report and on that basis prepare our position to be presented at the hearing. Beyond that, I will not go in any further detail except to say to the official critic of the opposition

that when that report is prepared, I am willing to share it with the official critic, and he can share it with the members of the opposition and we can discuss it prior to the hearing as soon as that report is ready. That's as far as I will go.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I understand that discussions are still going on. I heard what the Minister has said, but what we have before us now is that the impact statement has been filed by the Indian band, the hearings are going on for 60 days, the written briefs will be going on for 60 days, then the assessment panel will be reviewing the briefs and then they will decide if they need further study, if they need further input on the impact statement.

The City of Winnipeg has indicated that they are going to present a case to the assessment panel, and they are opposing the development. What I find here is it's past the point of a lot of negotiation. What is happening here is there is going to be a decision made and I think it only fair that when we are dealing with the quality of water, the drinking water, for the citizens of Winnipeg that the Minister should be able to say if they planned to support the city with the brief that they are presenting.

I am not asking then for the way he is going to - if he is going to make other presentations, although if he won't tell me that, I will accept that, not willingly - but I do believe that the Minister owes it to us to tell this House whether the province is planning to stand behind the city on this issue, or if the city is going one way and the province is planning to go another way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: According to the rules, there is a distinction between what the Minister has given, what advice he has given to some other body or entity and what advice he proposes to give. Rule 357(1)(cc) says that a question cannot be asked when it concerns what advice a Minister proposes to give the Crown, but may ask what advice he has given; in other words, things that he had done, he is answerable for, but things that he proposes to do, he need not be answerable for.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, I think that the Honourable Minister is quite willing to answer the questions. I understand that the Chairman has to understand his role as being Chairman and see that the rules are followed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I just cited the rules.

MR. A. KOVNATS: That's fair enough. But I don't think that we are swaying from the rules and the Honourable Minister really has no qualms about answering the questions. If he does, then I think that he will acknowledge that he feels that we are out of order in the line of questioning, but I don't think we've gotten to that stage. I think that we've had a very very good relationship up until now and I wouldn't want to see us bringing in the rules at this point to protect the Minister. He doesn't really need the protection that is being offered to him by the Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It's not the Chairman who is offering the protection. It's the rule that protects the Minister if he wants it.

Mr. Minister.

HON. G. LECUYER: First of all, I'd like to correct a comment made by the Member for Kirkfield Park in that the . . . Report has been filed with the FEARO. There will be hearings but these hearings are not - contrary to what I heard is that these hearings were going to go on for the next 60 days, in actual fact these hearings are not going to start before another 90 days. Therefore, that puts a different light on what I heard the member say. That particular report has some 70-or-more mitigating factors which the department wants to look at, which the department and the province is going to prepare its report on and that's the one I've said I'm prepared to share with the members of the opposition when it is ready. In the meantime, it would be to a large extent speculative to say, well, we're going to support the position of the City of Winnipeg. We haven't seen it, nor has the member who raises the question seen that report. We don't know how the City of Winnipeg, in that particular brief, is going to address each and every one of these 70 particular mitigating circumstances or issues raised in the . . . Report and I think we shall prepare our report independently. I expect that with the goal in the end to protect the quality of the drinking water for Winnipeg, we will have some common ground with the City of Winnipeg but I just don't want to make that statement until we have seen their position. I think it would be irresponsible of me to say that.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Mr. Chairman, the 60-day review is for written briefs and that started May 1st and ends August 1st. Then they will consider the briefs in relation to the impact study. So the briefs are being presented right now and they're being presented to the Shoal Lake Environmental Assessment Panel.

HON. G. LECUYER: The 60 days the member is referring to is the 60 days during which period the parties can respond or make factual corrections to the consultant's report, and it is after that, that the public hearings after a period of 60 days or a certain period of days after that, that the report will be reviewed and revised in accordance with the factual reports presented. It's only after that period that the public hearings will be taking place. So we are talking probably public hearings happening late fall, winter, at which time we will have our own brief prepared. Perhaps we'll have a chance to see Winnipeg's brief.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Now, we're getting somewhere, Mr. Chairman. That's exactly what I'm talking about. It's the brief that the government will prepare now. The city will be preparing a brief on this impact statement. What I want to know . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: It's not a brief.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Well, whatever you want to call it - it's a brief, as far as I'm concerned. The city will be preparing a brief and presenting it on the impact

study. What I'm trying to find out is what the government will be presenting to this panel at this time, in this 60 days, and if they will be going along with the city's position which right now stands in opposition to the cottage development.

HON. G. LECUYER: Essentially what the department is doing presently is reviewing in detail the report that the member makes reference to. In that sense, the province is doing exactly the same thing as the city is doing. The city is preparing a report. That report, even though the member refers to it as if there was a report in existence, or the member refers to as a brief, it's a reaction to the report. That city position is not written at this point in time. They are analyzing the report and will react on the basis of their findings. We are going to do the same, and that is what I said. We would be prepared to share with the members across, like they would, the City of Winnipeg, we hope that they will do likewise with us.

There hasn't been, to my knowledge, an official report - I repeat - prepared by the City of Winnipeg at this point in time. There may have been a statement on the general approach of the City of Winnipeg, but that is not their written report in reaction to this consultant's report at this point in time.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I will just make one further comment on what the Minister has said. What I am understanding is the city is going to be setting - that they are going to present a proposal. As far as anyone can understand about the city's position, it has been the same pretty well since they sent out their brochure to the citizens of Winnipeg, trying to alert them to the problem they had. That was November, 1982. We are now into - tomorrow will be June 1, 1984 - and what we have here is in this year, possibly, the Federal Government is going to come down with a solution.

It is imperative that the province not go its own way and the city go its way and we don't seem to be getting that message. It looks to me and it looks to a lot of other people at this time that the province is planning to go its own way. As much as I am hearing a lot about consultation, I feel very nervous about our water supply when I feel that the province may not be supporting the city in their actions.

HON. G. LECUYER: Well, I don't know where the member gets the impression that the province may not be supporting the city in its actions. First of all, let's find out what they city's actions are.

I might again point out to the member this pamphlet that she is referring to was put out by the City of Winnipeg, I believe the member said sometime in November or earlier last fall. I might also point out to the member, at that point, the City of Winnipeg was not sitting at these negotiations. The City of Winnipeg has been and is now a party to the negotiations which it wasn't at that time. So I might point out, going further back, that as I stated this afternoon, in fact in '78 or '79, the City of Winnipeg even went so far as saying at one time that it might agree to a cottage development based on certain conditions. We have travelled a certain distance since that time and, as I said, the negotiations are ongoing.

Furthermore, the member seems worried that the Federal Government is going to all of a sudden make a decision. FEARO, I have to advise the member, is not a decision-making body and FEARO will be receiving the briefs and go through public hearings. I don't know when yet. As I say, I expect perhaps late fall, winter, and a report will emanate from that. There will be suggestions in that report. There cannot be any decisions in that report. I presume that following that report, the parties, through the negotiation process, may already have come to some understanding, in which case the whole FEARO hearings may not even take place. But if they do, the recommendations will then be waived by the parties through the negotiations. It's not the FEARO Report that is going to be a decision on this issue. The member should realize that. So we're a long ways from a solution, I have to agree.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I believe that the Review Committee Report will weigh very heavily on how the Department of Indian Affairs makes their decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, a question to the Minister.

If the City of Winnipeg is in opposition to the cottage development, would the Minister care to indicate how influential the Provincial Government's position would be on the final decision? If the province said we will not approve of any cottage development, would that have a fairly major impact on the final decision?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The statement is an if, then, statement. It's a hypothetical question.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, may I point out to you that during the Estimates process, we are approving funds for a department to undertake actions on behalf of all of the people of Manitoba. Those funds are expended on the basis of certain policy directions.

What we've been trying to find out tonight is what this government's policy is in regard to protecting the water supply of over half the citizens of this province, and, Sir, if we cannot ask what this Minister's policy is, then I suggest the Estimates process is useless. Now is that what you want to turn it into, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Good, then will you allow the Minister to answer my question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Formulate your question in such a way that's in accordance with the rules of this meetings.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Point out which rule I have violated in asking that question, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Rule 357(1)(g), "A question may not be asked which is hypothetical."

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, may I attempt to rephrase the question so it meets with Chairman Santos' approval?

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it meets with the rule, yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes, we know how you live by the rules in the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Minister, does he believe the provinces opinion to be valued by those reviewing the decision as to whether the development should proceed?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's another question that violates another rule.

357(1)(f) "A question oral or written must not contain an expression of opinion."

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, may I try it again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, try and try.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A question asks for information. If you ask information, you get it.

HON. A. ADAM: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order is being raised by the Minister of Government Services.

HON. A. ADAM: Yes, the point of order is that the Member for Pembina, in all due respect, is attempting to get into an argument on the rules of procedure with the Chairman. You know, it seems to me that that's out of order. I don't think that members are to pose questions to the Chairman; they should pose questions to the Minister. I think that's entirely out of order. If he wishes to challenge, that's up to him.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

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

Mr. Chairman, does the Minister feel that the provincial position can be influential in the final decision that will be made on the cottage development?

HON. G. LECUYER: I suppose that the first thing that I could say to that is one of the remarks made by the Chairman, that's hypothetical. I have made that comment and having said that will go on to say that I would hope that the position that the province has in this regard will have some bearing; just like I will hope that the other parties' position, and expect that the other parties' positions, will have some bearing on this issue.

I would like the members to stop putting this, you know, in which camp are you? Which side are you supporting? Who's supporting who? I think that we have taken a position, which I think all parties have in this regard, and I think all parties want essentially. I haven't heard, and wouldn't expect any one of the four parties to the particular issue to say that they would want to see the drinking waters of Winnipeg polluted.

Now having said that, each one of the parties here has some particular goals to achieve besides that. The province will be presenting a brief, and as stated before, will be looking in detail at the consultant's report and

preparing its position. It's not a question as, do we support all out the position, or the brief, that Winnipeg is going to prepare, having not even seen it? We will prepare our reaction to that report keeping in mind that the overall principle that will guide the preparation of our report is safeguarding the quality of the drinking water for Winnipeg.

Now beyond that I can only go into some of the past statements that were made by the previous Minister, that were made in official letters by the Premier of this province in regard to this issue, which state and restate loud and clear that basic position and the principle which is guiding the province on this particular issue.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that is exactly the problem the Minister is presenting to us. It is a pretty nebulous statement for the government to make that we're going to protect the quality of water of the City of Winnipeg. The City of Winnipeg is prepared to say that we're going to protect the quality of our water and we believe the best way to do it is not to allow any development at Shoal Lake. That would seem to me to be an ideal position if the government wishes to protect the City of Winnipeg's water supply. That's a position they could take. They would support the major city in the Province of Manitoba. Their opinion should be influential to those who are making the decision. Good heavens, if the province's position is not influential then this government really doesn't throw much weight or carry much weight. But I believe it does, that's why we would like to see a definitive statement. A definitive statement saying, as the City of Winnipeg is prepared to do, that they will not tolerate development on Shoal Lake, would add a great deal of weight and force to the City's position. Mr. Chairman, this is not an unusual position for this party, and this government to take.

The former Minister of this department is one of the greatest champions of clean environment that I have ever heard. In opposition he protected us from everything. As a matter of fact in speaking of the water supply of the City of Winnipeg, the former Minister of Environment constantly raised the issue of concern about asbestos cement water pipes delivering water in the City of Winnipeg and the potential health hazard from them. We've got members who want wilderness parks and you establish them to protect the environment of the park. You've got a government that's prepared to ban development, or is considering banning development in the Grassie Provincial Park to preserve the environment.

You see this is what is frustrating. On one hand they want to protect the environment in every way, but when it comes to the City of Winnipeg, the water supply for 600,000 people, we have motherhood statements, and we appear to have a government that's not prepared to back up the City of Winnipeg in their efforts to have this development stopped.

You know, Mr. Chairman, the problem is, and I pointed this out to the Minister of Highways and Transportation and it's one of the problems this government has. When they were in opposition they made promises to people and to groups of people. One of them — (Interjection) — the Member for Inkster has just identified and confirmed the problem they've got. They had promises to the Native people in this province that if they received

their support last election things would happen. They are caught in their own election promises because the Native people delivered for them. You bet they did. Now when the Native people come to this government and say we want to put in a cottage development, this government is caught between what the Member for Inkster just said of keeping their promises to them and protecting the water supply of the City of Winnipeg. That's your problem, that's your problem, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order being raised. What is your point of order?

MR. D. SCOTT: My point of order is I think it is quite improper for a member to intone motives on other members of the Assembly, or of the committee, and the Member for Pembina has clearly just said that we made some sort of a commitment to the people of Shoal Lake, the Native people living on Shoal Lake, which isn't even in Manitoba, that they were going to be allowed to develop a cottage development which was absolute nonsense. He knows it. It's nothing but political grandstanding. The committee would be able to move along much quicker and much more effectively, and with much better decorum if the Member for Pembina would get off some of his high horses.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That doesn't constitute a point of order.

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

Now, Mr. Chairman, that's the problem the Minister's got and he inherited it. I'm not blaming him. He inherited it. He inherited from the Minister that's in this committee tonight that had this department before. They're afraid to make a definitive statement that they do not want cottage development on the Shoal Lake Indian Reserve, because they don't want to offend the Native people to whom they have held out great promise. That's the problem they've got and I think that is a problem because we're not talking about a small matter. We're talking about a water supply that's been in place, that is probably one of the highest quality one, the least cost for treatment costs in North America. It's one of the best. It serves over half the people of Manitoba. What the City of Winnipeg and its residents deserve from this government is not motherhood statements, but some statements of support at a time when that support would be very influential in stopping that development from going ahead with the potential damage to Winnipeg's water supply that is there. No question that it's there.

Without that kind of commitment, the City of Winnipeg, representing over half the population of this province, is left in limbo. Surely a government that creates wilderness parks and cries about protecting the environment could take this one step and make a definitive statement and show some leadership as the City of Winnipeg has done on this issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina needs a reminder of the rule that says that a question may not raise a matter of policy too large to be dealt with within the limits of an answer to a question.

The Honourable Minister.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to say to the Member from Pembina, who says that he doesn't want any motherhood statements; first, I would like to tell him that I just heard a whole lot of motherhood statements in his particular comments just prior to now, and I would think that if the Member for Pembina doesn't want any motherhood statements, I also am not prepared to give him any responsible comments.

If the City of Winnipeg is that sure, even before having prepared its response to the consultant's report, that no matter what, in spite of the fact that the consultant's report might say that some type of development might be possible without damaging the quality of the water in any way, we don't even know at this point if the City of Winnipeg is going to take that position in its report, so it would be absolutely irresponsible on my part just to go and give you a motherhood statement of that sort that you're looking for. I said we will take the responsible approach, make our detailed analysis of the consultant's report and prepare our brief in consequent and that will be the answer by which I will stand here tonight, not into some kind of motherhood irresponsible statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't understand why we use motherhood and not fatherhood.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then, Mr. Chairman, what we've seen is a Minister that's not prepared to show any leadership.

HON. G. LECUYER: We'll see.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(1) - the Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think we can move on to another aspect of the environment problems that we have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can we pass 2.(a)(1)?

MR. A. KOVNATS: No, I don't think so, Mr. Chairman.

I think that I would like to move on to mosquito control and the spraying of cankerworms in the City of Winnipeg and in the outlying district.

Can the honourable Minister advise what involvement the Provincial Government has got in the spraying or the control of mosquitoes? I shouldn't say the spraying, because we seem to be in agreement here. When it comes to the control of Western Equine Encephalitis, sprayings seemed to have been required, but I'm not sure whether it's required at this point. What control do we have now on the control of mosquitoes and what is the government's involvement in the control of mosquitoes and cankerworms?

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think the Member from Niakwa is referring to the statements made in the House not so long ago in terms of our revised approach to mosquito monitoring and surveillance.

We have indicated that we were separating the question of data collection, data analysis and decision-making in this regard and have identified the persons

to do so, rather than relying on one particular committee and asking everything of it. Perhaps overburdening it with all aspects of all three inputs here; data collection, data analysis and recommendation to the decision-makers. That's what we have announced and that is what is being put in place, with the Minister of Health having named those persons who are responsible for doing the data analysis and the data collection is taking place.

MR. A. KOVNATS: That's not quite what I asked the Honourable Minister. I got an answer telling me that data collection is taking place and that there's an analysis of the mosquitoes. I don't care to be counting the mosquitoes or how many mosquitoes we've got, what control do we have on them? Whether we've got 100 or 1 million or 10 million, how are we planning to control the mosquitoes?

I know that the Minister had made some statements concerning larvaciding, which has been in effect for a long time and the Minister took credits for possibly what he thought was a new approach to the control of mosquitoes. It wasn't a new approach, but I would hope that the Honourable Minister would give us some idea as to what control we will be implementing to control mosquitoes and not just the counting of them and telling people how many mosquitoes are around, because that's beautiful control.

HON. G. LECUYER: If the member is referring to the question of nuisance mosquitoes, I've said before the question of control of nuisance mosquitoes is a municipal responsibility and as far as I know the mapping and larvaciding program that the member refers to, as having been in existence at all time, started last year with some financial assistance through the Jobs Fund and we are carrying it on this year as a program financed through the department. That I'm aware of, it didn't take place before that on that basis.

Other than that we have a role to play in educating the public in terms of what personal measures they can take to protect themselves.

Now, if the member refers specifically to what is taking place in the City of Winnipeg, the member knows full well that the city, as any other municipality, submits its spray program to the department and uses chemicals that are approved through the Federal Department of Agriculture and then proceeds to carry on its own spray program with little of a role that the department can play in that regard.

If the member refers to in the future; we are talking in terms of putting in place provincial pesticide use permits, which recently - in fact during this month - is with the draft regulation that is being sent out to the municipal bodies and to the various organizations interested in this particular area. I believe that we can pass a copy of that draft regulation to the member, so that he can, as well, refer to it.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Well, there's quite a bit on this thing - my goodness I just read the whole thing - I seem to be a very fast reader. But anyway, Mr. Chairman, I can't really look at it. I guess I should have asked for it before. I just didn't realize that there was anything such as this available and I will, at my leisure, have a look

at it and if something is not to my liking, I'll certainly bring it up to the Honourable Minister during question period and he won't be able to make reference to, "Why don't you wait until we get into my Estimates?"

I really don't have too many more questions on the mosquito problem, although I know the best way of handling mosquitoes is how the Member for Churchill had advised - you just take one hand and you slap the hell out of it with the other.

I think that the Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park has a few questions she would like to ask on mosquito control.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, I'm sorry I maybe didn't hear or understand. Does the city not need permission from the province to do spraying of mosquitoes?

HON. L. LECUYER: The only requirement in the act now is that they file an Environment Impact Study.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Yes, so the province, at this time, doesn't have a veto on that?

HON. L. LECUYER: No.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Is this the area where we can discuss the transportation, the personnel transferred from the Department of Highways? Is this the allocation it's in?

HON. G. LECUYER: I'm sorry, I didn't understand.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Is this the allocation where we can discuss the transfer of the three safety groups from the Department of Highways?

HON. G. LECUYER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The answer is yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay. Then could the Minister indicate that under Salaries where last year it was 2.9, it's down to 2.6 and part of the Highways and Transportation transfer of \$146,000 would be salaries? There obviously must be some reduction in staff in the Environmental Control Services to achieve say \$300,000 to \$350,000 reduction in the salary bill.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, the information that I'm being given is that the only difference is due to the extra pay period for last year.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Is the Minister then telling me that Line 1 under Salaries, Environmental Control Services, there's the same number of staff this year as last year, including the addition of the three from Highways and Transportation?

HON. G. LECUYER: I understand the member is referring to the Environmental Management Services and it's in a different line here than what he's referring to.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, then I'll wait for that line, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It will be under Item No. 2.(b).

HON. G. LECUYER: Would the member ask his question again and I . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, I was under the understanding that the three people from Highways was under (a)(1), but you indicate now it's under actually (b)(1).

HON. G. LECUYER: Yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay then, why isn't there a greater increase than there is there then? Like you've got three more people in the Salary category this year over last year. Were some people let go out of that division to be replaced by?

HON. G. LECUYER: This would show as a reconciliation with last year, so the figures for 1983-84 would have been reconciled to show the transfer as if it had taken place last year, therefore the changes for this year would not be reflective of the particular transfer of dangerous goods.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, that's fine. I see what has happened in the Reconciliation Statement.

Can the Minister indicate the desire to remove a group of three with some expertise in the transportation of dangerous goods from a Transportation Department and putting them in his department where there is no transportation expertise to call on immediately within the department. What was the reason for the move?

HON. G. LECUYER: As I stated in my opening remarks this afternoon, the government, in the Estimates process, felt that it would be wise to put the issue of dangerous and hazardous goods to be co-ordinated in one department. In fact the member may have noticed on the Order Paper, and if he hasn't I'm drawing it to his attention today, there was a bill on the Order Paper today that is being brought forth, which is called "The Handling and Transportation of Dangerous Goods." Therefore that is one of the areas that will be considered during the course of the debates on the legislation and the legislation is intended to back up that particular change, which is of the transportation of dangerous goods to the department, which is in the process of implementing a full program, having to do with the management of hazardous and dangerous waste materials.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Will this new act then replace The Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act that we passed, I believe last Session?

HON. G. LECUYER: The member might recall well, that we did pass an act to that effect last Session, and that at the end of the Session we tabled The Dangerous Goods Handling Act. The act being introduced this year is in actual fact, a combination of the two. The transportation of dangerous goods had not been proclaimed at this point, so in effect, you are correct.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then under what legislative authority is the transportation of dangerous commodities being monitored in the province? We're, in effect, in a legislative no man's land without the previous act being proclaimed and before the new act, which is a combination act, is passed and proclaimed.

HON. G. LECUYER: Well, whether we have or have not proclaimed the legislation of last year, or whether we are combining with the handling of dangerous goods now changes very little because the federal Transport of Dangerous Goods legislation, at this point in time, hasn't been proclaimed either for the very fact that the regulation to implement that legislation has not been adopted federally.

If I haven't been clear on that, although I didn't think that I stated that the legislation hadn't been adopted federally because it has, but there hasn't been all of the regulations at this point in time put in place to make the act actually implementable.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, it's my understanding, Mr. Chairman, there are no federal regulations tabled yet, are there?

HON. G. LECUYER: I believe that there are some regulations in place now, but the full complement of regulations - almost none, I'm given to understand.

Also, I might add that in bringing in the transportation of dangerous goods as part of a new act, the one passed in the last Session, of course, would not be repealed until the passage of the new.

MR. D. ORCHARD: It hasn't been proclaimed.

HON. G. LECUYER: It hasn't been proclaimed anyway, that's correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(1) - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The three people who were responsible for the drafting of the original Dangerous Goods Act, is it the intention of the Minister to keep that expertise in place? This is not a transfer from one department with a finite end to the jobs - are those jobs secure?

HON. G. LECUYER: We have transferred positions, Mr. Chairman, but the positions themselves, although transferred to the department, will be modified or could be modified as the implementation of the overall hazardous and dangerous goods programs evolve within our department with the exception of the secretarial position which would necessarily stay. Yes. We need that secretarial support.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, then just let me get it straight. The secretarial position is one that is going to be transferred and . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: Confirm.

MR. D. ORCHARD: . . . and the person filling that one. But I believe there is a director and then Mr. Shafransky, I don't know what his position was, but he was the . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: He was the legislative analyst who has worked in the preparation of that legislation.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So I take it that those two positions aren't necessarily secure for the people currently holding them? Is this what the Minister is saying? I'm not putting words in his mouth, I'm just asking him.

HON. G. LECUYER: In essence, that's what I said.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Far be it for me to defend Mr. Shafransky, but I would question the Minister as to why, with obviously some expertise in place, I don't know whether his position was a director and then Mr. Shafransky as a legislative analyst - with some expertise in place in the problems involved in the transportation of dangerous goods, why would those people not be retained in the transfer? It would seem to me that if you're not going to retain them that this transfer could be interpreted as a de-emphasis by the government on the safety aspect and transportation of dangerous goods. That certainly is not the kind of public impression this government has tried to leave with the people, but if the expertise is not going to be retained, I think that's the only conclusion one can draw from this transfer.

HON. G. LECUYER: I want to make sure that there is no misunderstanding. I haven't indicated that the persons will not be retained. The department already has the handling of dangerous goods. The department already has the disposal of hazardous materials for which it is developing a program which will come in place in time and what it is acquiring through that is a portion of that overall program, I would say less than a major portion of that program. We will adjust according to the needs as that program evolves, and that is why I'm saying we will look at that as the program evolves. But for the time being, as I say, the positions have been transferred and the staff has been transferred.

Now whether the member is asking me to indicate whether we will - well, first of all, I don't think at any time any Minister would give a commitment that any particular individual that he has on staff would retain that particular position. No one is there to be able to make that kind of assumption anyway.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Right, but in this case, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate that the department has expertise in disposal and handling at industrial work place, handling and disposal of hazardous goods, but transportation of dangerous goods is a very complex issue. It's something that was discussed probably over a six-year period between the Federal Department of Transportation and its provincial counterparts across Canada. The drafting of the act took considerable time as it took quite some time provincially. The regulations aren't drafted. There is sizable expertise in the transportation field involving dangerous goods. I can't agree with the Minister that he necessarily has the expertise already in the department that he needs to provide the kind of protection and policy direction that the province needs in the transportation of dangerous goods. That's why I'm interested in pursuing the matter of whether the expertise that is in place will remain

available for the benefit of the department and the benefit of the people of Manitoba.

HON. G. LECUYER: I don't know what the member sees as a problem because it was started by saying that the transfer has taken place. We have transferred the position and for the time being these persons have been transferred as well, and the expertise, therefore, has been transferred.

I would also like to add that the Department of Highways will continue to play a role in that area as well. The transportation of dangerous goods is not going to be something that the Department of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health is going to assume independently of the Department of Highways. There will be, obviously, ongoing close correlation. A standing or a permanent committee of staff is already in place to make sure that will be ongoing, that the Department of Highways has certain expertise that will be continued to be required even though that particular function has been transferred to the Department of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health.

The additional comment that I would like to say is the Department of Highways itself was of the opinion that the aspect of transportation of dangerous goods was best placed with the overall handling, disposal and all other aspects of hazardous and dangerous goods to make sure that the co-ordination was there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: I was just going to ask the Minister and he has already answered part of it in the answer to the Member for Pembina about the correlation between the Highways Department and his department.

One aspect I was concerned with is the truck drivers. I mean it's all very fine to have all kinds of regulations on what you haul and where and when and why, but it's the drivers that essentially are the key to the whole thing. I was wondering if there is any liaison with the Highways Department with the trucking association, for instance, on some training for truck drivers.

HON. G. LECUYER: I just want to make sure that they understand what the member is asking, so that they understand the act and the provisions of the act.

MRS. C. OLESON: Partly that, Mr. Minister, and partly some knowledge of the type of goods they are hauling in case of emergencies and that sort of thing, also just plain training in the handling of the vehicle that they are driving because a lot of people can tell some horrendous stories of being involved on the highway with truck drivers that are not too proficient. I am not knocking them because it's hard work, but a lot of them I don't think have any training, and particularly when they are hauling something in the line of dangerous goods, I think they do need some more training than perhaps they get.

HON. G. LECUYER: I don't know if this answers fully the member's question and concern here, but I think the overall thrust of the changes to the Workplace Safety and Health legislation which, in essence, will help all workers in the workplace to be more familiar, whether

it is with the equipment they are working with or the tools they are working with or the risks on the job. That's the type of training through the Workplace Safety and Health committees that is intended to be provided to the workers, whether it is in a particular workplace or whether it is a worker or a truck driver working for a particular company handling dangerous goods.

Through The Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act, the truck driver will be familiar or at least know what are the substances that he is hauling through the manifest system, which will follow the dangerous goods from the time they are created to the time they are finally disposed of through a manifest system that will have to be filled each time these substances move from, whether it is the manufacturing plant to the plant where they are going to be used and a process of one type or another, or whether it's moving from that plant as a waste substance to its final disposal point in which circumstances, undergoing these various steps, there is, as part of the manifest system which is being developed federally and which will be used as a standard form throughout the country, a number of pages each time. A part of the manifest is therefore filled and sent in according to the provisions which are in the act.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Inkster.

MR. D. SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to raise a couple of issues here. I don't intend to - say at least go after my Minister, give him a little break here for a minute, I suppose.

I just want to raise some concerns that I have, I've expressed before in the House, and that I've expressed to the Minister. I am quite confident that the Minister is following up on these suggestions that not only come from myself but of other members as well, and this is the whole idea of spraying in our environment to control bugs. It kind of makes you think that the City of Winnipeg listens to the yet unnamed radio show on CBC radio on Sunday or every Saturday morning and listens to that record they played for a couple years of "I Hate Bugs."

But it's the issue that we can deal with insects, in particular, in our environment that may be unpleasant to us, even though they are an integral part of our ecological zone we live in that we can just, at will, go into our environment with no consequences and spray chemicals, in particular. We are moving into biocides now as well, biologically-based insecticides, and I have very strong reservations of us, as a society and as a government, permitting this. Particularly with the exemptions as they presently are provided for under The Clean Environment Act for the City of Winnipeg, where we have over half the population, and yet that is the area that we as a province have years and years ago, when the legislation was drawn up, exempted our responsibility. I think that we should be looking very seriously at that.

Now we have the city, where there is no health threat, no health threat whatsoever, with cankerworms and going about on days like today when we are saved by a breeze, they are not allowed to spray. But there is

no question of health hazard here. In my own feeling, there is even questionable question of health hazard, and certainly as far as one considers epidemiology in even with the insecticides used last year to control mosquitoes with the fear of an outbreak of Western Equine Encephalitis, we are now in a situation where there is absolutely no health threat to human beings by cankerworms, and yet the city is out once again spraying our neighbourhoods and spraying the rivers and streams and the property along the rivers and streams to try and control an insect which to many people is quite unpleasant.

I can agree, it's not pleasant to have to go out your back door and sort of make your way through the cobwebs to your car or out to the backyard, but the trees are very rarely, I would suggest, killed by them and certainly wouldn't be killed by the insects alone unless the trees were already suffering from another disease, because even if the leaves are eaten off by the cankerworms the trees releaf themselves. They did last year; they will in future years.

It is my understanding that we are now at the height of the cankerworm cycle so that next year it will not necessarily be a problem. I have fears that when we continually get into spraying programs year after year we are going to level off the populations at a very high level, like many experts are now claiming has happened in New Brunswick, with the spraying of the spruce budworm where at one time you had dramatic cycles in their population from high population levels to very low population levels, they have now levelled off at a relatively high level and the insects have become more and more immune to the chemicals.

Now methoxychlor, which is currently being sprayed by the City of Winnipeg, I have gone and looked up some definitions of it - some of the chemical composition itself looks more like an algebraic formula to me than it does of methoxychlor - but it recognizes the symptoms. I recognize that this is a chemical of a very very low level of toxicity and it's supposed to not be toxic to human beings. It's very much in order. We have . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member has only a time of 30 minutes.

MR. D. SCOTT: I have only been going five minutes, Mr. Chairman. I could go for 30 minutes very easily on this issue, Mr. Chairman. I shall not do that to the committee, although it is an issue that as far as importance to many people in our society they would wish I would go for several times at 30 minutes. It's not to be laughed at. The people, when I was in Finland and Sweden again last year, they could not believe that a government was allowed to spray aerial spraying or ground fogging urban areas. It's just unheard of over there. They can't believe that a government would be able to get away, be it a city, federal or a provincial level of government. More and more people here are starting to question the wisdom of this spraying too.

Although methoxychlor is not supposed to be toxic, in the definitions here, I'm reading from one called, Toxic and Hazardous Industrial Chemicals Safety Manual. They state that the symptoms of someone who is exposed to this are headaches, staggering, nausea,

vomiting, lethargy and convulsions. They exercise particular care in using it. They state it's less toxic than DDT. Those who are exposed to it, be it in manufacture or application, various safeguards that they should be taking, and when it talks about harmful effects, it says in another book, "The Handbook of Toxic and Hazardous Chemicals," it states that there are none known to humans, which is contradicted by the previous one of the Toxic and Hazardous Chemical Safety Manual and this latter one goes on to say, "In animals" - and I've always thought that human beings were part of the animal species - "it is normal to have trembling, convulsions, kidney and liver damage, even though it is supposed to be non-carcinogenic." We have a large number of people in our society who have respiratory problems and with those respiratory problems they are affected by almost any kind of spraying, whatsoever.

So, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to raise this issue. It hasn't really been raised yet, and although the Member for Niakwa mentioned it in the House the other day, it has not come up for much of a discussion in the House thus far, and I would just want to let the Minister know, as he well does, of my support on taking stronger measures in putting more regulations on spraying and when one can spray. We already announced some measures a couple of weeks ago in regard to spraying where there is danger to human beings. It seems now that we have to make some moves on spraying where there is no health danger whatsoever by the insects towards human beings.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Chair thanks the Member for Inkster. The committee thanks him too.

2(a)(1)—pass.

2.(a)(2) - the Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I thought the Honourable Minister was going to reply to the Honourable Member for Inkster. You weren't going to reply? Then I have a few questions.

Before I get down to rendering plants, which I think we will discuss under 3. Clean Environment Commission, I want . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can go there if we pass this one.

MR. A. KOVNATS: No, I'm not ready to pass this one, Mr. Chairman, for many reasons, one of them is that we all have the right to speak and I think that I'm going to exercise that right to speak at this point. I want to find out if we have any PCB stored in Manitoba, the amount of PCBs that we've got stored in Manitoba. I want to know about the danger and the level of asbestos that is still involved in the City of Winnipeg schools. I want to know concerning the pollution from the Bronze Foundry in the Weston School area, whether that's been cleaned up. The Honourable Minister made some reference to it before. I want to know whether we have any permanent storage facilities for PCBs and permanent storage facilities for materials that are carcinogenic. I don't really know what it means, but I've heard somebody else mention it. I thought I would like to ask the Honourable Minister if he would be prepared to give us a report on all of that. I would like

to find out from the Honourable Minister - I'm giving all these questions at one time. I hope he can answer them . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the purpose of efficiency, can the member ask them one at a time.

MR. A. KOVNATS: All right, then I'll hold back until we get an answer on what I have there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.
Mr. Minister.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To address the member's question in regard to PCBs, there has been an inventory conducted by the Federal Environment of all the PCBs in the transformers in the province. The transformers, as they are replaced, are stored by Winnipeg Hydro or Manitoba Hydro. Those that are still in use and have PCBs within them are so labelled, therefore we have a full inventory of the transformers in use in the province that do still contain PCBs. As those are replaced they are replaced with transformers which do not contain PCBs.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, I'm astounded because I remember the danger, the importance of taking these transformers that were in use by the Manitoba Hydro, and it seemed to me at that point and this was four or five years ago, when we were going to replace them immediately because there was such a danger, such a big issue, that was brought about in the Legislature concerning the PCBs. I'm astounded to find out that there are still some in service. Can the Honourable Minister bring us up to date as to how many are in service still?

HON. G. LECUYER: I don't know if I can provide the detailed information to the member in terms of how many are still in service, although there are some still in service. I want to indicate to the member that these are sealed transformers, and as I indicated before, in some circumstances they are still in service as back-up transformers. As they are being replaced gradually, they are being replaced with transformers that do not contain PCBs. In the meantime these that do and are coming off stream are being stored by both Manitoba Hydro and Winnipeg Hydro.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I'm glad that the Honourable Minister has given me the assurance that these sealed transformers will never become unsealed because I would have a great fear if that was happening. Where are these transformers being stored at this point?

HON. G. LECUYER: I haven't got that information. I could get it for the member, but I'm afraid I can't give it to him tonight.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you very much to the Honourable Minister. It is important information. Do we have any plans now for a location in the Province of Manitoba to store carcinogenic or cancer-causing materials, PCBs, anything else of a pollutant type of material that other provinces won't accept? Are we

planning now for a permanent location to store these type of materials?

HON. G. LECUYER: That's a tall order, Mr. Chairman. The Member from Niakwa is referring to almost all pollutants from carcinogens to PCBs. There are a wide variety of known carcinogens, suspected carcinogens, and others that we probably don't even suspect that might be or others that are not even in existence today that probably will be next week, next month. Who knows?

I think the best way I can answer that, Mr. Chairman, is to say that this is all part of this management of hazardous waste substances that we have referred to oftentimes, that the previous Minister of Environment brought on stream and has talked about in the House a number of times which is still in its first phase or nearing the end of its first phase. It started with the symposium last spring of which the dangerous goods handling is part of, which was the subject of Clean Environment Commission hearings during the winter, which is to be followed by further hearings from the Clean Environment Commission before we go into the second stage which will then start dealing with the type, the very thing that he poses in his question, the type of - how will I address the word that I'm looking for - the method by which these substances can be finally disposed of and there is not a single method for all of these substances. It think it's a combination. It's a whole program therefore that has to be put in place.

When I say the management of hazardous waste materials, because there are a variety of these materials, they cannot all be disposed of in the same manner, therefore it is a comprehensive program that has to be developed, the method that has to be chosen and the site that is part also of that third phase of that program which is where we can bring it all together. In the meantime, we have, as part of that program as well, put together, completed or almost completed an inventory of all of the hazardous waste substances being generated in the province. Perhaps staff can indicate to me how extensive that list is at the moment.

We are somewhere in the area of some 800 businesses in Manitoba that do handle some of these hazardous substances. The list itself would be a fair bit longer I think, 3,200 substances have been identified and are part of the inventory.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I wish the honourable Minister hadn't given me that information. It's kind of mind boggling, but I guess we just can't close our eyes to it. It has to be looked after.

Can the honourable Minister bring us up to date on what's happening in the polluted area around the Weston School that was caused by the foundry and who paid for the removal of that earth?

HON. G. LECUYER: The Weston School Division has agreed to a number of mitigating measures to assure the the lead levels at Weston School will not return to previous high levels. We paid for the removal. The school area was cleaned up last summer. It included the resurfacing of the playground, repainting the trim - a lot of the lead, it was established, was from the old paint that was on the building - and we are presently

sampling the lead level in the air at Weston School and it is established that at this point in time it is a very low level. We will resume ground sampling when the mitigating measures that I've referred to are in place. As well we propose to do monitoring of playgrounds in different parts of the city during the summer.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Are there any other locations in the city other than the Weston School area that we are monitoring and checking out the lead level dangers throughout all of the City of Winnipeg and throughout the province? I know that Weston School, it appears, is an ongoing thing because we've had an experience there. Do we have any experience anywhere else?

HON. G. LECUYER: There have been several other locations that have been sampled and so far there are no other locations that have presented any problem at this point in time, but as I've indicated as well, other areas will be also sampled during the course of the summer.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Can the Minister bring us up to the point now where are we experiencing any dangerous asbestos levels in any of the schools or has all the asbestos been changed to a more stable type of insulation?

HON. G. LECUYER: The member is asking this question I suppose because the asbestos has been in the past, or is known to be, when inhaled, a substance that has been established could be related to diseases and in particular cancer or what is referred to as asbestosis. There is an ongoing program in the department monitored by the Workplace Safety and Health officers. Therefore it's an area that would normally come under a different number, but I might as well answer the full question at this point in time.

The program operates basically in four different phases. That of identification, the evaluation of the problem, consultation between staff and the people involved with the operation and a control operation.

The identification itself includes: responding to concerns or requests or complaints from both management or workers and to confirm the presence of asbestos, if such is. This has been ongoing since 1979 with approximately some 2,000 analyses having been performed by the provincial lab since then.

The evaluation consists of assessment of the hazards to those who might be occupationally exposed to the asbestos through their work in order to determine the extent of the damage that they might be exposed to.

If the evaluation performed indicates risks, high risks of exposure, discussions are conducted with the management and the workers to detail with them the type of control measures that would be best in the particular case in question. It may be that there's a possibility of enclosing the fibres, it may be that there's a possibility that it is necessary to go as far as removing, encapsulating - there are different approaches to different situations depending of the severity of the degree on the basis of the evaluation performed.

I don't know if I've fully answered the question the member . . .

MR. A. KOVNATS: Fairly much.

I would just like to bring to the attention of the Minister; I have some concerns concerning the asbestos fibre danger and the PCBs and the danger with Manitoba Hydro, particularly with the new legislation that is coming out about where somebody can refuse to work in the presence of any of this dangerous material if there's a hazard to their health in the workplace. I don't know how it's going to be handled and I don't think that I really want to get into it at this point, but I bring it to the Honourable Minister's attention that I have a great many concerns. All right, the Honourable Minister wants to answer that.

HON. G. LECUYER: In general terms, I think that I've answered the question, the concerns of the member by, in essence, describing to him how the program is conducted and also advising him that the program is ongoing and it has been for a number of years. In fact, it started when they were in government in 1979 and it's ongoing.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I have some questions later on, but I'm just going to finish off a few little odds and ends at this point, concerning the recycling of garbage, and I'm not repeating an area that was brought up before. I'm going to talk about the plastic bottles, the disposable bottles, the aluminum tins, these are things that have been causing us an environmental problem for all of these years. Can the Honourable Minister bring us up to date on regulations covering all of these things?

Are we subsidizing anybody to go about and pick up these items because I understand the only place to recycle some of these items is in Calgary and you have to pick them up and take them out there? Do we have any place in Manitoba where we can recycle these items?

HON. G. LECUYER: As far as the bottles are concerned, there hasn't been any sense of a problem in that the bottles in use are mostly - whether it's the soft drink bottles or beer bottles - they are on a refundable basis and there has been, through ongoing discussion and voluntary controls imposed by the beverage industry, a limited number of cans put on the market with soft drinks. The problem may soon be upon us to a greater degree as the aluminum cans come into use, the non-returnable containers, and up until now there hasn't been any volume sufficient to warrant or to make it attractive enough for an industry to get involved, although I think that we certainly have had a number of requests. We are encouraging developments in that regard. If there is a problem, I suppose we have to say the problem exists really in the North, where there is a greater use of cans than in the south because of the transportation costs involved with bottles in the beverage industry.

I can also add, for the information of the member, that the question of pollution as a result of containers, especially non-returnable or refundable containers, is becoming of a greater concern throughout the country. In fact recently I received a letter, just a matter of a couple of weeks ago, from the Federal Minister of Environment telling me that this matter, this concern, has been brought to his attention by a number of provinces, suggesting that this be placed on the agenda

at the next meeting of Ministers of Environment and Natural Resources, the CCREM Ministers, in the fall.

I have replied to him, indicating that I supported this idea and I felt that it would be useful that a paper be prepared, or a first draft paper be prepared, for our discussion at that meeting. I've also asked staff within my department to prepare a paper giving us a better insight of the nature of the problem within the province, the quantity of these non-returns that are currently being accumulated in the environment, asking for figures in terms of the number of cans, not only the beverage and soft drink industry but the juices, the whole of the food industry, as well as the soft drink and beer industry.

I know the question of the use of aluminum cans in the brewing process is also becoming an increasing concern and I have at this stage a paper which I am taking for the consideration of my colleagues and Cabinet in the near future, but I am not at liberty to reveal its contents nor is it by any means an indication that we are on the verge of making any decisions. But I want to indicate to the member that it is in my estimation a very important question, one I think that is going to be increasingly a problem, one that I think will be a challenge to all of the provinces.

MR. A. KOVNATS: We're kind of winding down. We're getting down to where we can move on, but just one last item before we move onto the Mercury Agreement and we get down to that problem.

A little while back we received a questionnaire, and it seemed it was an environmental questionnaire concerning the Legislature, and some of the questions were quite interesting, but I thought it was an awful waste of money. Can the Honourable Minister bring me up to date as to what initiated the questionnaire that was circulated and for what reason did we circulate it? Was there some health hazards, some danger concerning this building? It seemed it was a ridiculous thing. We're always looking to save money and to put the money in the best place. What initiated such a ridiculous questionnaire?

HON. G. LECUYER: I know that it may on the surface look as if it's a ridiculous questionnaire perhaps, but it was for a very real reason. Some of the employees in this building, in fact some of the members of the Legislature, have been troubled ever since last fall through we don't know what particular substance that probably is in the air, or to which they are allergic to, but it has affected the health of a considerable number of people working in the building, seemingly on the east side of the building. So we wanted to determine to what extent this was a problem and that was the reason for the questionnaire. The problem is being addressed presently.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did the Member for Niakwa say that was the last question?

MR. A. KOVNATS: Yes, I did, and that's why I have my hand up because I came up with one more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. A. KOVNATS: May I pose the question, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: By all means.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I don't know who the members were. I guess if it was members of the group that I belong to I probably would have known about it. I just kind of struck me by surprise. But you know if there is a health danger, Mr. Chairman, I would think this health danger won't last more than another couple of years anyway for those particular members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(1)—pass; 2.(a)(2)—pass.
2.(b)(1)—pass; 2.(b)(2)—pass.
2.(c)(1) - the Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Can the Honourable Minister bring us up to date as to the problems concerning mercury pollution and why we only have, I would think, a half-a-secretary salary here, and whatever the Other Expenditures are and Recoverable from Canada of \$105,000.00? Can the Honourable Minister bring us up to date?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, this an agreement that was signed between the province and the Government of Canada to study and monitor the extent of mercury in the Churchill River Diversion Project. The agreement was signed on March of 1983. So it is expected to, the agreement is for four years to conclude in '86, I believe, with a total budget of 760,000 shared on a 50-50 basis between the province and the Canadian Government.

There are five objectives to the agreement. The objectives of the agreement are to further investigate the mercury level in the water sediments and the effect that the mercury would have on the aquatic food chain along the whole of the diversion route, and to determine what the sources of the mercury input is in the diversion system, to research mechanisms whereby the mercury released, how it enters the food chain, to assess the significance of these phenomena to future water management activities. And to advise the public the purpose, the progress, and the results of the studies undertaken. And if the member refers to only half-a-staff-year it's because the bulk of the work is done on a contractual basis.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I wasn't too sure. I was kind of guessing at that \$16,700.00. What really does that encompass?

HON. G. LECUYER: That's approximately the half person that the member was referring to.

MR. A. KOVNATS: That's a half-a-secretary then?

HON. G. LECUYER: No, no.

MR. A. KOVNATS: That's a full secretary?

HON. G. LECUYER: That's a half SMY of a, it's the program co-ordinators, the half-time of a professional person involvement.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Yes, is there any other mercury pollution in the province other than in the Churchill

area that we're making reference to here? We're monitoring this Churchill area. Are we monitoring any other mercury problems for the fishing industry in the province?

HON. G. LECUYER: The member probably is aware and that was something that we have been informed of, and there has been in the news, and a problem ever since the '60s I believe where the presence of a certain amount of mercury has been established in the Red, the Assiniboine, the Souris, the Winnipeg rivers, basically all the rivers of southern Manitoba, and in some instances has been established that there were mercury levels slightly higher than the levels acceptable for human consumption.

There has been ongoing monitoring of these river systems. The problem is basically handled through public information, and to that effect if the member is an avid fisherman when he goes to buy his licence this year he will also receive one of these leaflets to inform him of the situation. It's not a problem unless you're an avid and continuous eater of fish from these particular bodies of water. Commercial fishing is all monitored for mercury, as the member perhaps is already aware, as a condition of sale by the Fresh Water Fish Marketing Corporation.

MR. D. KOVNATS: I think we can pass this item, Mr. Chairman.

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

Resolution 68: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty, a sum not exceeding \$7,059,300 for Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, Environmental Management for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1985—pass.

I'm calling Item No. 3(a), Clean Environment Commission, Salaries, 3.(b) Other Expenditures - the Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Yes, I think at this point we will discuss the rendering plants in the Province of Manitoba. Happy days, here we go.

The Honourable Minister had made some reference to it in the Legislature concerning the Burns Plant at Brandon. You know, I don't want to bring up the whole of the issue. He knows the problems there concerning the rendering of animals like deads in the Western region of Manitoba, as well as we do have an industry here in Winnipeg that renders deads. But I think that it's the Brandon area which will have no such facilities anymore. I think that we have to prepare and not wait for the last minute until we've got a, you know, a truck load of deads and not knowing what to do with them after the plant is closed. It's not a hypothetical case, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not saying anything.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I was looking and I could almost see the lips moving and the words hypo starting it, you know, and I appreciate the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will the member please come to the point.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I thought I was getting to the point, Mr. Chairman. But you know I just didn't want to be stopped on it because it is such an important part of it and it's just not hypothetical. There was some reference to it in the Chamber that it might have been hypothetical and the Minister said that he would be coming into his Estimates very soon, and I would like him to bring us up to date as to what plans are being made now when the Burns plant closes. What are the contingency plans to look after the deads in that area because I'm told that it, you know, and I'm not trying to impress the Minister with my knowledge of what goes on in these rendering plants although I do appear to know quite a bit about it because it was very, very important, and I went out and I found out.

It costs about \$1.50 a mile to send a truck from Winnipeg out to Brandon, or places of that area. Somewhere in the area of about \$600, you know, to take a trip out to Brandon and back with special equipment.

Can the Honourable Minister advise if they are doing anything to encourage the Brandon plant to keep up their rendering facility in Brandon? After we talk about this we'll talk about the rendering facilities in Winnipeg.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I guess what essentially I can say to the member - I could go on and agree with him that the rendering plant in Brandon does serve a significant portion of the province, western Manitoba, on the other hand it remains a fact. I'd like to correct one thing. Not every dead animal is dead because of disease for one thing.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Some of it's heart trouble, I understand that.

HON. G. LECUYER: Some may die from heart trouble, some may die from old age. We heard the Member for Pembina mentioned this afternoon, some died because of . . .

MR. A. KOVNATS: Loneliness.

HON. G. LECUYER: . . . such situations as ice storms as we experienced recently and will create problems and circumstances . . .

MR. A. KOVNATS: The Honourable Minister of Government Services is going to be looking at that.

HON. G. LECUYER: But essentially what I would like to say is, first of all, there are parts of the province that have no rendering service now and they have to deal with that problem in the old-fashioned way. Now the question of closing of Burns in Brandon, the member raises that question as if this had been a long-standing knowledge that we had of this situation. I can only respond by saying I have no pat alternative to the question or pat answer. I can say we've been apprised of the problem. We shall have discussions with the industry, especially those sectors that are the prime users of the rendering plant now, to try and determine whether there is not a viable alternative possible, but I have no answer to give you at this point in time.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Well, I hope that the Honourable Minister would take it as a suggestion that we do have

people in the rendering business here in Winnipeg who are capable of going out to Brandon. I hope, you know as a last resort, I would like to see the plant maintained in Brandon for the good of the all the people that are working there and for the good of the community because it is a big part of the community in Brandon. I'm not looking to make plans now to close the plant and I hope, if there's any possibility of keeping it open, that the government of the Province of Manitoba will do everything they can to try and encourage Burns to keep it open. I'm not quite finished on this point.

Now it comes down to the rendering plants in the City of Winnipeg and I've completely investigated, even to the point where I started working in a rendering plant when I was in high school. It was my first contact with a rendering plant. I've been inside a rendering plant and worked inside a rendering plant and I don't imagine there's anybody else here who has worked inside a rendering plant. They've been by it and enjoyed the aromas that come from those plants, but I have been inside and I know a little bit about it.

Can the Honourable Minister advise whether the level of odours that seems to have been diminishing in our area has anything to do with the Province of Manitoba in controlling these odours that are coming from these particular areas? Can the Honourable Minister or his department take credit for what appears to be a lessening of these odours coming from the rendering plants?

HON. G. LECUYER: I thank the Member for Niakwa. The Member for Niakwa refers to a lifetime research of the industry, going back to his high school days, actually I worked in the industry as well in those days. The odour, the member is correct, living in the area, representing the constituency where a lot of that occurs. The member mentions it because he's just adjacent to it and therefore knows of what he speaks, just as much as I do.

You are quite correct in saying that there are regulations. The industry, by and large, abides by these regulations and I can only assume that the system in place and the bugs in the system have been ironed out, to a point where there's less of a frequency of malfunctioning occurring. When the problems have occurred in the past, it's not because there were not regulations or not an indication that they were purposely disregarding the regulations, but there are instances where there is malfunction, stoppage in the system or start-ups in the system in these situations, or temperature inversions or creations where the odours have been particularly bad, and I'm sure the member will find that this from time-to-time will re-occur. But it seems that in recent time, for a combination of factors, perhaps because of closer monitoring as well as, it seems, the system is functioning just more efficiently.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I am aware that there's about 100 jobs that are involved with the rendering industry in the City of Winnipeg, which isn't a small item, and I am told through investigation that the odours have been decreased because what has been happening is that the effluent that is going into the sewer has been cooled down to the degree where the smell isn't quite as harsh and being transmitted because it's transmitted a heck

of a lot easier with heat. When it's cooled down the smell isn't transmitted quite as much. I think that the people in the industry are becoming quite conscious of what's happening and are getting to be very good corporate citizens and are trying to contribute to the good part of our environment.

The only other item that I was going to ask at this point was what is happening - well two questions - what is happening to the fines that are imposed on these companies when the effluent is of a higher degree? Where does that money go, into what coffers? Is that money going to be used for the betterment of the industry or is it just a fund that is being used by the Provincial Government or the City of Winnipeg? I'm not sure who is imposing that fine, but it is being imposed and I think that rather than imposing a fine, I think that we should be controlling it to the point where the effluent meets the necessary regulations. Can the Honourable Minister bring me up to date on that?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, for the member's benefit, I would encourage industry and we encourage industry on the whole to spend their money on putting in place mechanisms and systems that will better protect the environment, the health of people, and avoid as much as possible, having to pay such fines. But when they have to, the member knows full well that the whole judicial system is not a money-maker but a cost factor, and like all fines, they go into general revenue, when that has to happen.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Can the Honourable Minister bring me up to date on the regulations concerning noises coming from railroad yards, highways that go by his house and mine from the heavy trucks? I know the Honourable Minister stood out on the highway and listened to those noises, because we have discussed it.

What are the regulations and are we doing anything to discourage trucks and cars and railroads from making unnecessary noises?

HON. G. LECUYER: We do have regulations under Workplace Safety and Health for the workplace areas, but that is not what the member is referring to and I know he is not, because, as he mentions, we have talked about this before. He is referring specifically to noise levels in the area near where I live. In fact, the city has a noise by-law; and other than that, there are no other by-laws.

I am afraid that the problem to which the member refers is one that will have to be solved through a number of other very costly alternatives such as, in the long run, the completion of the Perimeter Highway in northeast Winnipeg would help, as some of the truck traffic that goes that way would have an alternative route to follow. As the member knows, it's one of those alternatives that I advocate, but one that I know, full well, also has to be taken into consideration along with all of the other priorities of the province and the government.

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

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

About this time last year, I was getting letters from people in my constituency concerning the Ayerst Plant in Brandon and the Clean Environment Commission's involvement with that, and there were further studies going to be done on the effluent from that plant. I am just wondering if the Minister could bring us up to date on what has transpired concerning that plant.

HON. G. LECUYER: The particular industry comes under the City of Brandon by-law. As far as we know, in terms of the citizen complaints, the air emissions are actually minimal emanating from that particular operation. The liquid wastes are discharged into the City of Brandon sewer system. The ammonia itself in the wastes, which has been the primary cause of citizen complaints, has been investigated and the cause rectified by the City of Brandon itself.

The City of Brandon has a sewer charge imposed on the Ayerst operation and the spent solvents from the operation are collected and burnt at the City of Brandon waste disposal site with the approval of the city and the environmental management division.

MRS. C. OLESON: Well, then, has there been monitoring of the Assiniboine River to satisfy the Clean Environment Commission that the problem is taken care of?

HON. G. LECUYER: I have a fair bit of information on it here in front of me, but what I want to indicate to the member is that, yes, there has been an extensive amount of monitoring taking place. In fact, the matter is in fact being considered by the Clean Environment Commission at this very point in time.

MRS. C. OLESON: Then I take it that the company is able to operate and is still managing to process the product, and which the Minister probably knows, employs quite a few people in my constituency, and the fact that they have extensive herds of horses involved in this, they're very concerned that the regulations might put them out of business.

HON. G. LECUYER: It is definitely not our desire to put people out of business, nor the Clean Environment Commission neither, but it is the role of the division to monitor and control the emissions and assist the industry to comply with the regulations in place. Most of the time, most operations are able to do so. In some instances, once the regulations and the level is fully understood and clear, if the adjustments are required, generally they can be put in place. We hope that as a result of the present situation that is being considered now in regard to Ayerst, that is what is going to happen, that this operation will be able to continue. I cannot speculate as to exactly - I cannot say if any modifications will be required, if the Clean Environment Commission will have recommendations that will assist the industry in bringing about modification if it sees that as necessary.

MRS. C. OLESON: With regard to Simplot in Brandon, I read in Hansard of the '83-84 Estimates that there was a hearing to be held in October of '83 with regard to the Simplot Chemical Co., and I am wondering what

the results of that hearing were. What were the results of that hearing?

HON. G. LECUYER: In regard to the Simplot operation, there are two areas; one has to do with the liquid effluents and the other is the air emission. The one the member is referring to has to do with the air emission. The Clean Environment Commission has provided a report and recommendations to the Minister and the concerned parties with regard to the order under which the Simplot operates in terms of air emission.

The Minister has decided to approve the recommendations of the Clean Environment Commission which, in essence, do provide for a slight increase in flexibility to the Simplot operations in terms of air emissions which prior to now required them to limit their emissions to two parts per million and on the basis of the Clean Environment Commission - I hope the former Minister of Environment leaves the place before - I'm trying to stretch so that he doesn't hear me - but has recommended that it be raised to three parts per million which has been approved.

HON. J. COWAN: About time. Hear, hear, about time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)—pass - the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Is my colleague finished her questions?

Mr. Chairman, if my memory serves me correctly, the original standard imposed by the previous Minister was one part per million.

HON. G. LECUYER: Pardon me. I missed that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The original limit was one . . .

HON. J. COWAN: Your memory is as bad as your logic.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The original limit was one?

HON. J. COWAN: Two.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Was two parts . . .

HON. J. COWAN: By the Clean Environment Commission.

MR. D. ORCHARD: There was no attempt to restrict them to one part per million, Mr. Chairman?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: There will be some trouble in the recording of the proceedings.

The Member for Pembina has the floor.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Did the monitoring over the period of time show any expansion beyond the originally set limit, whether it was one or two parts?

HON. G. LECUYER: The member's memory is close to being correct, but there's a big difference in this particular case, because it's 100 percent difference.

The limit was two parts per million and for the member's benefit, that wasn't set by the Minister, but it was set by the Clean Environment Commission.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now, I take it, the Clean Environment Commission is making a recommendation to go to three?

HON. G. LECUYER: It has made that recommendation and a paper is being prepared by the current Minister for approval by Cabinet to abide by that recommendation.

MR. D. ORCHARD: It ends up with the Minister, presumably this Minister, is going to approve a three part per million and my error was 100 percent, his increase is 50 percent. Would that be correct?

HON. G. LECUYER: That is quite correct.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The question I have: did Simplot exceed the two parts per million during the monitoring period?

HON. G. LECUYER: It's my understanding that Simplot has exceeded that limit on occasion and that there have been modifications to its operation. These were referred in last year's Estimates as being implemented and it is our understanding that the operation can now function under normal circumstances, under the three parts per million. The Simplot industry - there are exemption times whereby for instance, should there be malfunction or stoppage or start-up due to these malfunctions, then there will be under those circumstances times when the levels will be higher, but that is also provided for under the current recommendations of the Clean Environment Commission. The limit, I'm advised, will also be reviewed in approximately a year's time from now by the Clean Environment Commission.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Is it a fair assumption that the momentary exemptions column in start-up and plant failure, they were not part of the two part per million Clean Environment order? They were part of it?

HON. G. LECUYER: They were, yes, they were.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, just one question. Can you smell three parts per million of ammonia?

HON. G. LECUYER: The Member from Pembina - I went over the records of last year's Estimates and I know that the previous Minister of Environment and the Member from Pembina went at it on that particular issue for a lengthy period of time.

HON. J. COWAN: It wasn't so long.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Gerry, if anybody could, you could.

A MEMBER: With a nose like his.

HON. G. LECUYER: I am advised by the Member from Niakwa that if anybody could distinguish it, I could,

and I have to advise the Member from Pembina appearances can be fooling. It's not the size that determines the quality of the smell; mine works very poorly. Actually I could say that it totally malfunctions, therefore I probably could withstand 50 parts per million.

To come back to the question or the point raised by the Member from Pembina; I'm given to understand those who have a very refined smeller, probably can smell the ammonia when it reaches a level of somewhere around five parts per million or perhaps a little bit less in some cases, but that's about the threshold point - five parts per million.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Employment Securities.

HON. L. EVANS: I'd like to participate in this debate just for a moment or two because of the questions asked by the Member from Pembina.

As the Member for Brandon East in which this facility is located, I can tell you that over the years I've had dozens, if not hundreds, of phone calls of people phoning me at 11 o'clock at night, little old ladies, maybe little old men too, complaining about the smell from Simplot.

Now, I'm not suggesting for a moment that the quantity of ammonia in the air, the content is such that it's lethal, I'm not suggesting that, but it is annoying and people with respiratory diseases in particular seem to get very upset about it.

I would like to invite members to be in Brandon at times when you have these big green-purple clouds wafting over the community, and people do get upset. I've gone out for walks, as I usually do in the evening, and I've had my lungs cleaned out a few times by a very powerful smell of ammonia. Now, I don't know what the parts per million were, but I can tell you it is a nuisance factor and it could be a danger in some cases. There's been occasions where they've shut off the ventilating system at the Brandon General Hospital because of ammonia seeping into the air vents, etc., of the hospital.

So, I would just say this, that the people that live nearby and are affected by gases that come out from time to time, particularly if the wind is blowing from the east or the southeast, are concerned and I get the phone calls. I'm not arguing that it is a lethal amount, I don't think it is because nobody has died or dropped dead on the street yet, but nevertheless, people do get concerned. The fire hall gets calls, and the MLA gets calls and people want you to do something about it.

I'm very glad that the former Minister and our government did have the Clean Environment Commission go there and give the public an opportunity to be heard and make their concerns known.

HON. G. LECUYER: In replying to the Member from Pembina's comments a while ago, I hadn't noticed that the official watchdog from Brandon East was part of our deliberations. I probably would have been careful, or I would have sent a memo to the Member from Pembina and asked him to ask this question later.

I know the Member from Brandon East has a very sensitive smeller and what no one knows is, is he actually acts as the monitoring system over there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No imputations.

HON. G. LECUYER: Getting serious here, I would like to also indicate for the Member for Brandon East, and I think he is aware of this, that the complaints he's referring to have been far fewer and far between in recent times than they had in the past. This is due in large measure to some of the improvements put into place by the Simplot and that I think we can say what Simplot has. I've had a number of discussions with them. They have certainly showed a great deal of willingness to co-operate in every respect possible. I think that everybody in the area, in fact, at the Clean Environment Commission, and the commission makes these comments in its report that the members who appeared at the hearings made the comments that there had been general improvements in recent times. We can only hope that it will continue on that basis and the Simplot operation will be able to function in an ongoing basis in compliance with the regulation.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Did I understand the Minister correctly that this new order, 3 parts per million, is up for review at a year's time?

HON. G. LECUYER: I believe that is correct. An approximate time. I'm not sure if I say a year's time, I don't want the Member for Pembina to hold me to a week or a month there, but give or take, yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well then, will it go through a hearing process again at that time?

HON. G. LECUYER: Yes.

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

MRS. C. OLESON: Could the Minister indicate, has he any knowledge of what it cost Simplot to implement any changes they had to implement to comply with the regulations?

HON. G. LECUYER: There are two ways of answering that. If the member is asking how much additional amount it costs to comply, I believe that part of the expansion of its operation, which in itself was a very costly expansion or measure, but the expansion enabled them to increase their production, I don't know by how much. But in performing the expansion, there were improvements to the mechanisms put in place which make for lower emissions, but to be able to tell you how much it actually costs to further limit the emissions, I couldn't give you the exact number. The officials from Simplot, when I last talked with them, are perfectly conscious of some of the remarks also gleaned from last year's hearings. Whatever amount of ammonia goes out the stack is also revenue lost, and their interest as well as in the interest of all residents of Brandon is that it be limited to the greatest degree possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)—pass; 3.(b)—pass.

Resolution 69: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$315,800 for Environment and Workplace Safety Health, Clean Environment Commission, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1985—pass.

4.(a) Manitoba Environmental Council, Salaries; 4.(b) Other Expenditures - the Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Honourable Minister to advise who are the people who provide the advice to the Minister regarding Environmental problems and concerns?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, on The Manitoba Environment Council, there are approximately 100 people who serve on the council. At some specific times there might be a few less, but it's limited to 100.

MR. A. KOVNATS: So, am I led to believe that the salary is \$500 a year per person?

HON. G. LECUYER: I'm advised that also includes fringe benefits.

All kidding aside, Mr. Chairman, this represents the salaries for permanent staff of the Manitoba Environmental Council which in 1984-85 stands at just over two and a fraction, and that represents the salaries of 49,900.

MRS. C. OLESON: How often does this group meet?

HON. G. LECUYER: With that size of a committee, the committee deals with a wide variety of issues and has quite a few committees which meet. One or another of the committee of the Environmental Council meeting on a weekly basis, but the whole Environmental Council meets twice a year.

MRS. C. OLESON: Well, they have an entirely different function from the Clean Environment Commission, is that correct? They are an advisory group that advise you on matters that should be brought to your attention about a wide range of things to do with the environment, I take it, and you develop a policy from their recommendations?

HON. G. LECUYER: That is quite correct. Perhaps I could give you some examples. During the course of 1983-84, they submitted 10 briefs on various issues going from pest control, public education, on methods of pest control, establishment of pesticides control, hunting of timber wolves, legal hunting. They perform such special functions as advice to the Minister on matters regarding aerial spraying for mosquitoes. They took part in the 1983 consultation which had been established by the past Minister of Environment. They give lectures on various topics in environmental issues. They are actively involved in the environmental week and they also organize the cartoon contests in the schools. They are involved in public education programs and will, for instance, man the stalls at the particular exhibitions and a wide variety of other programs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)—pass; 4.(b)—pass.

Resolution 70: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$62,600 for Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, the Manitoba Environmental Council, for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1985—pass.

5.(a)(1), Workplace and Worker Services, Workplace Safety and Health: Salaries; 5.(a)(2), Other Expenditures.

Okay we stop at 5.(a)(1) and 5.(a)(2) - the Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In last year's act by this department, there was a Workplace Committee's regulation set up, whereby people with employees of more than 20 were to set up a committee in the workplace. Has the Minister had any complaints about these committees?

HON. G. LECUYER: I gather the member was referring to the Workplace Safety and Health Committees which were in existence under the previous act and which are now mandatory, largely based on the number of employees, under the amended act as it came in force on January 1, 1984. There we expect that the number of Workplace Safety and Health Committees are going to continue and grow during the year, and that as a result of these committees coming into existence in the workplace that the number of accidents and illnesses related to injuries in the workplace hopefully will decrease. There will be of course a period of time or a transition when these committees, first of all, come into place and start functioning properly as a Workplace Safety and Health Committee.

But if the member is saying have there been complaints in terms of resistance to the establishment of such committees? Very few that I'm aware of. We did receive a few of those specifically in regard to the school divisions, for instance.

Lately I've also received, what I've done in regard to those, I've indicated that the legislation had been enacted and that I expected that the committees were already in place. Since then I've received and told some of these school divisions, for instance, to get in touch with other school divisions who already had committees in place before they were even mandatory, in fact, and were quite pleased with the fact that they had them in place.

There have been a number of positive articles that have appeared: one in the MAST Review and to the Manitoba Teacher. Since then - it might be interesting for the member that one of the divisions that had complained sent me the copy of the minutes of the meeting with the teachers recently indicating that they had put in place their committee. They're quite happy of the development so far and hopefully they will continue to be as committee starts to be operative.

MRS. C. OLESON: Well, I'm wondering if the Minister is aware of one particular problem that surfaces with school divisions, that is, that the regulations apparently say that the meetings have to take place within the working hours of the people involved. With school boards involved with teachers, with custodians, and with bus drivers, it follows that there's no possible way they could meet while all of those people are working because when the teachers are working the bus drivers are not and vice versa, for instance. I'm wondering if the Minister allows any leeway in that matter because it is very difficult for a school board to comply.

HON. G. LECUYER: Perhaps there is confusion in the fact that all the act says, or the regulation says, is that it has to be considered part of their work schedule, but

it doesn't say that it has to be during working hours. In fact, regarding the specifics, how the school division goes about implementing its committee, there's a great deal of flexibility open.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1).

HON. G. LECUYER: I'm sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. G. LECUYER: The staff is advising me that there is actual - and I want to correct that - the wording actually says during working hours. But that has been interpreted and will continue to be interpreted as part of the work schedule of the employees.

MRS. C. OLESON: Because that was one difficulty that they were going to comply to the letter of the regulations, then they would, you know, I'm sure you'll understand that would be rather difficult.

One school board in my constituency, I was reading in the Neepawa Press of March 1st, lists all the inspections and various regulatory boards, their bodies that inspect their schools, and found it a little difficult to see why this one was necessary. I'll quote where it says: "Our schools are now being inspected by the caretakers, principals, the loss prevention officer from MAST, representatives from the Fire Commissioner's Office, the local Fire Department, the Department of Health, the Department of Labour, Department of Education, and the Clean Environment Act people." So they found it very difficult to figure out why they need yet another body to study all this matter. So I'm sure that most of them will of course comply, but it does present another expense because they're going to have to pay people for the time they spend at these meetings. It is another form of inspection in the workplace which they really didn't feel was necessary.

HON. G. LECUYER: I think the member is quite correct that in the school division system initially there was a negative reaction. I think that to a large extent the portent of the regulation was not fully understood. I think that the ongoing discussions that have taken place with the various school division indicate that this is not so any more. During the course of the last week, 50 school divisions were contacted and a negative response was heard from only two of them, so the school divisions are complying. I think that they don't see it so much as an infringement or it's seen more as, perhaps even more so, important in the school system to develop the proper workplace safety and health habits in the school system because this is where the workers of tomorrow are being formed. That inasmuch as - well, I suppose we could branch out to another topic here - we hope that these habits, they have to be formed somewhere and it is very important that they be formed at an early age as part of our school system which should teach our young people not only the academics required to enter into either continued education or various profession but as well to teach them this is part of the lifestyle that they will carry - not only carry on in the workplace but also during their leisure hours.

MRS. C. OLESON: Just one question, probably from the Minister's answer. Are there students on these committees?

HON. G. LECUYER: There should be, yes, and they're at what we expect will happen and is happening, is that students at the high school level are being appointed as representatives on the committees. There will be teachers, there will be students on the committee.

Now we're not saying to the school division you have to have a committee at each school level. There will be in some cases only a committee at the divisional level, on which there will be some students. We don't expect to see some elementary students on the committees.

MRS. C. OLESON: Well, in the case of a school in a division with over 20 staff members, for instance, would they be required to have a committee and would the division level also have to have a committee or could you have one to do the whole division?

HON. G. LECUYER: I thought that's that what I had already stated, but to clarify, and I've verified to make sure I was providing the correct information, there is no requirement that there be a committee at every school level.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5(a)(1) - the Member for Gladstone.

MR. C. OLESON: This is on another matter. There was reference in the Estimate debates of last year to regulations that a plan be worked out between employers and employees as to what to do in emergencies and this is concerning workers working alone in convenience stores. I'm wondering if that has taken place, was there a follow-up on that, and is this plan to be registered with this department or what is the procedure?

HON. G. LECUYER: The working alone regulations which the member refers to is one that has been in the process of being developed now for 18 months, I am told, which has gone out for consultation I think three times or at least twice, which is now in its third draft form. I understand it's now in the hands of the Workplace, Safety and Health Advisory Council. It's in the hands of Legislative Counsel for final drafting for the correct wording. I expect that I will be receiving that final draft in the very near future for a recommendation to Cabinet and adoption as a regulation under The Workplace, Safety and Health Act.

MRS. C. OLESON: Has the Minister received input from some of the larger convenience store chains and from others as to input into the regulations?

HON. G. LECUYER: The draft regulations were sent out to 1,500 different groups, interested parties, convenience stores, retail chains, who had an opportunity to provide us with their input on this particular issue. That is one of the reasons, Mr. Chairman, that the regulation has been so long into the drafting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5(a)(1) - the Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Concerning the Workmans Compensation Board . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. G. LECUYER: For the Member for Niakwa's benefit, that's why I thought we would deal with 5.(a) and deal with the Compensation Board under 5.(b) and the Worker Advisor under 5.(b).

MR. CHAIRMAN: If we pass by 5.(a), we go to the Workers Compensation Board.

HON. G. LECUYER: That's what we had I thought agreed upon, when we began the . . .

MR. A. KOVNATS: Fair enough. We're talking about workplace, safety and health then before we get to Workers Compensation Board. Concerning the new regulations, as far as any of the workers who will not have to work, if there is a danger to their health in the workplace. I started speaking on it a little earlier and I am very very concerned as to who's going to regulate it. Now I know that there's going to be some cases that are ridiculous and there's going to be some that are absolutely worthwhile. Who is going to regulate to protect the workers who are honest and the management?

HON. G. LECUYER: The member is referring to the right to refuse dangerous work without fear of discrimination or loss of pay. The member perhaps doesn't know or has forgotten that this regulation, this measure has been in place or in existence since 1977. I guess what we have to add, having said that, is that with the amendments to The Workplace, Safety and Health Act in the last legislation, the procedure has been more clearly defined and as a result, specific 8-step procedures have been set out in the act, whereby it's clarified how this right to refuse is to be utilized. For instance, well I don't want to go into the details of the 8-step measure, but that's drafted as part of the act.

If the member wishes to have a copy of the act to refer to that or if he wants me I shall go into the details, but as a result of the new amendments to the act, no, Mr. Chairman, we don't expect that there will be undue or abuse of the system through frivolous recall to that right to refuse. In fact, I could give the details of the number of instances it has been resorted to and it's not very frequently, probably not sufficiently frequently enough. But because of the 8-step procedure in place before any employee can abuse of the system, they would have to definitely think twice. As far as I know there hasn't been any abuse at this point in time and no complaints.

MR. A. KOVNATS: If I could just discuss the new health regulations, not in any great length, but just to kind of touch on it. If the Honourable Minister can advise as to what the impact is going to be on the increase in medical costs and I'm told that the increases are going to be - and the word that I was advised - is astronomical and I'm kind of going slowly because I'm just not quite aware. I want to find out from the Minister

as to what these increase in costs are going to be, and do we have the staff to look after the new health regulations and hygienists and occupational medical doctors, and who is the chief occupational medical officer?

HON. G. LECUYER: I'm not sure that I fully understood the member's comments. If he is referring to the cost of the amendments to The Workplace Safety and Health Act, the committees that are in place, that, I expect, is in the end not going to be a cost but a saving factor in terms of the injuries that are going to be prevented and the growing costs and compensation benefits are going to be reduced.

If the member is referring to occupational health, I would like to mention to the member that although we are still in search of a full-time chief occupational health officer, we, in the meantime, do have a person who will be acting in that capacity in the Department of Health in the person of Dr. Peter Warner who will have the responsibility of chief occupational health officer for the department or the division of Workplace Safety and Health.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1) - the Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: How many hygienists are on staff right now?

HON. G. LECUYER: Ten, the same number as last year.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(a)(1)—pass; 5.(a)(2)—pass.
5.(b)(1) Worker Advisor Office: Salaries; 5.(b)(2) Other Expenditures - the Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I started asking about Workers Compensation earlier and I was told that we would be getting to it under 5.(b). Can the Honourable Minister advise whether a review of The Compensation Act will be taking place, has taken place, when it will be announced, who will be doing the review and what the cost of the review will be?

HON. G. LECUYER: The member is way ahead of me in that particular area in terms that I cannot provide him with detailed answers to all of these questions. All I can say is that we are at the point now where I am considering various alternatives in terms of how to proceed. We are at the point where I am contemplating meeting representatives of the employers' groups and the workers' groups in order to receive their suggestions in terms of how to proceed in actual fact to start the review process of the Act.

So, at this point in time, all I can say to the member is that I am looking at a group of three people who are not yet selected to do the actual review, to begin the actual review, but none of this has actually proceeded to the point of implementation at this time, so there are a variety of options and alternatives still being considered.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Are these three people part of the Workers Compensation Board at this point, or are we going to be bringing in additional help?

HON. G. LECUYER: As I said before, I haven't yet made any firm decisions on that and I want to discuss this issue with representatives of the employer groups and the worker groups. But it would be my belief that we should consider appointing people who are not part of the system at the present to conduct this particular review.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Concerning the cost of operation of the Workers Compensation Board, I have a figure, but it's not up to me to supply the figure, it's up to the Honourable Minister, what is the cost of operating the Workers Compensation Board for last year?

HON. G. LECUYER: The member will find that in the Financial Report.

Mr. Chairman, is the member referring to the costs of administration or to the total cost?

MR. A. KOVNATS: Total cost.

HON. G. LECUYER: That's what I thought. The member will find that on Page 15 of his Financial Report.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I don't have the report.

HON. G. LECUYER: The total cost was \$61 million. That's including the compensation costs, medical aid costs, rehabilitation costs, amortization of the pension increases in terms of both principal and interest, the administration expenses, the worker advisor operation, all of it.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I only have a couple more questions concerning the payout.

What was the difference between the payout over the income? Did we operate the Workers Compensation Board on an equal basis, or was there a net loss or a net gain over the year?

HON. G. LECUYER: If the member is looking for the net effect, including the surplus of the reserves, then there is no net deficit, but if the member is looking in terms of the income, as compared to the overall costs, then there is a \$19 million deficit.

MR. A. KOVNATS: A \$19 million deficit, fair enough. I was just wondering where the percentage increase to the people who pay for the Workers Compensation came from and now I'm aware that there was a net loss of - how much was it? - \$19 million?

HON. G. LECUYER: In terms of the actual total cost of payout as compared to the revenue income from assessment fees, a difference of \$19 million in 1983.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister advise as to the cost of remodelling and refurbishing the board's building in Eaton's?

HON. G. LECUYER: The building improvements, including general renovations, electrical alterations; approximately \$237,000, which will be amortized over

20 years at a cost of approximately \$12,000 per year. In terms of the new office furnishings; that's made up of approximately \$300,000 which represents in actual fact approximately one cent per \$100 of assessment of payroll. This, I have to also further add to the member, is also in relation with the bringing on stream of the computer program because of which the present layout and the furnishings of the board were not compatible.

Members should know that the existing furnishings were purchased prior to 1959 and in most cases they utilize more space than necessary - especially on the basis of the fact that the space is pretty crammed at the Compensation Board. We could not accommodate the installation of the computer terminals without these changes.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is the Minister advising the committee that the total cost of renovations, remodelling and refurnishing was \$237,000 plus \$300,000.00?

HON. G. LECUYER: That's correct.

MR. G. MERCIER: Did that include a lounge and carpeting?

HON. G. LECUYER: I didn't hear the first part of the question.

MR. G. MERCIER: Did that include a lounge and carpeting?

HON. G. LECUYER: There is no provision in there for a lounge. There is provision for a library and a meeting room. The carpeting referred to is something that was done last year in four offices at the cost of something like \$19,000.00. Also, the figure given a moment ago and the total renovation that I mentioned also contains, in the area being renovated, some carpeting in that area.

MR. G. MERCIER: Did that work take place in March of this year?

HON. G. LECUYER: That work is taking place now.

MR. G. MERCIER: Has the board hired a social director for staff?

HON. G. LECUYER: No.

MR. G. MERCIER: Can the Minister advise as to the duties of one Wendy Miller?

HON. G. LECUYER: She is the information officer for the board.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is one of her main functions to arrange socials and entertainment functions amongst staff?

HON. G. LECUYER: Not at all.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, does the board pay bonuses to employees?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, at Christmas time the board has been paying a bonus of \$25 to employees since 1949.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, does the board provide days off with pay to staff for recognition of certain achievements?

HON. G. LECUYER: It hasn't been heard of.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, in the past few months the board has completed what has been termed its political house cleaning of all senior officers that were on staff of the board when this new NDP board was appointed. The list of senior officers - the Member for Inkster calls it a good NDP board - includes Dr. McPhail, Dr. William Neil, Dr. Frank Ball, Norm Hiebert, Ernie Dyer, Arthur Cross.

In a news report, Dr. McPhail indicated his resignation was requested, ". . . because my medical judgment was not in line with the policies of the board."

HON. G. LECUYER: I'm sorry, would the member please speak louder. I cannot hear what the member's saying.

MR. G. MERCIER: In a news report, Mr. Chairman, Dr. McPhail was quoted as saying, "My medical judgment was not in line with the policies of the board. It didn't fit in with the NDP philosophy of the board." Would the Minister explain the difference?

HON. G. LECUYER: Well, I didn't hear the ending. Could the member speak louder please?

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, Dr. McPhail is quoted as saying he didn't fit in with the NDP philosophy of the board and his medical judgment was not in line with the policies of the board. I want to know from the Minister how the board's policies differ from Dr. McPhail's medical judgment.

HON. G. LECUYER: The board has been appointed to do an effective job of administrating the board and I would hope that the board is operating and administrating the operations of the board at all times with the best administrative procedures available to them. I would reject the comments made in reference, or the political connotations given by the member. I do believe the doctor in question left voluntarily on the early retirement option.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the chairperson of the board is reported as saying she could concur with Dr. McPhail's claim that he didn't fit in with the philosophy of the new retirement." Dr. McPhail has said it was not a voluntary retirement, contrary to what the Minister has just said.

Would the Minister explain how the philosophy of the new board differs from the medical judgment of Dr. McPhail?

HON. G. LECUYER: Well, I don't accept the assumption made by the member or the intent of his comment, and I would like the member to revert to Page 4 of

the Annual Report which states, "The Workers Compensation Board of Commissioners is committed to the principle that the injured worker has, by virtue of The Workers Compensation Act, the right to the provision of support services through the Workers Compensation Board with the use of the funds the employer has provided. The Board of Commissioners believes the delivery of these services should be in a manner that is accountable to the injured worker, the employer, the community and the community as a whole." And that is what the Minister expects of the board and no less.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I agree with that too, but how did Dr. McPhail not fit in with this philosophy of the new board?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I would have to speculate in order to answer that. I think that the only person who can provide that kind of response is Dr. McPhail himself. If Dr. McPhail has a disagreement with the administration of the board, it doesn't make him necessarily correct but I will not make that kind of assumption on his behalf.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the other person who could explain is the chairperson of the board who is sitting right beside the Minister. Why doesn't he get a response from her?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister responsible is the one who is responsible.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I did provide an answer and I did consult on numerous occasions with the commissioners of the board.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I want to know what the cost to the board is of these firings and forced retirements of all of these senior officers from their posts.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, the member is seeking information. First of all, I would him to make his statements correct and, in answer to his question, I have no answer because the board hasn't as such fired any employees that the member seems to imply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question should be framed so as not to suggest its own answer.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, it's a fact and I don't accept the Minister's answer for one moment. He knows darn well these people were forced to retire or were fired. I am asking him what the cost to the board is in terms of severance pay and in terms of retirement allowances to all of these people. If he wants to retain confidentiality, I am not asking for each individual. I am asking him to lump it all together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question contains some inferences.

MR. G. MERCIER: You are right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And therefore it is a debate.

Mr. Minister.

HON. G. LECUYER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If the member wishes to ask a question, I will take the question and do my utmost best to provide him with an answer. If the member wants to make an accusation or inferences, that he is free to do, but he can do so after or at some other time. Right now, he is here to ask questions and I will not answer his question on the basis of the inferences he is making.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I can tell him one way or the other this information is going to come out. I am asking him, and I am prepared to go along with what I suspect would be an argument he would make with respect to confidentiality. That's fine. To avoid that problem, I am asking him to give me a total amount, total cost for all of these senior people in terms of severance pay and retirement allowances. What is it costing the Workers Compensation Board?

HON. G. LECUYER: Well, on the basis that he now words his question, first of all, I would like to indicate to him, and I won't use specific names, that though there are in there resignations and none of the employees in question actually were given termination letters and, beyond that, to go into the actual costs in terms of severance pay, separation pay, holiday pay, the total is \$243,000.00.

MR. G. MERCIER: The member indicated that was for vacation pay, severance pay and what else? Holiday pay, I believe.

HON. G. LECUYER: That and benefits.

MR. G. MERCIER: Those were lump sums paid to the total of these individuals?

HON. G. LECUYER: Most of it was paid in lump sum payments but some of it was over a deferral span of four or five months.

MR. G. MERCIER: Now over and above that, these individuals are all receiving retirement pensions, is that not correct?

HON. G. LECUYER: Those who are entitled to pension on the basis of their years of service, yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: What is the total amount of retirement pensions these individuals are receiving in this year?

HON. G. LECUYER: I am not in a position to provide that answer but I will obtain that information and provide it to the member in the House if he wishes.

MR. G. MERCIER: The Minister must have access to that information with staff here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister has given his reply.

HON. G. LECUYER: I am getting some information. The first one I'd like to make and make sure that it is

clear is that the cost of the pension income for the members involved represent no additional cost now as they were all set aside as part of the pension reserve fund in the past. The total amount of pension benefit in question here, although I don't have an exact figure, is between \$4,000 and \$4,500 monthly.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: For all seven individuals?

HON. G. LECUYER: For all six individuals. Not all of these are qualified for pension benefits, about five. There are either four or five of those who qualify - four members who qualify for pension on that.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, were these individuals not replaced?

HON. G. LECUYER: One of these, Mr. Chairman, was replaced. Two of the others were combined into a single position which has been filled. Those both were filled within ranks. One was one from outside, and another one in the medical field is to be filled in the near future.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, how much of an increase in staff has taken place since the new NDP Board was appointed?

HON. G. LECUYER: In the total operation of the board since June, 1982, as compared to March of 1984, there are some 40 additional employees in the total board operation, which gives a ratio in Manitoba of 236 claims to one staff person as compared to 171 claims to one staff person in Saskatchewan; 136 claims to one staff person in B.C.; 156 claims to one staff person in Newfoundland-Labrador; 204 claims per staff person in New Brunswick; 280 claims per staff person in Nova Scotia; 132 claims per staff person in Ontario; and 151 claims per staff person in Quebec. So, in effect, Mr. Chairman, Manitoba has the second lowest staff ratio per claims.

MR. G. MERCIER: Under the old board, Mr. Chairman, the assessments were the lowest in the country and the benefits were the second highest in the country. Can the Minister confirm that from 1981 to 1983 administration costs have increased \$2.962 million, an increase of almost 70 percent in two years?

HON. G. LECUYER: There has been in effect, Mr. Chairman, an increase in administrative staff, in administrative costs, and I'm trying to get the breakdown. But I would like, as I'm getting this information, to stress for all members present that the assessment rate for Manitoba is still the lowest in the country.

As part of the increase in the administrative costs, there's quite a few factors that enter into that. Part of that is the negotiated salary increases for the second year of a two-year contract, which was 10.8 percent, which represents \$360,000; the effective incremental salary increases which represents \$160,000; retirement allowances which represents \$243,000; the benefit costs over all that represent \$170,000; the increase in staff

represents a full year from 1983, \$279,000; staff hired for a partial year in 1983, \$132,000.00. That represents in itself a total of approximately 1.5 million of the increase which the member referred to.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, would the Minister confirm that my figures are correct that the increase is 70 percent in two years?

HON. G. LECUYER: The overall administrative increase that I have, the two years the member's referring to, from 1983 as compared to 1982, is roughly 33 percent.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, and from 1981-82 it was 26.83 percent.

Mr. Chairman, a question for the Minister I put to him the other day, in 1983 the board recommended an increase in the average assessment rate of 35 percent, but the rate increase was limited in general to 9 percent, but it did go as high as 20 percent. In 1984, the board recommended an assessment increase of 54 percent, but the rate increase was limited to 20 percent, and the government provided \$4 million, which I believe is unprecedented.

The Minister indicated in his press release of February 24, 1984, that this year's rate increase would only partially cover the board's projected 1984 cost of 64 million. As a result he said employers will probably be faced with increases over the next several years. The Annual Report states that the Finance Department do projections of costs and I would ask the Minister to advise the committee what the projected rate increases are for future years.

HON. G. LECUYER: I would like, for the benefit of the Member for St. Norbert and all members present, for them to take a look at what is occurring in the compensation system all across the country. I'm sorry I did not bring a copy of a particular article which appeared in Canadian Business, but I will definitely send a copy, I only wish I had sent a copy to the Member for St. Norbert because he apparently hasn't read that article. I think he will find it very enlightening when he looks at what is occurring in the compensation system in other provinces in this country, and I repeat what I said earlier, that the costs to employers in Manitoba is still by a long shot the lowest in the country.

As far as speculating what will be the actual increase in the assessment rates for next year, until the actuaries recommend a rate to the board on the basis of this year's experience in terms of costs and revenues, and projected costs and revenues for next year, I can only speculate what it will be. We don't expect the revenues for this year to match the cost and on that basis, in discussing with the employer groups this early winter, whether they were prepared to bite the bullet right now or . . . in fact, it is the employer groups who indicated that they would prefer to have an opportunity to be able to plan their operations in advance and be able to include in their planning the eventual increases, rather than be faced suddenly with the required 53 percent increase.

So the cost next year, as I say, can only be speculated upon at this point in time. But I repeat, the employers themselves have asked that the increases be phased

in over a period of years. On that basis, I can only foresee that there will be an increase in the coming year, but I would like to add that, in the meantime, over the last few years and including this year, the employers have had the benefit of a smaller increase than they would otherwise have had to pay to meet the actual cost to the board.

The Member for St. Norbert should realize that in the long run to provide such benefit to injured workers as a rehabilitation program, a proper rehabilitation program is also probably going to mean reduced costs to the employers if we gauge only by what's happened in provinces such as Ontario, where the funds are in a deficit position which is probably very close to the \$2 billion mark at the present time. It is also in a deficit position in Alberta and in British Columbia; whereas, here in Manitoba at this point in time, the operations of the Compensation Board are not in a deficit situation in terms of the class fund reserves.

As the member looks at the financial statements, he will note that the reserves, during the period of 1983, actually increased by a total of \$11,247,000.00.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, these increases in assessments have taken place despite the fact that accidents decreased in 1982 by 9.3 percent and decreased in 1983 by 1.4 percent. Now, is the Minister telling me he doesn't have any projections of future assessment increases, even for the forthcoming year, 1985?

HON. G. LECUYER: The member makes reference to decrease in costs. The member should be aware that the assessment rates should have increased in the last few years substantially more than they have, and the employers have had the benefits of the lower costs. There has been a certain decrease, as the member points out, in terms of total number of claims. There are many factors which represent additional costs, such as the salary rates, the weekly average payouts have increased, the medical costs have increased. The costs are not dependent upon the number of accidents, but on the severity of the accidents and the average days lost due to injury. The fact that, by law, the ceiling is increased according to a formula which I'm sure the member is familiar with.

So there are, indeed, quite a few factors that represent additional costs, in fact, substantial additional costs. The member can relate to that by looking at the

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

HON. G. LECUYER: That was the end of my remarks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(b)(1) - the Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, there's a note in the report with respect to the board's purchase of automobiles. It may be the reference in part to the purchase of automobiles for the use of the new NDP Board which were originally leased. The previous Minister indicated last year that he'd looked into this matter at my request and was concerned about this and indicated that the automobiles would be used at

least in part by staff. Can the Minister indicate how these automobiles are being used? Are they being used solely by the new board or in part by staff?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, for the member's information or benefit, the vehicles in question are used by staff employed at the board. The commissioners pay on a biweekly basis for the use of the cars whenever they use them.

MR. G. MERCIER: How much do they pay?

HON. G. LECUYER: Standard government rate.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, what are the members of the board earning in 1984 or being paid?

HON. G. LECUYER: The chairman of the board is a senior officer 4, the two other commissioners at the senior office 2 level. The member probably can figure out what is the total amount.

MR. G. MERCIER: I'd like to know the dollar amount they're being paid, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert wants to know the dollar amount being paid.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, approximate \$150,000 per year. No, total.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister will clarify.

HON. G. LECUYER: Total.

MR. CHAIRMAN: \$150,000 total.

The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I think the Workers Compensation Board is in a sorry mess. We have a situation where administration costs in two years under this board have increased by 70 percent while accidents declined significantly in 1982 and then further in 1983, while at the same time, assessments increased by 9 percent in 1983 and 20 percent or so in 1984.

What has happened during those two years is that the full assessments to cover the costs of handling the work of the board have not been assessed, so we're sitting on a time bomb, Mr. Chairman, because the costs of operating the board and the assessment increases in the future are bound to be extremely high, extremely significant, unless the government continues the unprecedented action that it took this year when it contributed \$4 million of the taxpayers' money directly towards the operation of the Workers Compensation Board.

At the same time, we see the board spending a total of over half a million dollars in remodelling and refurbishing offices, carrying along the precedent they set the day that they were appointed when they recarpeted and remodelled offices for themselves and purchased cars, and at the same time dismissing all the senior officers of the Workers Compensation Board, which required a total lump sum payment in the area of some \$243,000 and an ongoing retirement pension

for these people, and while they certainly contributed, most had many years of service yet to be given to the board.

At the same time the board has hired 40 additional people. There may have been a requirement for a few additional people, but when you lump all this together, Mr. Chairman, the board is in a mess. I suspect that the Minister has the information with respect to projected assessment increases, but he's simply too embarrassed to bring it forward so we'll have to learn about it on a year-to-year basis, Mr. Chairman.

This board is in a serious mess and their operation of Workers Compensation has serious financial implications for the province for future years.

HON. G. LECUYER: I'd like to point out for the member's benefit that the Treasury Board contribution to the board is not an unprecedented measure, has happened before. As I indicated, it was done primarily to take into account that fact that during this last year - and to a certain extent some of these are still occurring - some of the claims which should have been taken into consideration and should have been dealt with in the past have not; therefore having reopened the possibilities of adjudication to and review of these claims, implied additional costs which it would have been perhaps difficult to justify imposing upon employers that might not have been in existence at the time or that could not be imposed on employers that were no longer in existence and therefore that was the rationale for doing that.

The member seems to be repeating the same thing from year to year. He talks about the remodelling of offices which, in effect, were not remodelled. That was made clear to him last year when he said that the offices were repainted. The member should understand that the repainting of walls is something that has to be done periodically if you want to keep your assets in reasonable condition. The member should also realize the fact that the costs have been increasing is probably because there is a better and a fairer, more equitable service being provided to workers. The member should question whether that service should not have been provided before.

The member should look at what is happening in the operation of the boards elsewhere and he would quickly realize - and I encourage him to read the article in question in the Canadian Business Journal which I was referring to a while ago, which by the way is titled: "A crisis in the Workers Compensation Board," and appeared I believe in February for his benefit, and I shall send him a copy - and should know that Manitoba was starting to lag fairly behind. I have full confidence that the board is not in a mess, as the member suggests, but is being streamlined and brought into the 20th Century as it should have been for some time.

As a result of it, we will see, for one thing, a great deal more communication with all sectors of society both from the worker and employer sides, and there have been a substantial amount of increase in communication in that regard. As well I expect with the establishment of a computer system, there will be greater information available for both workers and employers, as well as a more efficient and speedier handling of claims.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Co-operative Development.

HON. J. COWAN: Just one question for the Minister, Mr. Chairperson. It was indicated earlier that the accident rate, the number of accidents had gone down in the past year. To what would the Minister attribute that decrease in accidents?

HON. G. LECUYER: I would suspect, Mr. Chairman, on two grounds.

One, I would expect, might be due to the level of economic activity in the province.

Secondly, I would expect, and sincerely believe, that it's probably starting to reflect some of the measures that this department, through the Workplace Safety and Health Division, is implementing through changes in The Workplace Safety and Health Act: the implementation of the committees in the workplace; the development of a greater awareness among the working force of the need to become more aware, more concerned, and to do something about situations that present risks, and increase the potential for accidents in the workplace. So as a result of that I expect that we will see, and I hope to see next year, and in the years to come, a further reduction I would hope into the number of accidents.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(b)(1)—pass.

5.(b)(2) - the Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to finish, before you finish it off, a couple of questions concerning the Workers Compensation Board of Manitoba 1983 Report.

Under the introduction it says that, "The Workers Compensation Board administers the Workers' Compensation Act." It seems logical. "The act provides compensation benefits to workers who are injured, or contract an industrial disease as a result of, or in the course of their employment." Are compensation benefits paid for any other reason other than those that are stated here?

HON. G. LECUYER: No.

MR. A. KOVNATS: If anybody receives any problems and, you know, I'm going to go a little bit further, not physical problems but mental problems due to an accident, these are not to be considered, or have not been considered? Is that what the Honourable Minister has just stated?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, for the member, the mental problems then would be a result of the accident and would be part of that category there which is referred to as disease "as a result, or in the course of their employment." The mental disorder or mental problem would be a disease then which is, in that case, compensated for because it has been accepted as a result of the injury.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I had given the Minister notice of this next question. How many claims were made in 1983?

HON. G. LECUYER: That figure, Mr. Chairman, is in the Annual Report. I have the details here as well with, by the way, corrections. In 1983, the total claim files processed were 44,373, as compared to 46,754 in 1982, as compared to 48,231 in 1981; time lost claims - there were a total of 19,245 in 1983, as compared to 20,337 in 1982, and 20,213 in 1981; the time loss claims rejected in 1983 represent a total of 570, as compared to 613 in 1982, and 303 in 1981.

MR. A. KOVNATS: To the Honourable Minister, what was the percentage of claims that were made that were not paid?

HON. G. LECUYER: Percentage of claims . . .

MR. A. KOVNATS: That were requested that were not paid or were rejected?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I read the statistics. I haven't worked them out in terms of percentages, but perhaps the member can work them out. I haven't got them listed as a percentage here, but I gave you the exact figures for each of those three years.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I'll get the figures when the report appears then.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5.(b)(1)—pass; 5.(b)(2)—pass.
Resolution 71: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty, a sum not exceeding \$3,353,900 for Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, Workplace and Worker Services, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1985—pass.

Back to the Minister's Salary, 1.(a) - the Member for Niakwa.

The staff is excused.

MR. A. KOVNATS: You know I kind of missed it. We went back to the Minister's Salary. Is this the place where I make a motion to reduce the Minister's salary to what he's worth?

A MEMBER: You would have to increase it.

MR. A. KOVNATS: You would have to increase it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are not encouraging the member to do so.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Carry on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(a)—pass.
Resolution 67: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,315,400 for Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, Administration and Finance, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1985—pass.
Committee rise.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, H. Harapiak: We are considering the Estimates of Health. We are on Page 87.

2.(g)(3) - the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think at the time that committee rose, at 5:30, the Minister was just making a comment or two in concluding his remarks on home care and describing some of the differences in volume and caseload that had developed in recent years. There are a number of subjects, particularly related to home care, that I want to ask him about, but I want to make sure that he concluded his comments about the differences in the caseload, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: When we left I think we had agreed that the two pages I sent to my honourable friend, Mr. Chairman, with leave of the committee that they would be included as read, the whole record, in the report, and as far as I'm concerned there is no need to read any more, especially since there's not that many of us here today.

If there are any other questions, I will endeavour to try to answer them.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister about the use and utilization of licensed practical nurses in the home care field. I note that in the figures he gave me on the two pages that he sent over, there is a line which identifies auxiliary services delivered by LPNs and home care attendants and on another page there is a reference to the average monthly number of persons delivering services part time, and again the LPN category is cited. Given the fact that there is some debate of an ongoing nature of the role and status of the LPN in the health care system and that that category is the subject of some review, or at least part of a nursing review that's taking place and seems to be a recurring question, Mr. Chairman, I'd ask the Minister whether there is not adequate and sufficient justification right here in the home care program itself for maintenance of and support of the LPN category for continued effort to produce LPNs and maintain them and keep them in our health care system? They would appear to be very useful over and above their value to which I subscribe very strongly in the hospital and health care facility field, they would appear to be extremely valuable in delivery of home care and home care services. I wonder if the Minister would comment on that point and offer some reassurance to LPNs of the need that the province acknowledges for a continued supply of LPNs to provide this kind of service.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think the sympathy I share with my honourable friend for the plight of the LPN is known and I hesitate to comment any more than that, again for the same reason that I mentioned before the the dinner hour, because the O'Sullivan Commission will be making a study to see what can be done.

I would be very disappointed if there is no rule for the LPN, and I doubt that will be the case. In the meantime, we certainly intend to use as many and probably increase as I say. I think in the figures that I gave you, the LPNs in 1982 there were 95 and then

107 in '83. So I certainly have no reason to stop or to reduce the role of the LPN in home care, but I would sooner wait until the O'Sullivan Commission report is through so we could then, without prejudicing the result of that or trying to find a solution before the work is done. I think it would rather unfair.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, we'll await that with considerable interest, Mr. Chairman. I am sure the LPNs throughout Manitoba will await it with similar interest and concern.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister about the home orderly services and the concept of the home orderly service and the thinking process that the government is going through at the present time with respect to delivery of that service. The subject, as you know, Sir, has been at the root of some discussions that have taken place in this Chamber in both the current Session and the last Session of the Legislature and, certainly, the subject of some questions and exchanges between the Minister and me in question period.

The situation seems to be that a private company known as the Home Orderly Service Ltd., which has been the singular, I think, distributor of this kind of service, the singular provider of this kind of service in Manitoba, has found itself very recently in a position where because of a number of discussions, disputes, debates, questions, criticisms, etc., etc., whether justified or not justified, in a position where its concept of service and its programming format is likely going to be taken over by the province, by the government, delivered through another form of delivery, whether by clients of this service or whether by the government itself; and there are a good many questions of insecurity and indecision and doubt that now surround not only the receivers of this service, the consumers and clients, but the providers and the orderlies who work for Home Orderly Service Ltd. themselves.

Certainly, also, Mr. Chairman, there is a considerable question weighing on the minds of the operators of Home Orderly Service Ltd. as to where they stand. There are a number of meaningful open-ended questions on this subject insofar as the electorate of Manitoba, the citizens of Manitoba, are concerned because there are budgetary and financing problems that are involved and there is the whole question of job security and there is the whole question of preferential interest that comes into concepts of this kind.

So I would like to ask the Minister whether he can report to the committee at this stage on the status at the present time of his or his department's evaluation of Home Orderly Service Ltd. and his or his department's views on the delivery of that kind of service; what is wrong with it at the present time; what can be done to improve it; what can be done to deliver a service of that kind that is fair to everyone, fair to those who have been involved up to this point in time, fair to those who want to be involved in the future, and certainly fair to those who are clients and consumers of this service?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I am very pleased to have the opportunity to set the record straight, if it isn't already.

I want to say that at no time did I criticize the operator and the company that have been giving us the service at this time. That's not to say that I've never had criticism of it, but I know that we will also receive some no matter who does it, because there is so much expectancy out there, No. 1; and No. 2, he was asked to deliver a certain service and we will try to improve the service anyway. He should not be faulted for that part of it.

Now, what we did, we asked for tenders for the coming term. There was no contract. There had been some kind of a verbal agreement for a while. We asked for tenders; Mr. Watson's company, or his group, did tender, and I think there was another one from out of the province and I think a third one of some kind of a co-operative or something - they were going to tender anyway, I'm not sure if they did.

Now, the situation is this, with the enriched program that we will eventually - I say eventually because it will take a while to put it into force and into effect - the tender of Mr. Watson, which was not the lowest by the way, the lowest was the one from outside of Manitoba, and there wasn't that much difference with the cost that we could deliver, and I'll explain that, but it wasn't that much to go outside, especially to stay with some outside operator.

The present company, of course, delivered in 1983-84 for \$402,347.00; that was the cost of the program - \$402,347.00. Now the tender for 1984-85, at the different rates, of course, was \$548,136.00. Now if the government does the service, there is an added incentive, besides many incentives that are well-known, there's certain people in the field that exist, but there is help from the Federal Government, which we will not get under a private operator. It is through CAP. The CAP contribution through the Federal Government, when that is taken into consideration, the estimated cost of the government service that we're embarking on will be \$506,000.00. So that's a saving of in excess of \$42,000.00.

So having said that, I'd like to say that, first of all, that the new service will offer employment to those orderlies and staff of the former company for whom there will no longer be employment with the company. That is the orderly and staff will perform the same type of duties as other attendants and staff now employed through the home care program. They'll be offered the same employment conditions as their counterparts, the homemakers and so on in the program.

Now to start with, we would intend to employ all of them. In fact we will have to recruit, we will need more than are performing now. So it's not a question that anybody would lose their job because we're going to cut down on the numbers. The only way they would be if later on we want to enrich the program, their qualifications have to be improved and the education and training has to be done; if they don't want to do it or if they then do not meet the qualifications, that would be the only reason; in other words, if they don't perform.

Initially, during the transition process the new service will provide the same level of services as at present and as soon as possible, however, the improved standards and services which are set out in service specification will be introduced. The service specifications were prepared with the assistance of

representatives from two organizations of the disabled. The Manitoba League of the Physically Handicapped did not participate, although invited to do so. There will be a regular and extended training program, identification badges and uniforms, improved backup coverage and extended bedtime service hours on weekends and special holidays. Every effort will be made to meet, as far as possible, individual needs for flexible scheduling and to meet unexpected urgent requirements. There will be an added safeguard; a mechanism with consumer representation for the review of problems consumers may experience with this new government service. This will provide for consumer input into the operation of this service.

There are new requests emerging, especially for the physically handicapped and we are aware that the Government Orderly Service will not satisfy all the concerns. In recognition of a need to progress towards a more ordered review of concern and of methods to demonstrate these, an alternate service mode and advisory body with representation of physically handicapped persons would be established.

I want to say at this time, that I don't think this will be easy and I'm sure that it's not going to be perfect. That's practically impossible. We will strive to improve it with the advisory committee to really talk to these people that are receiving the help to see what kind of help they want instead of imposing something on them. I think they know better than we do what is their priority, and also, if there's complaints, as I said there'll be a mechanism to have some kind of appeal. I want to serve notice now that there is no way that we'll meet all expectancy or that we'll give all the services that everybody wants. It is impossible, if for no other reason, because of the funds that we have. We hope that it will be greatly improved.

Again, I say not necessarily just because of the change - I think that has some advantages doing that and I think it will be cheaper because of the financial assistance that we will get from the Federal Government, but we are trying to improve the program and I hope that we will be able to do that.

As far as Mr. Watson himself, I would sooner not discuss it with him at this time. I think it wouldn't be proper to make this public. There's ongoing negotiations with him. So far he's been represented by legal council and he's had some discussion and the staff have found him to be very helpful and in a spirit of co-operation and co-ordination and we certainly intend to be fair with him. As I say, though, I wouldn't want to elaborate on this, certainly not without his permission and especially until a final decision is made.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for that information and I certainly thank him for the statement and I'm sure that the current owner does, and I'm sure that all Manitobans of good will and energy do, thank him for this statement that the government certainly wants to be fair with Mr. Watson, certainly intends to be fair with him, because I think that is what people, Mr. Watson, me, the Minister himself, the rest of us, Manitobans of good will and fairness, expect and that's really all they ask of their government in situations of this kind that people do not be dealt with summarily or arbitrarily or in a high-handed or

unreasonable way, that the government deal with them fairly.

It's very important, I think, that we have the Minister's assurance that there are ongoing negotiations and discussions taking place at the present time with Mr. Watson, the current operator, and that it's the Minister's intention that the government be fair with him. I don't intend to press him for details. I can understand the caveat that he places on that, but that assurance is important and I'm glad to have it.

I would ask the Minister whether the substantially expanded service that he has referred to, with backup service, etc.- and I suppose that implies round-the-clock response capability - whether that expanded service and backup service, that he refers to, will not mean that the cost of the program to the province and to the taxpayer will escalate very significantly?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I guess maybe I didn't make myself clear. The cost this year was 402,347, \$402,000.00. Now the cost that we accepted, the tender of the present operator of plan, would have been \$548,136.00. That's certainly not all profit, this would be an improvement in the plan because of what we requested in the tender.

Now, the estimated cost to the government will be \$608,592 but the government will see back from Ottawa, through the CAP Program, \$102,248.00. That's the estimated cost of course. So, the estimated cost to the government will be \$506,000 compared to the \$548,000 that it would have cost us to keep on with the same firm under the new program. In other words, the saving of \$4,000, although the actual cost of the program will be about \$60,000 more. As I explained we will, we can, if we run the program ourselves, we'll get reimbursed under CAP.

Another thing I want to say at this time, if I may, would be that we intended kind of pilot project to explore things a bit in conjunction with the disabled community we are trying to plan, we're interested in planning a project, but will demonstrate possible alternatives for delivering home care.

For instance, one of the requests of the disabled people have been, well, we know what we want, let's figure out a certain cost and let us employ the people ourselves, let us decide on the priorities ourselves. That's something that I'm interested in trying. We had to be very, very careful before you just send the funds to groups, but this way - I think that, of course, we'd have to make comparisons and the total cost would be important - we wouldn't want to spend more money, but it might be that they themselves can choose better what they want, or they might get help through friends in different ways because as I said earlier before the dinner hour, our service to the disabled is not complete under home care.

I think we've learned the last few years that we need some special services for these people. For instance, usually the people on home care, I don't know of too many that go and work, but some of the disabled people are helped. There's money spent, and they're educated, and they can go ahead and hold a position. They might need help; they might need transportation.

I don't know if too many of the people of the committee realize what the cost is. I know I received

a call around Christmas from a disabled person who was invited to go and have Christmas dinner with her sister, I think pretty well across town. I think that it cost her for a return trip, it took her hours, and it cost her in excess of \$58 or \$60.00. I think that we have to look at that now.

I got sidetracked a bit, but I mean the same problem exists for those that are going to work, for instance, and they might get some help to help them get out of bed and dress and get ready to go to work, even at certain times, maybe at work for toilet facilities, to take advantage of facilities and so on. So this is something that we will explore. We hope that we will have a pilot project in place for this year anyway and I could report next year on that.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I understand the figures the Minister has given me. In effect, what he is saying is that in this coming year, if the government operates the service, the province will benefit by a saving of \$42,000.00. It can be delivered by the government with a contribution under CAP from the Federal Government that would net out at a cost of \$506,000; at the present time, the cost is \$548,000.00.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The member might have probably meant that the present time is not 548, this would be the present company. If we had gone with them and accepted their tender, it would have been 548. At the present time, this year, it's 402.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Thanks, I appreciate the correction. If the government accepted the tender submitted by the company for 1984-85 delivery of the service, it would have been \$548,000; so by going the route that the government intends to go they're, in effect, looking at a net saving or a net reduction in expenditure of some \$42,000, but, Mr. Chairman, that's 1984-85. The Minister also said - and I hope I'm quoting him correctly - that the new service will provide the same level of service as the existing level to begin with, but the inference is that the government feels that they want to get into something bigger and better and more elaborate. I'm asking whether that would not escalate costs enormously?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I should have explained the figures I gave. The figures of 548 is what we asked in the tender and the estimated figure of the government delivering the service is 608, and again, less CAP at 506. I said that for a while we will provide the same service and that's during the transition. It is not because of funds at all, because it will be physically impossible to change anything until there is an orderly way to protect the people who are there, to see who wants to work for them and also for that improvement and improved service, we will have to hire more people. That'll take a little while. Then, also, with the training, and improving the training of these orderlies, it is because it will not physically be possible to give the service starting in two months, or August 1st. So that's the only reason for the cost there. That is before the year of the intended service that we wish to give them.

MR. L. SHERMAN: But down the road, Mr. Chairman, the intention would be for a type of service that is

bigger and better, if I might use that term, than the service that exists at the present time. So presumably, in terms of long-term budgetary planning, the government is facing the fact that they're going to be looking at a much bigger investment, a much bigger expenditure, a much bigger appropriation request for home orderly services than we're looking at the present time, is that not correct?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I don't want to give the wrong impression, that we're going to double or triple the numbers of orderlies, and we're going to double or triple the hours, there'll be improvement in that. What we're trying to do with the training and the proper people and changing the system a bit is mostly to have it more efficient. As I say, the 608 would be delivering the level of service that we intend to give for a full year. I was saying that it will take a little while, not because we want to save funds or we haven't got the funds, it is because it will be physically impossible to take this time to adjust the program, to change the program, to see what we want and then for the administration of the program. Where we think that we can improve it mostly is in the dispatching and the organization of the program itself.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Who will set up this new delivery system and this new service, Mr. Chairman? Will that be done under Miss Enid Thompson or will it be done by new personnel seconded or hired for that particular task?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Miss Thompson is certainly the senior personnel or the person that will captain the team for sure, but they will receive help from the Winnipeg Regional Office and then Dr. Wilt has been involved in that also as the ADM responsible on the administration side, Mr. Maynard also, and in fact the members of the Pascoe with the planning and so on; then, as I said, working with the advisory committee for some part of it because we're not just dealing with the physically handicapped. Then we intend to hire a manager; we will advertise for a manager, a superintendent who will also be training the orderly, two dispatchers and a clerk-typist. It will be five people that will be working for the department as such.

Now, we'll have flexibility. It might be working very close to home care, but it might be a program on its own. That is not planned. We have to be careful that we have to treat the staff - I'm talking about the orderlies now, not these five, these five will be department employees. The others will be the same as I mentioned earlier, like homeowners and so on. It will be more term, I guess . . . with the home care payroll, but you'd still need a staff here of some kind.

MR. L. SHERMAN: There's no requested increase in the staff year complement for continuing care for 1984-85. My question would be, Mr. Chairman, at this juncture whether the secondment as it were, of Miss Thompson and Dr. Wilt to put this program together and put it in place will result in robbing the existing Home Care Program and depriving the areas of responsibility in the home care field at the present time of those valuable professional services.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm not too sure I got the question completely.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, I'll put it another way. I can put it in a much simpler way, Mr. Chairman.

Is this not spreading Enid Thompson and Dr. Wilt too thin?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No. When you talked about seconding - I wish somebody would spread me too thin - maybe I should take over the program.

The situation is that these people will be involved in setting up the program. In fact, most of the work is done now. In finalizing that there have been discussions in Cabinet, approved in principle and so on, but then they'll go back to their work. That's part of their work now, and in fact it was part of the home care.

I should say that the decision to take over this program was after this was printed, so it is possible that we will need five new people. We're looking around to see if some unfilled position could be used for that, but eventually we might need these five positions and that might come during the year. It will be reflected in next year's Estimates. That's a possibility unless it is being done directly under the Home Care Program. But, as I said, it might not even be the full Home Care Program, so there's still flexibility in that. The main thing now, is to deal with Mr. Watson and the orderlies to make sure that there's continuity, and that's what I meant. For a few months it will be exactly the same program until we've got this thing all settled.

We feel that we'll be able to take over the program on August 1st and then there will be another couple of months after that for the complete transition.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I'd like to go back to the tendering process for a minute, Mr. Chairman, if I could. I ask the Minister whether any bid was submitted by clients of the Home Orderly Service themselves, either in the form of the individual clients that they constitute or in the form of a group or an organization or a collective structure of clients with a view to running the service themselves?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I had heard probably the same rumours as my honourable friend that there was a possibility there would be some form of co-op, and I think I referred to that earlier. The answer that I'm getting from staff here is that at the time of the tenders they did ask who the people were that were presenting the tenders, so it is a possibility that that was done.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Under the concept now being developed through the office of continuing care, is there any likelihood - and I leave the argument as to whether it's desirable or undesirable aside, I don't want to get into that argument - but is there any likelihood that the service will wind up being run by the clients themselves rather than by responsible persons in the department. Not that the clients are not responsible, but there's a whole question of preferential treatment that comes in here as I'm sure the Minister appreciates, and fair and equitable consideration for those in need of the service.

So, I'd like to know whether those in need of the service can be assured that there will not be some kind

of stacked deck consisting of a number of clients themselves who are influencing the way the program is run, perhaps to the detriment of some other clients.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The program as such will certainly not be run by the clients. My honourable friend might want to have more information. There will be an advisory committee as I mentioned, not to have preferential treatment, but because it is a bit of a change, a bit of different services, because I could see it now, and then there'll be a mechanism to have an appeal. That doesn't mean that they will be favoured. What I did say earlier is that there is a possibility that some of the clients as a pilot project will be given a grant and will have to be responsible for their own services and it would have to be comparable to the service we're getting there, just as a pilot project and then we would have a comparison for the cost and efficiency and so on. That is a possibility. That would be a very small part. There wouldn't be any conflict of interest because they would receive approximately the same amount of money as it is costing us now to give them the service and they would be responsible only to provide services for themselves. There wouldn't be any chance of interfering with anybody else.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, just two last points on this. One, I welcome the assurance that the Minister gave that job protection in this instance is a consideration and that those persons currently employed by Home Orderly Service Ltd., who are persons with expertise and ability in this field, have been operating in this field as orderlies and deliverers of the service for that company, are being given priority consideration for inclusion on the staff of the new program and the new service and that they will have every opportunity to serve in that new service and therefore their jobs are secure and protected.

That's a statement that is most welcome on this side of the House, certainly by those orderlies and by their families, many of whom have been in touch with me and have had some fears and anxieties in recent weeks as a result of what's been going on. That is an assurance that I think the Minister has already given and I don't need to ask for reassurance on that. That's on the record, I appreciate it. I wish to note it and acknowledge it.

But, finally, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the overall arrangements that are still being worked out, the Minister has said that there are ongoing negotiations with the present owner and every attempt is being made to include them fairly and reasonably. I would just ask him whether in fact those discussions that are now taking place really offer the existing operator very much of an alternative? It is not a fait accompli that those persons, other than private clients, who have been receiving this service, if they want support from the Provincial Government, the provincial taxpayer, are going to be expected to receive that service from the new government program and that therefore any clientele that the present operator has been serving will be seriously reduced, and in effect there is not going to be much of any opportunity for him to compete in the field.

So my question is, are the discussions really meaningful in any way or are they just so much window dressing?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The last thing I'd want to do is mislead my honourable friend or the members of this committee. My honourable friend is absolutely right, the only clientele, the gentleman, if he decided that he will keep on with the service, will be people that need service that are not covered by any government program, or I think it would be completely ridiculous, and certainly that administration, to say we're going to go in a program, but you have your choice. A program like that would be like saying, you know, if you want home care, you go wherever you want. That wouldn't work. That is not what I meant and let me, without being too specific, try and explain because I realize now that maybe I might be misleading the committee, certainly not purposely.

What we're looking at is the transition period, for one thing, the co-operation that we're going to have with them and the remuneration for a service. That is the thing we're looking at and we want to be fair. Also, we are looking very seriously trying to make it possible, the choice will be as to find one of the positions not necessarily in that program, but where he could work as an orderly or whatever with the gentleman. Also he would be invited to apply for any or all of the five positions that he wants, not with certainly any guarantee of work. Looking at everything being equal, he would be chosen for the work - I say everything being equal - but apart from that I think we're pretty well sure of guaranteeing him, offering him a position. Now, is he going to take it? That's something else. But my honourable friend is absolutely right. I think probably my friend is talking about third-party things that are paid by other government agencies and so on. No, that will not be the case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(g)(3) - the Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I apologize for not being here at the start of these discussions when some of these questions may have been asked.

In this particular area, I find there is a considerable amount of discrepancy from one area to the next as to who is going to receive care and who does not qualify for care. Can the Minister tell me who is really responsible to determine if they, first of all, qualify for care and how much care they should receive?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I guess if I looked at last year's Hansard I'd see the same question and maybe I could refer him to the answer, but I'll try to add on.

It is a government program. You're dealing with mere mortals, of course, and somebody has to make the decision. The program and the guidelines are defined that these copies are not secret documents. The situation is that there is evaluation. As you know, we have the delivery at the regional staff, that we work in all the regions in Manitoba, mostly the evaluation is done with them and some of the people who are working directly for the program. That might be referred to a doctor, to a hospital, by an individual or requested by an individual or relative and that is looked at. A decision is made, the service is provided, as much as possible, then it is assessed and there is no guarantee.

The idea that some of these people, who are home care, people who are coming out of hospitals that

normally without home care might need a bed for a longer period of time, eventually it is the intention or it is the hope that these people will be able to function without home care at all. So that has to be evaluated and there are other examples of that. Some people will probably need home care, or the next step will not be the reduction of home care, will be probably admitting them to a bed in a personal care home. But the decision is made by the regional staff and the director and staff of the Home Care program and they do that following the guidelines, directive and policy of the government.

There hasn't been any change while I was the Minister responsible in the Schreyer years or while you people were in government and my friend for Fort Garry was the Minister. In my term so far, there have been no changes at all. That is done by staff and that is reviewed. What we will add to that is that we will have the mechanism because there are some complaints. Mind you, some complaints are very legitimate and other complaints, well, some people you'll never satisfy, no matter what. I've had examples of people that we spend \$5,000 a month or quite a bit more than that, for some time, and they are never satisfied. Well, you know, these people, there's not much you can do.

The assessment and all that will be done. Besides that I announced a - I guess my honourable friend wasn't in the Chamber then - mechanism where there will be an appeal made and through a committee of some of these people who are receiving some of the service and so on, that know the service and there'll be an advisory committee to help us maintain and improve or whatever when there are changes in the guidelines.

MR. A. BROWN: So would this then mainly be determined as to who was going to get assistance and what level of assistance, you say by the medical staff in that particular area of the hospital, the public health nurse and so on, or would the decision be made by someone other than let's say the public health nurse or the doctors?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Do you want me to repeat the whole thing? You're asking me the same question that I took half-an-hour to answer. I did not say that it would be the doctors in the hospital, I said we might be referred, respective clients will be referred, from all over the place. I explained that with the regional staff that are visiting them, it might be a public health nurse, it might be the social worker, depending on the need that they have and so on will report. These people hold meetings and they go through certain cases. There is personnel or a case worker assigned to each one and that is reviewed as often as necessary and they'll make a decision.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, the reason why I'm going after this, I know of an area where they have a real problem in this particular area, and it seems to me that those people who are in real need and so on and who are making application, I don't think that some of those applications ever really go farther than the public health nurse and we're getting into a real problem area. I'm not knocking the program and I'm not saying

that the Minister is to blame, I'm just trying to find out from the Minister, when such a case as that occurs, where can they appeal further for assistance when they cannot get it. The case that I'm specifically thinking of is the public health nurse who seems to be intent on I don't know what, saving money or whatever. She seems to be very difficult to get along with. That's the case. Now where do those people go to appeal that public nurse's decision.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I think the easiest way to give satisfaction, or try to give satisfaction to my honourable friend, is that he furnish me with all the details, names and so on, not publicly, and I will investigate that. Because the people, that is, the public nurse is certainly an expert, and it might be at a certain time. It doesn't mean that everybody that is requesting help should get it automatically. There's no change to that. It could be that a bad decision will be made by the public health nurse. You've got to trust somebody somehow. Now just to safeguard, that person could appeal directly to my department, could appeal to the MLA, who then could give me the information. And you're rest assured that if anybody in the House has a case I will make sure that it is investigated. Also I would announce the new mechanism of having an Advisory Committee that will work with us to change the guidelines, if necessary, and then the mechanism to review the case if there is a worthwhile appeal, a serious appeal. With all that we still will make mistakes but we'll try the best. And as I say, in this case because my honourable friend is no doubt thinking of a certain thing, if my honourable friend wants to give me the details and names I'll make sure that there is a thorough investigation.

MR. A. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I'll do exactly that because I would like to have a discussion with the Minister on this. I would like to discuss this with him privately at some time because I know, I've an area where there is a very distinct problem, and I really don't personally want to get involved with this because then I'm going to get, everybody that's going to be needing care is going to come to me rather than going where they should be going. So you have to be rather careful that you don't get involved in some of these situations.

Now no doubt because of the Home Care Assistance Program, the persons panelled for personal care home placement is way down. Can the Minister give me a figure as to how many have been panelled at the present time, and are waiting placement in personal care homes? Can he give me the figure of last year so that we can compare last year to this year?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'd like to inform my honourable friend just before the dinner hour I presented to the chief critic of his party a couple of pages with all this information in. We've covered part of it, and I hope we won't have to repeat everything. Furthermore with the permission and leave of the committee this will appear in Hansard completely, even what I didn't read, the whole thing will be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(g)(3)—pass; 2.(g)(4)—pass - the Member for Fort Garry.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I can give the information to my honourable friend. The information on External

Agencies deals with two of them - Meals On Wheels, and I won't go with the details on that. We all know what that program's all about. There's an increase of \$5,000 from 38,500 to 43,300.00. Also the Youville Foundation which went from 47 to 65.4. It was something, I think last year was the first time they've ever received funding and this has been increased. That's the two external agencies.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, is that increased grant to the Youville Foundation to provide additional salaries for additional foundation workers, community care workers, or health workers?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I would be, they would, I'm sure that the department and the personnel would examine their budget with them. I haven't got the budget or all the details. It is the service that they rendered. I could give some explanation of the program if it's necessary.

MR. L. SHERMAN: No, it's not necessary but I was just wondering whether . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, okay. No it was a rather . . .

MR. L. SHERMAN: It's not a new program.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: . . . a fairly new program that the Grey Nuns operated on their own for a number of years and it was getting too costly. They applied last year. We gave them the 47, not necessarily that that was the right amount, and then this year with looking at the funds that we had, of course, and so on we increased that to 65. So it is to provide. Much of their help also is voluntary help. But they have paid personnel also. So I suppose that I could get the budget but I haven't got it at this time. As I said we had underestimated, not necessarily underestimated the amount last year, it's just that it was the first year and it was just a flat grant as close as we could without all the figures and the information in. But it turned out to be quite an underestimation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(g)(4)—pass; 2.(h)(1)—pass; 2.(h)(2)—pass; 2.(j)(1)—pass; 2.(j)(2) - the Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: There is a substantial increase in the budget being requested in this vote, Mr. Chairman, for the Children's Dental Health Program or for Dental Services. I take it from the earlier comments of the Minister in his opening statement that it relates specifically to the Children's Dental Health Program. I would ask for some explanation on that. It's close to \$1 million. In fact it's \$1,003,000 I think, increase in the Budget under this particular line. The Minister's referred to a universal program of children's dental health care. I would ask him to elaborate on that for the committee. What does he mean by universal? What age groups are we talking about? What demographic groups in terms of urban rural mix are we talking about? How soon is he intending to implement the expansion?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I hope that you're going to protect me from these undesirable helpers here. Could you order them out or something?

HON. J. COWAN: I've just been trying to make his life easier.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I think the best bet if this meets with the approval of members of the committee I'd like to make a statement. I think it's the easiest way and then try to answer the question on the dental program because it was never really announced in detail at anytime before so I think that before announcing it to anybody else I think it should be done in the House in detail. It's not that long.

It's the government's intention to request an additional \$1 million for expansion to the Manitoba Children's Dental Program. This expansion is in keeping with our desire to provide universal dental coverage to school age children throughout the whole province. The expansion will take place in several stages.

In September of this year, children born in 1978 will be eligible for dental services as provided by government employed dental nurse or dentists in private offices through arrangements with the Manitoba Dental Association. This expansion will add an additional 5,000 children to the 46,000 currently serviced through the program in the 30 school divisions as well as 10,500 in school divisions not presently receiving services. New areas to be included in the program are the City of Brandon, the rural School Divisions of Mountain, Tiger Hills, and Pembina Valley. These areas will receive services from the dental nurse teams. The Cities of Winnipeg, Thompson, and Portage la Prairie, and the rural School Division of Western, Rhineland and Garden Valley will also be included in the program. But these areas will receive services from dentists practicing in private dental offices. The several special divisional areas such as Pinawa would also receive services.

The second stage of expansion will take place on January 1st, 1985 when children born during 1977 and '76 will be added in the new area previously mentioned. This expansion will add an additional 20,200 children to bring the total receiving service to 81,700 children. On September 1st, 1985 our objective is to add children born in 1979 to the program; and in January 1986 to include children born during 1975 and '74. These expansions will add approximately 28,500 children.

The final expansions are planned to take place in September 1986, and January 1987. These expansions will add approximately 27,800 children to the program so that by January of 1987 all children 6 to 14 based on year of birth will be eligible for dental services. This will amount to approximately 138,000 children throughout the province. In order to maintain the program for children ages 6 to 14, each December 31st, children who will turn 15 the following year, will be deleted from the program. In other words, we'll go up to 14 years old. For example, in 1985, this will be the children born in 1970. Our goal is to provide quality dental care at reasonable costs. We've been successful in achieving this goal so far and I'm confident this will continue.

This program will provide basic services such as fillings, cleanings, extraction and x-rays. However, specialized services such as orthodontic work will be the parents' responsibility. This is consistent with existing program services. There won't be any changes there.

As I mentioned previously, there are two methods of service delivery and I believe they both provide excellent quality services. Dental nurses have been with our program since it began in 1976 and provides services for school clinics. These nurses are trained at the Wascana Institute of Applied Arts in Regina. This two-year program focuses on preventative and restorative procedures. These nurses receive supervision from qualified dentists in the department's program.

We've had discussions with the Manitoba Dental Association. They are in agreement with the proposed expansion. We are continuing to negotiate the method of payment, probably a CAP patient system, as we've used previously. When those negotiations are complete an announcement will be made. I understand that although they requested \$100 per eligible child last year, they only used about \$72 per child - that's the dentist. I'm optimistic that this will be the approximate level which will be negotiated.

I would like to point out that under the expanded program there will be one central administration with the agreement of the MDA, it has been decided that the program should be administered by one system within the government in order to ensure comparable data on both methods of service delivery. I expect the system will be in place on or about January 1, 1985.

I would also like to make special mention of the new addition of a mobile dental clinic to our program. This dental clinic is a 27-foot Class "A" motor home that has been converted to a dental clinic. The motor home will be used in school divisions receiving services from dental nurses in areas where suitable clinical space is not available. I'd like to point out that it is not our intention that this vehicle will replace school clinics but it is an alternative until appropriate space can be provided.

In conclusion, I'd like to invite you to tour this vehicle tomorrow from 11 o'clock to 2 o'clock. It will be parked in front of the Legislative Building and my staff would be more than happy to show you through it. So, if you can pass on that message to some of your colleagues or our colleagues, the van will be the clinic. The mobile clinic will be parked at the front of the Legislative Building between those hours.

Thank you very much.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the statement of the Minister represents a major program announcement that certainly hasn't received much attention, to my knowledge, up to this point in time. I think it's well worth saluting and it's well worth exploring. It's a major expansion of the Children's Dental Health Program, a service that is supported by all of us and an expansion - that I think I speak for my colleagues on this side of the House when I say that we endorse.

We are very pleased that it involves the Manitoba Dental Association, the professional himself or herself in the dental field, in terms of participating fully as an equal partner in delivery of this kind of service and that it is not a program confined exclusively to delivery of administration to government offices and government employees alone.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister mentioned, I believe, that the school divisions in the southern part of the province currently not included in the program are targeted for

very early inclusion. It's my understanding at the present time that we have approximately 30 school divisions in the province in the program. Some 17 are covered, I think by the Children's General Health Program administered by the government - there may be some fractional differences there because of partial divisions that are included in the two categories - and some 13 covered by the Manitoba Dental Association. Is that correct? If so, that would leave something like 17 school divisions still to be included before the whole province is covered. So before we go any further, can I ask the Minister for confirmation on those figures?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, exactly with the fractions; 17 $\frac{1}{3}$ and 12 $\frac{2}{3}$ this year, '82-83. It's the same number of school divisions for '83-84; in '84-85, there'll be 21 $\frac{1}{3}$ for the dental health service, and 28 $\frac{2}{3}$ Manitoba Dental Association. That'll be an increase of 16 for the Manitoba Dental Association and 4 for the dental service.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, does the program delivered either through the government delivery system or the MDA include all the school divisions in the province at the present time except those in the south? Are we covered off completely in the North and in the other parts of the province? I recognize there are many school divisions in the south which are not in the program at the present time. I understand that that's one of the early expansionary steps contemplated by the Minister, but is that all that needs to be added before we have the province fully covered or are there still some regions, remote areas, and formal school divisions in the North that have to be added? Oh, Thompson - the Minister says Thompson.

If Thompson comes in, does that cover us completely in the North? The bay line is covered and the remote communities in the North that have been served by the MDA in the past two or three years . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Through that other program that exists.

MR. L. SHERMAN: . . . are still part of the system and there are no additional remote communities in the North to be added. Is that correct?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's right.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Now the south consists of - what? - some one dozen school divisions that are going to be added now, the southern part of the province has not been included in the program up to this point in time. Is that 12 or 13 school divisions in total?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There are six rural; one at Portage and Brandon; 10 in Winnipeg. In other words, of all the school divisions of Winnipeg, none of them are covered. There's Brandon and Portage, Thompson eventually and then six in the rural.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Six rural south divisions. Are they all coming in as of September 1, 1984? The Minister described three stages of bringing this program up to what he describes as universality.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The first stage in the program the City of Brandon, the rural school divisions of Mountain, Tiger Hills and Pembina Valley - that's where the dental nurses came.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Brandon, Thompson . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would remind the members that the Hansard staff is recording this and I'm sure you'd want it recorded properly; so please wait to be recognized.

The Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: All right, I apologize. This year they include the program in the City of Brandon, the rural school divisions of Mountain, Tiger Hills and Pembina Valley. They will be receiving service from the dental nurses' team. Now this year again, the Cities of Winnipeg, Thompson and Portage la Prairie, and the rural school divisions of Western, Rhineland and Garden Valley will be included, but this will be from the dentist plan.

The second stage of expansion that will take place in January of 1985 will be of a different age - that will be the children born during '77 and '76 will be added in the new area previously mentioned. On September 1, 1985 our objective is to add children born in '79 to the program and in January 1986 to include children born during '75 and '74. The final expansion, and that should be in September 1986 and January 1987, that will be that everybody by then of January '87, all children in school from the age of 6-14 will be covered and by then there should be approximately 138,000 children in that category.

MR. L. SHERMAN: The Minister is saying that in the later stages of the expansion what we're dealing with is the addition of age groups. The early stages of the expansion, essentially, have to do with the addition of school divisions, the inclusion of school divisions that are not currently in the program.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Because you have to start with the first year.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Yes. Mr. Chairman, we're ultimately going to wind up, I just want to ask for confirmation on this, ultimately going to wind up with 28 $\frac{2}{3}$ school divisions being served by the Manitoba Dental Association and 21 $\frac{1}{3}$ being served by the government delivery system. Is that correct?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Correct.

MR. L. SHERMAN: The 10 school divisions in the City of Winnipeg will be among those to be served by the Manitoba Dental Association. That's correct. The school divisions in Brandon, which number what - two or three?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: One.

MR. L. SHERMAN: One. Brandon School Division is going to be served by the government program. Is that correct?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, that I have to correct. Eventually it will be just one administration so I want

to make sure, when we say government, it will be through, what is known now as the Nurses Program and the present government program.

MR. L. SHERMAN: But the delivery of the service in Brandon will not be available to the private profession in Brandon. That's what the Minister is saying. It's going to be available to the profession in Winnipeg, Thompson and Portage but it is not going to be available to the profession in Brandon; so how many dentists are there in Brandon at the present time? Does the Minister know that?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: In Brandon there are 17 dentists. Now I would like to say that this will be reviewed. This is one of the reasons why we're trying to get some comparison between the two programs; and there's ongoing negotiations with the Dental Association, but instead of waiting forever and a day - and I don't think that would be proper because you need the experience of the two programs. They will fuse together. At one time I think that I mentioned - two or three years ago - the first Budget that I had, that it was an ideology thing that we were trying to work together, and at the time it was felt that maybe the nurses or what is known as the government program now, would deal with a certain age and then the others.

The Dental Association told us that wasn't practical, so there is a possibility that would be changed, but for the time being, my honourable friend is right. It is the same way it is now and all the profits were going to be under our former administration. That doesn't mean that we cannot employ dentists in Brandon, if they wish, and then, of course, there would be all the referrals. This is not taking any business from the dental profession. It is adding work, because if you look, and I think it is a known fact that the figures that you have, with the education they are getting and so on, the people are much more conscious of the need for dental health also, so I don't think that they will be suffering and we're ready to use them as much as possible.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Has the Manitoba Dental Association responded favourably to this proposal, Mr. Chairman? I would presume that, on balance, it has. It appears to put in place and put in motion a form of delivery of dental health services to which I'm sure the profession would very strongly subscribe; but I ask the question for the record, is this something that the government is doing unilaterally or has the MDA said that they're fully in agreement with it too?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I should add, just before I answer the latest question, that there's two dentists in Brandon that are already working part-time for us, for the plan.

Yes, there's been ongoing negotiations with the MDA. This was something that was approved by both. In fact, it was a joint - there was an announcement, but all the details weren't in place then and presumably it was supposed to be a joint press release, but the MDA, which is quite natural, wanted before announcing it, wanted to discuss it with the people of Brandon because of course the profession in Brandon were concerned, compared to Winnipeg where they had all the work, so that was done.

But yes, the MDA approved this and actually, what I announced today, is a joint announcement.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Has there been, to the Minister's knowledge, any criticism of the plan - the expansion concept - from the private dentists in Brandon who are not going to be included? Have they registered any objection? Have they had any discussions through the MDA with the Minister on what impact this might have on their individual practices?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There is no doubt, I think it would be naive to think that they would not prefer to have all the service. There's no doubt about that, but the discussion was with the MDA mostly. I saw some reports in the newspaper at the time. I think none of them said that the service would not be as good. In fact, some of them went on record to say that definitely it would be good, but they expressed some concern. There's no doubt about it, but it was done - I can understand their disappointment. Some of them, especially when they just learned on the same day or so, but we haven't heard from the MDA of any real, serious problem or concern or criticism.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Is it the Minister's intention, Mr. Chairman, to use the - maybe "use" isn't the right term, I guess - but to compare the program in Brandon and the program in Winnipeg as checks and balances against each other?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, that's exactly what we want to do and I would suspect that it will keep everybody honest and on their toes. I don't say that we'll make a comparison and then decide with only one plan. I'm not saying that, but there might be some adjustments. It might be that something would be delivered better in a certain way; I have no ideology hang-up on that.

I'm looking at cost; I'm looking at universality; I'm looking at the education and I'm looking at - not universality, but percentage - those people that are accepting it. There has been discussion. For instance, the doctors are using their offices and at their request I went along with that, understanding that they have to deliver a high percentage of people utilization rate, it has to be, with the understanding if that doesn't work, well then they would themselves feel, we had a chance; it's not working. So these things have to be worked out, but that is why, for instance, we wanted a city like Brandon to be able to bring some comparison.

At one time it was to try to divide the two, part of the City of Winnipeg and part of the City of Brandon and, at the suggestion of the MDA, they didn't think that would be too practical, so that is why we decided to have Winnipeg for the dentist and the other city, Brandon, for the nurses or the government program.

We're doing the same thing in the rural areas, remote areas - not remote areas as yet - but at least in the rural areas, to be able to make a comparison. A comparison hasn't been available so far.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: The Minister's talking, Mr. Chairman, of adding 5,000 children to the program by

September 1 of this year, that's only three months away; another 20,000 by January 1, 1985 - if I took the figures down correctly; several more thousand by September 1, 1985. Is Manitoba Dental Association, is the complement of dental nurses, is the government program, are the capital facilities and pieces of equipment sufficient at the present time to move into that kind of expansion as rapidly as he contemplates? Are they going to be able to meet these deadlines?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think my honourable friend knows the answer. I would not announce this if I didn't think that we could deliver, that it would be less than honest. I don't intend to play games.

Some of it could be done with some of the people we have in place. That's another reason why this division, that was taken into consideration, that you just go miles away to deliver a certain program because you might have so many nurses that could take a few more. For instance, as you noticed, we're just going to the age 14 this time so we can start instead of keep on 14, 15, 16.

The target date I might say also - we're a little off for this program - we found out and everybody agrees with, that it should be a lot younger than that. We will eventually have to look at that. We are not hitting our target date. That is why the 14 to 18 and so on, it's not very important. I doubt if we'll ever cover that. It might be that we will cut down to the lower age and start earlier if that's at all possible; that is the situation.

Now, we've had - I don't remember exactly how many we have in Wascana now - but we signed another agreement with them and we have 10 now. We feel that with the graduate and, if need be, added with the recruitment, because you know that the plan in Saskatchewan, for instance, has been changed somewhat and we feel that we can do it and obviously the dental profession also feel that they can deliver.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, I'm interested in the Minister's comment about the desirable target age group, Mr. Chairman. I would agree that ideally conventional wisdom in the field indicates that the best place to start in terms of developing dental health and protection of healthy teeth and the health benefits that flow from that is age 3 or age 4. So ideally if we could get into a system that got down into the preschoolers rather than the high schoolers, we'd probably be performing a greater service for society. Nonetheless, I certainly have no criticism with the expansion that's proposed here as far as it goes. I'm pleased to see it coming into being.

I have a question about the available supply of professionals, however, Mr. Chairman. Like the Minister's response on the question of supply of dentists and distribution of dentists to our rural communities, communities outside the major urban centres and also the situation at the present time with respect to dental nurses, it's my understanding of the some 75 or 80 dental nurses who originally went through the bursary course at Wascana College, only 30 of them, I believe, I may be wrong, but only something like 30 of them are actually practising their professions, their careers, in Manitoba at the present time. Some of them went

into dental hygiene, some of them I think even became dentists, and some of them went to other jurisdictions, other provinces and other fields of work. Is my estimate correct that there are 30 dental nurses in the program in the system in Manitoba at the present time, or is that simply the number that is in the government service? Are there others who are working in private dentist's offices that would have been graduates of that same bursary program of a few years ago?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It would appear that you are somewhat generous, I think it's about 24, but anyway let me try to give you - there are 82 of those nurses employed as dental assistants; MCDP1, employed as dental nurse; MCDP19, employed as dental nurse, dental hygienist, dental assistant in private practice in Manitoba, 14; employed as dental assistant instructor, 2; employed as dental nurse, dental hygienist, dental assistant in private practice outside of Manitoba, 5; employed as dental assistant at the University of Manitoba, 1; employed as dental nurse in the Saskatchewan Dental Plan, 2; employed as dental nurse in Mount Carmel Clinic, 1; employed as dental nurse by Federal Government, 2; dentistry graduated and students, 4; employed in other fields, housewife or students, 14; dental hygiene student, 1; unknown, 16. The number of these dental nurses are also hygienists, I think there's 10 of them, where the total is 82.

The number of graduate dentists in '82 - might as well give you that - is 28 in '83, 21 in '84, an estimated 25; number of graduate hygienists 27 in '82, 37 in '83, an estimated 26 in '84, and we have now 457 dentists in Manitoba.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Do those figures that the Minister just gave us, Mr. Chairman, represent an increase over previous years and do they represent a body of professionals who in large part are distributed fairly evenly throughout Manitoba, or are they all concentrated in Winnipeg?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I am told that it's approximately the same and there is 72 in rural Manitoba; 6 in Thompson; as I mentioned earlier, 17 in Brandon; 7 in Portage la Prairie; and in rural school division, there's 4 in Morden, 1 in Winkler, 1 in Glenboro. That leaves 351 in Winnipeg.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(j) - the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I noticed an ad in the Free Press, Job Display Advertising section, a couple of weeks ago, the Dental Services, Manitoba Health, advertising their Dental Nursing Program inviting applicants to apply for a dental nursing course. I'm wondering what the status is at the present time with respect to the government's target for participants in that course, given the limited number of dental nurses available, operating, and practising their profession within the government program in Manitoba at the present time, given the targets that the Minister has set for expansion of the program, both in terms of students and in terms of school divisions, how many applicants is he looking for to enroll in a new dental nursing cycle at Wascana College?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, there are 10 now and there'll be an additional five every year for three years, so 15 on that that are.

I think that one thing that should be mentioned, there was at one time quite a battle between the two plans. I think that when we first recruited in 1974-75 or somewhere around that time. We pretty well assured them of a position here of some security, and they didn't receive that. So I think some of them might be gun-shy; we lost a lot of them like that. I think with the better relationship now, with the two plans, we will lick that and we shouldn't have too much difficulty. As I say, if need be, we'll go and recruit, but we feel that we will have enough, we will be able to manage.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Is that still a two-year course at Westman Institute?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes.

MR. L. SHERMAN: The Minister says yes, it is. I would ask then, is he satisfied that with the 10 applicants that he is looking for at the present time, an additional five in the next two years of this expansion program, that will give him a sufficient number of dental nurses to supply this expansion, to deliver the expansion in the areas that he has specified?

Naturally, they would not be responsible in those school divisions that have been assigned to the MDA, but in those that are already under the dental nurse program and in those that will be added to the dental nurse program, does this additional complement of dental nurses give the Minister enough to do that?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It's certainly my understanding but I might add that I am not too concerned because if that can't be delivered on this program there is always, with the relationship that exists now and so on, I don't expect any difficulty. There could be some adjustment. There are 10 that will graduate in September, 1985, and then there will be five each year as of August, 1984, and that we feel is certainly sufficient to deliver the service that we have.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Could the Minister advise what is happening if anything to the preventive program, the fluoridation program that exists in the school system at the present time? Is that going to be replaced or phased out when the new universal program goes into effect in the 10 school divisions in Winnipeg?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, we are not yet phasing out. There is no thinking of any phasing out at this time. I might say that I have received more information that we have 11 applicants from Saskatchewan now and Mr. Searcy will be going next week to hire three of them. This also can't be much of a problem.

MR. L. SHERMAN: But the fluoridation program stays in?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, P. EYLER: 2.(j)(2)—pass; 2.(k)(1)—pass; 2.(k)(2)—pass; 2.(L)(1)—pass.

2.(L)(2) - the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the whole question of mental health and mental health services is extremely important. It's also been the subject of some criticism, the target of some examination and some debate professionally and politically in recent weeks and months; in fact, one might say in recent years in the province. I think it is important to look at that subject area as we reach this line of the Estimates, although I recognize that we are dealing here with the Mental Health Directorate and it might be that the Minister would suggest we should be dealing with mental health services and perhaps under a different line. I will leave that to his determination.

But provided it's reasonable to look at it here, I wanted to ask him what's happened to the Pascoe report and to the spectrum of mental health services in Manitoba, and what is desirable in mental health programming development? There seems to be a state of indecision or lack of determination at the present time existing in the province where the government's intentions and initiatives for improved mental health services are concerned.

Can the Minister advise what his plans are for the Mental Health Directorate and where the recent report on mental health services sits in his ministry's thoughts at the present time?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I would like to say that first of all the Pascoe report, we have received it awhile back. There are quite a few people, members of the public, different people that wanted to make representations, so we set up a committee to hear this representation on the Pascoe report that was chaired by the Deputy Minister, Mr. Edwards. That is pretty well finished now and they are preparing the recommendation for me. Then, of course, it will have to be proposed to the Cabinet, or to the government, and then the government will decide on what to do and how fast to do it.

I might say on that, though, there have been some changes since last year. Dr. Mike Kovacs was the acting provincial psychiatrist. Dr. Kovacs hasn't been all that well so he has to be replaced. He couldn't accept the permanent position as full-time director and we have now an arrangement with Dr. John Toews who is the Chief Provincial Psychiatrist.

We also have a new Director of the Mental Health Directorate, who is Mr. Tom Walters, and he will begin at half time on July 1st, and be full time on August 1st of this year.

I want to say that, of course, the Adolescent Treatment Centre that both my honourable friend and myself have been promising for years and have been working for, for years, is nearing completion. It is progressing on schedule and it is slated to commence operation in September of '84.

The Board of Directors of the centre is now being appointed and will be chaired by a Mr. Hymie Weinstein, and Dr. Rox Wand has been seconded from Psychiatric Services for Children to the centre in the capacity of clinical director for a one-year term. The hiring and training of clinical and support staff is currently under way.

On completion, the Manitoba Adolescent Treatment Centre will be comprised of a residential unit with a capacity of 25 adolescents and a day treatment program for an additional 25 patients. The community program will be geared to the reintegration of the adolescent into the community and an out-patient department will also be developed as part of the treatment program.

A specialized educational program for adolescents is being developed in co-operation with the Manitoba Department of Education and will play an integral part in the treatment process. Negotiations are now under way with the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 and the centre will serve as a training centre for multi-discipline professionals in community child psychiatry. The Community Psychiatric Services for Children branch of this department will work closely with the centre in co-ordinating referrals from rural and northern areas.

I will announce in a capital program also that there will be kind of a free-standing, I guess we'd call it, psychiatric department at the Health Sciences Centre that will be a reorganization, redevelopment of the Department of Psychiatry at the Health Sciences Centre. The restructured department will provide a net reduction of acute psychiatric beds and transfer a portion of current funding to support acute psychiatric day hospital care, develop community residences for the support of the chronically mentally ill, as well as provide appropriate community based outreach services. The acute psychiatric beds will be available within a full range of Health Sciences Centre psychiatric services.

The net reduction of two psychiatric beds and the delivery of alternate community based services is consistent with the recommendation of the recent mental health working group which proposed major revision to the current provincial mental health system. Whatever is going into place is consistent with the recommendations so even without a formal overall plan from Cabinet, we're moving in the direction of the report, at least those that are obviously accepted by nearly everybody. The establishment of the new program design will be assisted by the linkage between the government and the Health Sciences Centre and the University of Manitoba with the recent appointment, as I mentioned earlier, of Dr. John Toews as Chief Provincial Psychiatrist.

The proposed change in service delivery was proposed by Dr. Harry Prosen, Professor and Head of the Health Sciences Centre, Psychiatric Department and has been endorsed, in principle, by the Health Sciences Centre Board. Administrative details of the program at this time are now being finalized by the administration of the Health Sciences Centre.

I think my honourable friend might remember in previous years, we nearly lost Dr. Prosen and there was some discussion to keep him here. We've been discussing and asking recommendations in this reorganization of the Health Sciences Centre and the co-operation between the university and different groups is following his recommendation.

I should say also, we can elaborate on that later on when we deal with the Alcoholic Foundation, but one of the recommendations of the program - and there are so few that are being refused at this time, that this is one of them - the report is given as an alternative and a possibility that the Alcohol Foundation would become part of the Department of Health. I'd like to

announce today that that suggestion has been rejected. It hasn't been accepted.

With the discussions that we've had with different groups and so on, it was felt that fine, there might be a closer working together of the group as far as the administration is concerned, but they would run their program, would have that freedom, and they would also have an open door between the administrator and the members of the board directly to my office also.

We might also elaborate a little more, although this had been announced, there'll be the building that should start very soon of 100 beds in Brandon to replace some of the beds there are in the Brandon Mental Hospital at this time. That is also conforming to the report of the - in '85 there'll be approximately half a million dollars, or \$400,000 for the facility design and land acquisition.

I think that we were quite fortunate that where the jail was in Brandon, that's a site that's owned by the province. The jail has been declared a historical site but I think there's been negotiation between my department and the Minister responsible for historical sites and I think we will be able to accommodate that at least the facade or something will be kept and the building will be kept and the building will be where it is. When a decision is made later on if it has to work more closely with the General Hospital well then it will be a kind of free standing; it will probably have its own board also, a private board.

I think that's about it. Now we are ready to try to answer as many questions as possible at this time. I think we can cover most of it here except we'll elaborate more about any of the Capital Program when reach the institution. Although in the past, it always came under the department but that might be a change also. It is a possibility that will, as far as the hospital itself, might be an independent board and working under the commission. That is being looked at at this time.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, my first question at this juncture to the Minister would be as to whether there is really any intention whatsoever, any intention on the part of the government to do anything with respect to the report that has been referred to as the Pascoe Report? I don't know what the proper title of the report is, but it was conducted under the aegis of Mr. Pascoe. We all know what we're talking about when we refer to the Pascoe Report.

It reviewed the mental health field in Manitoba - the shortcomings in the field, the needs, requirements and pressures in the field, and indeed the strengths in the field, in a very comprehensive way. It involved the input of a wide number of professionals and others from health and social service fields.

It made some very strong recommendations, not the least of which was an evolution to a complete phase-out, I think, of both the mental health centres, the mental hospitals that we have in the province at the present time, Brandon and Selkirk. It called for - well, that may not be precisely correct, but it called for the eventual closing of those institutions as they presently exist, as they presently operate, perhaps their replacement by other types of smaller and more community-oriented facilities, but basically a closure of those two existing institutions and some very comprehensive and sweeping changes in respect to mental health and mental health programming in general.

it called for the addition of a significant number of community mental health workers and we're all aware that we're continually under pressure to maintain an adequate supply of psychiatrists. Certainly we're always in difficulty in maintaining an adequate supply of child psychiatrists. Those conditions aren't unique to Manitoba and I'm not suggesting they are.

I know that jurisdictions all across this continent are struggling with the challenge of maintaining a reasonable level of psychiatrists in their health care systems. But nonetheless, that report pointed the way to some of those things. Among other things, it called for a substantial infusion of money, a significantly increased budget in mental health. Perhaps the budget in mental health has increased significantly through pieces and parts of the Estimates that are not all contained under this one item that we're looking at right now. But I can't see in my examination of the Estimates, that there is an increase in funding and financial support for mental health services.

When we get to Children's Psychiatric Services and Forensic Services for example, which we'll be reaching in the next few days in consideration of these Estimates, Mr. Chairman, we'll be looking at a budgetary reduction. We're certainly not looking at anything of any substantial increase for the mental health centres in terms of operational budgets. Maybe the Minister has contemplated some major capital spending at both plants, but all in all, it appears to me that at the very best, we've got a hold-the-line program here in mental health. That's being complimentary.

I think, in fact, if one wants to scrutinize it very objectively, you'd say that we're looking at cutbacks in mental health funding. Cutbacks in support, financial support for mental health programming and services. That flies directly in the face of what the Pascoe Report recommended and what most professionals would say is necessary in this field.

Now the Minister is going to tell me that dollars are hard to come by, I know that dollars are hard to come by. There are other areas of government in which they don't seem to be as hard to come by, however. This is one of the major frontiers in health care. I know the Minister appreciates that because he and I have talked about mental health services and facilities in the past and what is needed and what is necessary in the 1980s and the 1990s to keep our society healthy and happy and productive and the challenges that we face in the whole area of mental health care.

It is in this field in particular, Sir, that we should be expending as much energy, and finding for expenditure, as many dollars as we can; and the Pascoe Report recognized that. I might say, they weren't the first to do it. I've talked about this for some time; I would say the Minister's talked about this for some time.

I had conversations with the Minister three and four years ago when our positions were reversed, on this very subject, and he has never disputed the argument that this is one of the major frontiers where we've got to get to work to reinforce our society. So I must confront him with my disappointment. I think that this represents a very disappointing response and I ask the question now as to whether there's any intention whatever to do anything about the recommendations that came forward from that study or whether it's just going to gather dust on the shelf.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I have trouble understanding the disappointment of my honourable friend. I think it is premature. It might be that he will be disappointed, but I think it's premature at this time. I think I gave the only answer that I could give,

My honourable friend is absolutely correct. This is probably one of the areas, not only in Canada - but let's deal only with Canada - where you are more in arrears. I think one of the reasons for that was because of the hospitalization and Medicare program where mental health was never covered by the Federal Government. Therefore it was a lot easier to spend 50-cent dollars than pay all the costs ourselves. That's one of the concerns.

Secondly, even psychiatry is still a relatively new profession, a new part of medicine, and it's not fully accepted, even in certain areas. There is the difficulty of getting qualified people, and there is the study that's going on. Taking all that into consideration, I'm doing exactly what I have announced that I would do.

We set up because of all that, so I have no trouble with that assessment, that we recognize, both of us, that something had to be done, that there was an urgent need for some action. That is exactly why that became the priority of our director himself. We insisted that the Director of Planning himself chair that committee. We took advantage of everyone that we could who had any knowledge in this field. We had, I think, the 13 or so sub-committees that I mentioned. They did an excellent report, as a first report; but then there were other people. It is a touchy thing. You know the difficulty that we had with the Canadian Mental Health Association at one time wanting to be part of that when, in fact, at one time they were threatening to do their own study, but we said let's do it together. We're not recognizing anything else at this time; we're not going to have duplication. That was accepted; they participated. We're glad for the report. We thank them.

But there was also the public that wanted to be heard and they were given this chance and that is all finished now. I quite openly, in questions with the press, explained what the situation was. I would hope that we will do much of it. There'll be a final recommendation, as I stated a while ago. One of the recommendations was that the Alcoholic Foundation would disappear, as such would be integrated into the department. That has been rejected; I can announce it now. I think that we probably will ask for a better, closer link as far as the administration. That might be worked out but they will have their independence; they will have their board and they'll have the open door to the Minister. But the thing is, there'll be a recommendation fairly soon, a final study by my department, the one that I'm responsible for, and I will present that to my colleagues in Cabinet.

Then the member might be disappointed; I don't know. There is no way that we can look at the whole thing and say we're going to approve everything; we're going to do everything now. I would hope that it will serve as a guideline, as a model, as a design for the future and I think that I explained that, depending on the economy, depending on the money available, it could be stretched or made a little more compact, could be done in five years, in three years, or it might have to go 10 years. I can't do much better than that, but I'm sure there will be recommendations; I'm sure some recommendations will be accepted.

I do not accept that there has been a reduction. The only reduction is because of that 26th pay period; that's the only thing. There has been some redirecting of funds and also we are going in that direction. For instance, that adolescent thing - I'm not going to accept that nothing was done during the time of my honourable friend or in our time - the Adolescent Centre is new. Sure, it wasn't approved; it was approved before that, but it is something going in that direction that fits in with that report.

Again, I've talked a bit of the reorganization and the five-year plan. We'll elaborate on the construction which I announced again today and at the Health Sciences Centre dealing with psychiatry.

There's been an awful lot of work to plan and organize these things and that's an important thing, too. Just before dinner, my honourable friend said we can't just talk about mortar and bricks and that's exactly what we're doing. There's been a newly structured Mental Health Directorate within our department which will provide for a more integrated and balanced approach to mental health service delivery in the province, working closely with Dr. John Toews, our newly-appointed Chief Provincial Psychiatrist, the directorate has been given the mandate for the planning and monitoring of mental health programs for both the department and the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

This dual reporting mechanism will address the need for a stronger integration of institutional and community-based mental health services. Efforts are now under way to staff the restructured directorate, utilizing vacant positions. We said we'd prioritize and that's what we're trying to do. We can't have all new money. The former Community Mental Health Directorate, well it's replacing that directorate anyway.

Once fully operational, the director will be responsible for developing and promoting a comprehensive range of alternatives to institutional care - that's the challenge that I was issued before the dinner hour - the developing and monitoring of program standards to develop effective implementation strategies consistent with established policy and legislation; ongoing program evaluation; a promotion monitoring of demonstration projects to provide innovative services to high-risk populations; liaison with the Chief Provincial Psychiatrist in promoting appropriate training of community mental health staff; monitoring and ensuring an adequate supply of manpower for Mental Health Services and the appointment of a Director of Mental Health - well, I just announced that the newly appointed director was Mr. Tom Walters.

I think we are moving in the right direction. It is true, we're not cutting back. That will cost quite a bit more money to operate the Adolescent Centre and then Brandon and other facilities that I'll talk about later. It is only the first step, and I would hope that next year at this time - probably it will be announced before, but at least during the Estimates, I'll be asking you for increases in this field to start the second phase or the first real phase of the implementation of the Pascoe Report. I will be just as disappointed as my honourable friend if I can't do that next year, so I think that we share the same concern.

As far as the program, of course, it is a recommendation, nothing is government policy as such, except in the direction I mentioned. We're going in that

direction. We know that that is being consistent. If there's any doubt, we're very careful not to do anything that will go counter to the recommendations that we might adopt later.

I think that we have to be careful when we say we're going to change, we're going to phase out all the institutions. We are phasing out buildings to start with - I'm not saying that's the only thing - phasing out buildings, substandard services or accommodations. That's the main thing. I said and I maintain also that, call them what you want, you might change the names, but I think there will always be a need for some institutions in mental health. I don't think it will be the same as we have now. I think that once we find exactly what my friend and I are trying to do with this challenge of meeting this, in other facilities, in other areas of the health field, we will have to have, for instance, some accommodations for group residents and so on. That will take some of the people away. But because of cost, certainly not just cost, but because of the type of patient that we might have, I think we will always need some facilities. I think it's wrong to say, all of a sudden we're closing all the institutions.

The day of just going somewhere and hiding these people, I think that's gone; I hope it is. I think that society has to learn to live with all their people. They can't just go and hide the senior citizens somewhere. They say, oh, we're giving them a nice place in the suburbs and so on, get them out of the way, and the mentally sick patient or the retarded, that's gone. I think that we have to learn that part of society is not just the people with no problems at all. I think we have to cope with that. We've done that, we're moving in that direction, we're taking some of the people in the school division and they educate him through our school system and that wasn't done in the past. I think we have to provide help.

I said earlier that for the handicapped, we're talking about trying to equalize things, that they don't want our sympathy, they want grants and they want to be able to function the best they can with their handicap but to be part of society. They don't want to be shoved aside somewhere else where they don't want our charity. They want just to be able to equalize things to do whatever they can.

I think it's the same thing with the mentally ill. I think that there's so much that has to be done. There are a lot of people that are walking the street that need help. I think we have to have day hospitals. I accept all that, I know that we're on the same wavelength on that, or I hope we are, and I think that'll show when the recommendation comes in. I'll work very hard to sell those recommendations to Cabinet, but I can't guarantee now what will be done. Will we increase \$5 million next year? I doubt it. I think the recommendation was the first year that we spent \$5,000.00. I don't think that's really possible when we look at the needs of the province and the deficit and all that. I don't think that we can, but that doesn't mean that we can't move it. It might be a lesser sum, instead of three years, it might take 5, 10 years to do, but at least let's make a start. I think that is the situation.

I see also in the institution that you will see - call it different names - to qualify for Federal Government programs or whatever provincial programs, I think that one thing that should have been done a long time ago

is get psychiatric-geriatric institutions. Many of these people that are in personal care homes, I think that has to be done, that they have to accommodate of the people that are mentally ill. What is mental illness? Many of them forget and so on. Most of them, the percentage of them, to a certain point, are suffering of mental illness at certain times, so that will be done and especially if we could work with our programs. That's what we want to do in Brandon at that kind of an institution. So if it's phasing out that other institution to have that kind, fine, but it's taking care of some of the same patients, putting them with the help that they want and this is what we'll do. We'll have 100 new beds that we'll replace and we'll close 100 substandard facilities at this time.

Another thing that we might do instead of shoving everybody in one area, I think it would be proper when those beds have to be replaced - we're moving now in Brandon and we're going to move in Selkirk - eventually I would like to see the next best, so that would close 100 beds or so, maybe close 150. That's just as an example, I'm not being accurate at all, but we might close 150 beds and replace only with 100 beds and then some cottages in certain areas.

I think that I started to say awhile ago that I think that we've got to come back in the areas, for instance, if we're going to have one of those psychiatric-geriatric institutions, I think we should we should have one up North. You don't have to bring everybody to Selkirk or Brandon. We'll have to be careful, it has become an important part of the economy of those towns. My responsibility as Minister of Health - I don't run a Chamber of Commerce business - I'm not saying that will not be looked at. The member knows that, he was in the Cabinet. Collectively, we'll have to look at all that, but my main responsibility is the people we serve. Of course, we're interested in the people providing the service, but that would not be necessary if we didn't have the patients.

It could be that the first one will be in Brandon and then in Selkirk, and then eventually in Thompson. If that is closing and phasing out the institution, yes. That has to be understood, as far as I'm concerned, they are still institutions. You might group a different group of people, but the people that can go there, you might reduce the population of both these institutions by creating as we go. That's not the easiest thing, it's quite costly, but to have these cottages. You know, the trouble that mental retardation has and I think it's the same policy.

When I was the Minister responsible for both, I felt exactly the same. I think that we have to move to try to reduce the population of these institutions, but I don't think it's possible and I disagree with those that feel that eventually all these buildings will have to be closed. That position has been reversed in many parts of the world, that we're going in that direction, and then the cost is a factor without reducing the service or giving inferior service to the population.

I think it's encouraging, I think we had a darn good report. There was an awful lot of money spent and I am the most dishonest person in this House if I did that just to fool people and spend the time of the taxpayer and took the time of the Director of Planning and others just to bring it to whitewash or to have an excuse not to act, that's not what I intend to do.

As I say, I feel that we're on the same wavelength, I don't think we disagree too much. I've heard the member talk before when he was the Minister. As he said, when I was the Minister earlier and lately, and I've heard some of this public statement, but all I say if I disagree with him and as I say that he's a little premature in his disappointment, that will come, that there's no way that I could be ready before that. It's worth doing it well and we want to do it well. It's been so long in coming that it was worth doing right.

In the meantime, with the resources that we have, we're moving. As I say, there are other things that will tie in with that and I'm sure, because we're not doing anything, for instance, we're not going to finalize this thing about Brandon, will it be free standing? Will it be affiliated with the General Hospital as some of the recommendations seem to be, or will it be just left completely aside with the institution? I hope that both of us will be pleased next year when I stand up to make the next announcement.

Mind you, my friend might have to read about it. He might be in a position where he could be really helpful to me. I hope he is and then we can work together.

MR. L. SHERMAN: I hope I'll be reading about it, an agreement of legislative debate anyway, let's put it that way.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. A. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This is an area in which all of us, of course, could make long speeches on and finding all kinds of things that are going wrong with this particular program. First of all, I would like to say that I do have a special interest in this particular program and I have been watching what's been going on. Mainly I am familiar with what is happening at Eden Mental Health and I would say that they're doing a great job and I think that everybody is doing a good job as far as they can, as far as the health dollars allow.

In the report of the Department of Health - I see a statement over here - there are 66 mental health professions. Would all of these be psychiatrists or would you have other professionals? Could we have a breakdown of those 66 people?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I wonder if my honourable friend would wait until we get to the Commission. There's been a transfer and it's working with the Commission now and I'll have all the information and the staff that can be helpful at that time.

I heard you correctly with the Eden . . .

MR. A. BROWN: No, on Page 63 of the your Annual Report, you have with a staff of 66 mental health professionals: "Community Mental Health Services provides comprehensive assessments." Of these 66 mental health professionals, are all of those psychiatrists? That's the figure that I wanted a breakdown on.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, there are different people working in that, community health worker, psychiatric nurses and so on. They're not the professional, as such, with the psychiatrist.

MR. A. BROWN: My question then would be: How many psychiatrists do we have working in the province at the present time?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It is fee for service. We are buying time and we'll be able to give you the information.

MR. A. BROWN: Very good. Then I wonder, like on the heading over here it says, "Provides for program development, standards and evaluation within adult mental health services. . . ." If you remember last year, we were discussing evaluation and we were discussing an article which appeared in one of the medical magazines, which said that Manitoba was one of two provinces which kept absolutely no statistics regarding mental health, that none of these statistics were forwarded so that there could be proper program evaluation. The other province, I believe, was either Newfoundland or Prince Edward Island.

Can the Minister tell me now, is there a follow-up being done? Are statistics being kept so that we can have proper program evaluation? What kind of process of evaluation are we achieving, because really the only evaluation that we can do would be to keep proper statistics and follow-ups of how these patients are doing after they received treatment?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I can tell my honourable friends that, yes, indeed we are keeping records. I think what we haven't got at this time is a computerized system, and I hesitate to talk about computers with my honourable friend, but we're working on it and we feel that this is a necessary thing and we hope to have it in the not too distant future.

We have the information, but it's not computerized like most of the other areas.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 2.(L)(2)—pass; 2.(L)(3)—pass; 2.(m) Health Information Resources, 2.(m)(1)—pass; 2.(m)(2)—pass.

2.(n) Manitoba Health Research Council — the Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'll be very brief. I just want to say that I'm very pleased that the appropriation for the Manitoba Health Research Council is still in there. The request is slightly larger than the amount budgeted for last year. It's still a very . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask permission, I apologize for appearing to anticipate what will be said and maybe clarify the thing and save time.

There is not a large increase because there is a large share of the money from Lotteries, probably in excess of \$1 million will be added to that, that will go directly to this thing.

MR. L. SHERMAN: Well, I'm very pleased to hear that, Mr. Chairman, and I certainly welcome that, and I'm sure that all members of this Chamber do. It was a hard and long difficult struggle getting to the point where we had an appropriation, a line in the Estimates, for health research that respective treasury board chairmen of whatever party could live with, and I know that the Minister shares my enthusiasm for that kind of an investment. It's been a difficult struggle getting it up to this point, .75 million. I was glad to see that it was still there and hadn't been reduced in any way under pressures of restraint or constraint.

It's very welcome news to hear that an additional amount of that magnitude will be going in from the Lotteries Foundation. That will start to give us the kind of base funding for health research that, I think, we all agree is very necessary to maintain our capability and to hang on to our researchers and our research experts, with which we are so richly blessed in this province, because the competition for those researchers is acute indeed. So, I welcome that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 2.(n)—pass.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Garry, that committee rise.

IN SESSION

The Chairman reported upon the committee's deliberation to Mr. Speaker and requested leave to sit again.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, S. Ashton: The Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: I move, seconded by the Member for Wolseley, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. D. MALINOWSKI: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wolseley, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried and the House adjourned and will stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow (Friday).