

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, 21 July, 1986.

Time — 2:00 p.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER, Hon. M. Phillips: Presenting Petitions . . . Reading and Receiving Petitions . . . Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees . . .

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to present the First Annual Report of the Department of Northern Affairs for the year ending March 31, 1985.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. R. PENNER: I beg leave, Madam Speaker, to table the 1985 Annual Report - this will be in fact the First Annual Report of the Law Enforcement Review Agency.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Co-operative Development.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, it's my pleasure to table the Annual Report for the year 1984-85 of the Department of Co-operative Development.

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . .

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. E. KOSTYRA introduced, by leave, Bill No. 45, An Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act; Loi modifiant la Loi sur la pension de la fonction publique. (Recommended by Her Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor).

MR. M. DOLIN introduced, by leave, Bill No. 46, An Act respecting The Institute of Certified Management Consultants of Manitoba; Loi sur L'Institut manitobain des conseillers en administration agréés.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, I would like to raise a brief point of order relative to the First Reading of the bills.

Madam Speaker, I've sought and I will table a letter from Legislative Counsel to me which briefly reads as follows: In your letter of July 10, 1986, you state: "There appears to have developed a practice in the Legislature that when a Minister or member introduces

a bill for first, second or third reading, the title of the bill is read in both languages, but not the rest of the motion. It appears to me that it is only legally necessary to read the title of the bill in one language, either French or English." Mr. Pepper goes on to say: "Section 23 of the Manitoba Act states either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the Houses of the Legislature. Motions are part of the debate; therefore follows that titles of bills need not be read in both languages."

Madam Speaker, I raise the point because there are bilingual members on both sides of the House who do well in reading the title of the bills in both languages, but there are many others of us who do not, and perhaps, so that we particularly do not fracture the French language, it's only necessary to read the titles in one language.

I'll table the letter.

MADAM SPEAKER: I do not think the member has a point of order. He has a point of information and it is not necessary to read bills in both languages although each member can choose whether they wish to read it in one language or the other. I do, as Speaker, prefer to read it in both languages, but each member can make their own decision.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MTX - hiring discrimination, Saudi Arabia

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Premier and I wonder if he has had an opportunity over the weekend to confirm that discrimination with respect to hiring is being practiced by MTX and Saudi Arabian Datacom Ltd., with respect to its employees that it employs in Saudi Arabia, that discrimination against the hiring and employment of both Jews and women for work in Saudi Arabia.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: This matter has been questioned and dealt with dating back to 1979 in this House when the Manitoba Telephone System first began to look at involvement in Saudi Arabia when members opposite were in government. It was dealt with, as well, in the Federal House of Commons in 1979 during the Clark Administration. The Minister responsible for the telephone system has been undertaking inquiries and will elaborate further.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MTS.

HON. A. MACKLING: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I wish to confirm that I have asked the Telephone System to give me further information in respect to this whole area. I haven't received all of that information yet, but what I have learned is that for some time - and as the Honourable First Minister has pointed out, dating back to 1979 - the Canadian utilities in Saudi Arabia has been, such as, to allow the Saudi Arabia Embassy in Ottawa to determine the eligibility of staffing requirements in Saudi Arabia. The concern on the part of the utilities has been to not offend against the laws of the jurisdiction in which the employment occurred.

The records of Hansard indicate that the question was raised in this House by the Honourable Member for St. Johns, the Honourable Saul Cherniack; and the Member for Fort Rouge, Mr. Lloyd Axworthy; also the Honourable Mr. Sidney Green, among others; and assurances were given then by the then Minister, Mr. Ed McGill, that these arrangements, through the Telephone System, were really as agents for Bell in those first arrangements. Accommodations were made to reflect the laws and customs and traditions of Saudi Arabia.

I believe those same arrangements continue today. They are a continuing matter of concern for, I think, women in society and religious groups in society. We take those concerns seriously, we are looking at obtaining both further information and then consider options in respect to that whole area.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, in 1979, we may well have been agents for Bell, and Bell may well have been the company making the decision. But in view of the fact that since 1982, the Manitoba Telephone System has invested in a wholly-owned subsidiary, MTX, and a 50-percent owned subsidiary, Saudi Arabian Datacom Limited, both of which involved the investment of Manitoba taxpayers' money in those corporations there; and in view of the fact that they must adhere to discriminatory hiring practices in order to operate in Saudi Arabia; and in view of the fact that that discriminatory hiring practice offends against the moral standards of most Manitobans, will the Premier now give us the assurance that he will withdraw all of this Manitoba investment in these companies that have to practice discriminatory hiring against Jews and women?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, this is certainly a matter that we will take under very serious consideration. I would like to say to the Leader of the Opposition, he cannot separate himself from the decision of the government in 1979 that chose, Madam Speaker, voluntarily to be agents for Bell of Canada. It was that government that chose to be agents for Bell. Despite that, Madam Speaker, we are prepared to review this, as indicated in this House, by the Minister responsible for the Telephone System.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Premier can indicate what difference he sees between discrimination and hiring due to race or colour, versus discrimination and hiring due to religion or gender?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, as we have indicated very clearly the Minister responsible for the Telephone System is evaluating this matter and, once

he has completed his evaluation with MTX and the Manitoba Telephone System as to a comparison, what has taken place in previous years, whether or not that was right or wrong, whether it's right or wrong now, that evaluation will be made and an indication will be given by the Minister.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I don't want to just have to wait for the evaluation of the Minister. I want the Premier, himself, who has piously spoken about various forms of discrimination, I want him to tell the people of Manitoba what difference . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Is this a question?

MR. G. FILMON: . . . he sees between discrimination due to race and colour, versus discrimination due to gender and religion.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. That question does seek an opinion.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, the opinion that I want is from the Premier, whose government is discriminating.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition knows a question should seek information, not an opinion.

MR. G. FILMON: Right, Madam Speaker. I want to know whether or not the Premier is just as committed to sever economic ties in investments in a country that discriminates against women and Jews, as in a country that discriminates for race and colour?

MADAM SPEAKER: The question is still seeking an opinion and the question is also repetitious. Could the honourable member please rephrase his question.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, I am not repeating myself. I asked whether or not the Premier is committed to ensuring that there's no discrimination in our investments, in our economic ties, with a country that discriminates against women and Jews; is he just as equally committed to eradicate that discrimination as he is to eradicate discrimination in economic ties in countries that discriminate against race and colour?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I think it goes without saying that this government opposes discrimination against women, whether it involves religious groups, cultural groups. Madam Speaker, we don't change our position from year to year, as the Leader of the Opposition has when, before the election last August, the Leader of the Opposition led the way in calling for sanctions against South African and ever since we've made our statement vis-a-vis sanctions against South Africa, he's been attempting to raise questions that deflect from a strong position in this House as against apartheid in South Africa.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, in view of the fact that private multi-nationals, such as Coca-Cola and Xerox, choose not to make investments in companies,

such as, Saudi Arabia because they discriminate against Jews and women, why will the Premier not order the divestiture of our investment in Saudi Arabia, as the Manitoba Telephone System, on behalf of the people of Manitoba?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, because I think that in any sane, reasonable kind of society, we ensure we have all facts first. We also ensure that our positions are consistent. We don't say in August of 1985, let's cut all ties, and then after the election, we reflect negatively on the decision of this government to propose the cutting of sanctions insofar as South Africa.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, this is an issue that doesn't require a great deal of study. If, indeed, the Premier is committed to eradicate discrimination, eradicate his participation in discrimination against Jews and women, why will he not withdraw the investment of Manitoba Telephone System now and take a stand?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I thought, and I guess I have to repeat it for the second, or third, or fourth time, unlike 1979, when the House in 1979, in Ottawa, when these matters were raised, this government is going to review this matter to ensure what actions need to be undertaken.

MTX - amendments to Bill 78

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. Can the Minister indicate whether amendments brought forward in Bill No. 78, The Manitoba Telephone Act, in the 1982-83-84 Session, were designed to give retroactive legal status to the creation in 1982 of MTX, which at 1982 undertook direct investment in Saudi Arabia? Was that the purpose of the amendments to Bill No. 78?

MADAM SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable member could repeat his question. I would like to remind him that he is not to seek, for purposes of argument, information on past history. It's hard to tell with his first question what his purpose is in asking it.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, I believe and I quote from Hansard, Thursday, Mr. Mackling, the Minister responsible for Manitoba Telephone System. He said: "I would like to indicate that the operations of the MTX were conceived and began initiation under a previous administration." What I am trying to point to the people of Manitoba is that is not correct.

My question to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System was: Were amendments in Bill No. 78 in the 1982-83-84 Session designed to retroactively give legal status to the creation of MTX, which was created in 1982 under a New Democratic Party administration, and began investments in Saudi Arabia in 1982, on behalf of the people of Manitoba, through the creation of MTX, which was illegally created at the time?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Manitoba Telephone System.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, at this stage I will not involve myself in a debate with the honourable member about his suggestion that this legislation was made retroactive to cover the negotiations or the agreements already reached, because I indicated that I'm going to get full information, full factual background on all of these things. I'll include those questions in that, but what I'd indicated earlier was that under the previous administration there had been developed a pattern for the Telephone System to be involved in contracts in Saudi Arabia, albeit as agent for another telephone system, and through that pattern of events a course of action seemed to be in order for a further consolidation or confirmation of those contractual arrangements that had been established between those two areas. I'm going to look at the factual background to all of that and I'll be reporting later. I don't choose to jump to assumptions that the honourable member wants to make.

MR. D. ORCHARD: A new question to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System. When the Minister is undertaking his review as to how MTX was created by his government in 1982, for the purposes of direct investment by the people of Manitoba in Saudi Arabia, would the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System avail himself of the Auditor's Report 1982, in which I shall quote: "I have serious concerns as to whether the System is not extending its scope of operations beyond what the Legislature intended. I believe it would be prudent before the scope of operations" - MTX operations, Madam Speaker - "is extended so significantly beyond the customary operations to obtain legislative authority which clearly authorizes such an extension."

That, Madam Speaker, was why we had Bill No. 78, was at the Auditor's suggestion in 1982, as a result of this New Democratic Party's direct investment in MTX and in Saudi Arabia, despite the discriminatory laws of that country.

HON. A. MACKLING: I will include that question that was buried somewhere in that statement - I will certainly look into that. I would point out, however, that what I'd indicated about the pattern of employment of resources from Manitoba, human resources from Manitoba, in Saudi Arabia had been established under the previous administration.

While it was questioned in 1978, there appeared to be a clearance from the Federal Human Rights Commission and I guess, for that reason, both members in the New Democratic Party Opposition in the Legislature at that time, and presumably all else, felt that given that finding by the Federal Human Rights Commission, that the practices of Saudi Arabia in requiring conformance to their traditions and laws, on the part of people working there, was not discriminatory of the rights of Canadian citizens.

In light of that, I suppose those concerns no longer continued to be raised in this House. The questions have been raised afresh. Certainly they demand a rethinking and a review of those things and I've indicated that will be done.

MTX - business plan with Cezar Industries

MR. D. ORCHARD: A further question to the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System.

Will the Minister, since he in the last Public Utilities hearing on Thursday of last week, would he make available to myself and to members of that committee, the business plan by which MTX has invested \$3.375 million in a joint venture with Cezar Industries of California? Will the Minister undertake to make that business plan available to myself prior to the next sitting of the Public Utilities Committee so a more intelligent discussion of that business plan and of that investment can be made at the next sitting of the Utilities hearing?

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I will take that request under advisement. I would however indicate that, as I have I think during the course of the committee hearing, and in this House, voiced my concern as to the extent that, in competitive areas of its activity, the full working details of a corporation be reviewed to the public.

I believe that we want as much disclosure as is reasonable, particularly for Crown corporations. However, I do think that we want to ensure that where a Crown corporation is involved in a competitive field, that their presence in that competition isn't going to be unduly affected by having public disclosure that private corporations would not face in the same area.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, we are not talking about a private corporation; we are discussing MTX, which is a Crown corporation belonging to the people of Manitoba.

I wish to have the business plan so that we can assure the investment in Cezar Industries does not lead to the same kind of massive losses that we are experiencing in Saudi Arabia. That is why I want the business plan.

MADAM SPEAKER: That is not a question. I am sorry, that is not a question.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, I apologize if the Minister did not foresee a question.

MADAM SPEAKER: I did not foresee a question. I heard two statements. Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes, Madam Speaker. In view of the losses by the Crown Corporation, MTX, in Saudi Arabia, I would appreciate seeing the business plan of this investment with Cezar Industries in the United States, to determine whether Manitobans are going to be further asked to pick up losses on ill-fated business adventures in the private sector by the Manitoba Telephone System.

Discrimination - hiring practices

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kirkfield Park.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for the Status

of Women. As Minister responsible for the Status of Women, will she recommend that this government stop discrimination against women, discrimination that is coming about by this government conveniently ignoring hiring practices of countries that practise discrimination against women?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for the Status of Women.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm pleased that my colleagues, the Premier, and the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Telephone System, have taken this matter very seriously and have said that they will look into the entire issue and report back. Obviously, as Minister responsible for the Status of Women, I am concerned about any restriction of career opportunities on the basis of sex, or creed, or race, or colour. Obviously, we are concerned, on this side of the House anyway, that equality be achieved by all women around this world, not just in Manitoba.

I think, given the history that has been discussed during this question period, and the complexity of the issue, I think it is appropriate that the Minister responsible for MTS carry out this review, as he has said he will do, in a serious way. Upon receiving that information, I will be offering further advice and suggestions about the role of women's issues in this matter and about the philosophy that is basic to this government.

Women's Directorate

MRS. G. HAMMOND: I have a new question for the Minister responsible for the Status of Women. In the annual report that came out from the Manitoba Women's Directorate, it indicates that the Women's Bureau, their mandate was to ensure that government programs, policy, and legislation reflect women's concerns and that, under the direction of the Minister, that they assist government departments and Crown corporations.

What I would like to ask the Minister is, in light of the statements that she's making about how wonderful the government is in women's issues, what has happened with the department, with the Women's Directorate, that these issues have not come to light through that department? Why is the policy obviously failing, because we do not just have this issue, we have the homemaker's compensation and we have the telephone directory for MTS, and that is just to mention three.

I would ask the Minister to find out just what is happening in the Women's Directorate and in her department, and let's get these issues in the forefront of her government instead of the back.

HON. J. WASYLYCIA-LEIS: I'm pleased to report to the House on the very important work that is being carried out by the Manitoba Women's Directorate. Not only has staff of the directorate spent considerable time looking into issues, as mentioned by the member opposite, but has played a very active role in working with departments right across this government to promote equality and to ensure that advancement of women in every sector of our economy.

Madam Speaker, the input of the directorate on issues such as homemaker's pensions; such as pay equity; such as the crisis facing farm women in the rural economy; such as the labour market strategy that is being seen as a model right across this country; such as assistance with respect to immigrant women and language problems; such as the local economic problems facing Native women. All of these issues have been researched carefully, will be studied and reported back to my colleagues, and we will continue to ensure that equality matters, that status of women matters, are given a high profile on this side of the House and not treated in an inconsistent manner as members opposite tend to do.

MRS. G. HAMMOND: Madam Speaker, to the same Minister. I believe that the staff of the Women's Directorate are obviously doing their job. What my question to the Minister is, when will she stop studying the issues and get to work and do something for women in this province?

HON. J. WASYLICIA-LEIS: Madam Speaker, the only way to answer that kind of question, that kind of almost irrational question, is to point to the long list of initiatives sponsored and initiated and acted upon by members of this government. To mention just a few: child care, pay equity, pension improvements, assistance to rural women, and the list goes on and on, Madam Speaker. I think our record speaks for itself; our position has always been consistent.

Members opposite are able to present this kind of position while criticizing pay equity, while criticizing increases to the child care services, while criticizing major initiatives that all women in this province recognize as important for advancing the position of equality in all facets of our society.

Tax return delays - discounters

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ellice.

MR. H. SMITH: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs concerning the delays in tax returns which have forced many people in my riding to use tax discounters. Is the Minister aware of the increased number of Manitobans who are using these companies, and has he expressed the concern of the Manitoba Government to the Federal Minister about this issue?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. The last part of the question is in order. Whether the Minister is aware of something or not is not in order.

The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. A. MACKLING: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I thank the honourable member for raising that question. I think Manitobans generally have been concerned about what has occurred for many, many years, a very, I think, odious practice of discounting the money that is owed to Manitobans and Canadians generally.

I think it shows the inadequacy of our tax system. Money is owing by a government to an individual, but

the individual has to wait many, many months to get the money and, therefore, goes to someone who will discount . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. May I remind the Honourable Minister that answers to questions should deal with the matter raised.

The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, the matter of discounting the money that is owed to that individual, in order that they get the money more quickly, is a very terrible practice. The fact that people go to get their money on a discounted basis from these tax discounters is a tragic indication of the failure of the federal system to handle tax returns promptly. There is no reason why, in this technological age, that those very simple returns could not be handled quickly. I have written to the Federal Minister pointing out that this discounting practice should be eliminated, and can be eliminated if the Federal Department were to process those returns quickly.

As a matter of fact, I suggested many of the people who look for that discounted money very quickly, I'm sure would be prepared to pay a nominal fee in order to have their tax return processed by Federal Government officials.

MR. H. SMITH: Madam Speaker, a supplementary question. What response did you get from the Federal Government from your letter? What sort of answer did they give saying that it could not be done?

HON. A. MACKLING: I have had no response, Madam Speaker.

MTX - Saudi Arabia

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I direct a further question to the First Minister, and ask him to make sure that, in any instructions going to the Minister of Telephones, that he clearly differentiates between the two situations with respect to our involvement in Saudi Arabia. Madam Speaker, many countries like Canada send experts, particularly to developing countries. They can be agricultural experts; they can be educators. There can be specific

MADAM SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have a question?

MR. H. ENNS: Just a little preamble, Madam Speaker, to an important question. That kind of activity that MTS engaged in under a previous administration surely ought to be able to continue - and I hope it does continue - as distinct and separate from the Manitoba taxpayers' investing millions of dollars to create a commercial enterprise to do business in a country - which we have some objections to with respect to the morality and the discrimination that's practiced in that country.

MADAM SPEAKER: May I ask the honourable member where his question is?

MR. H. ENNS: Madam Speaker, the First Minister obviously understood the question because he was rising to answer. My direct question to the First Minister is that he understands, and so instructs his Minister responsible for Telephones, that in reviewing the situation, we do not mix apples and oranges, as the government has been trying to do in evading the serious questions that are posed by my leader on this issue. Sending communications experts to help a developing country develop their communications system is one thing; setting up a business enterprise with taxpayers' money - in the hope to make money - is another thing, Madam Speaker. That's my question to the First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I think the honourable member protests too loudly. During the term that the honourable member, along with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, sat in the treasury benches of the Lyon Administration, they earned a lot of money through the Manitoba Telephone System, as agents for Bell Telephone, that was involved in the same type of investment and activity they now condemn. That matter, Madam Speaker, was later dealt with, with the Canadian Human Rights Commission, in June of 1979, when the Canadian Human Rights Commission deemed Bell Canada's actions not discriminatory.

Madam Speaker, despite the duplicity on the part of honourable members across the way - and let there be no doubt there is duplicity on their part dating back to 1978 - the Minister responsible for our Telephone System is prepared to undertake a further examination of this matter, particularly in view of the comments that were raised in 1978 by the former members in this Chamber for St. Johns, Inkster and Fort Rouge.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside with a supplementary?

MR. H. ENNS: Yes, a supplementary question, Madam Speaker. Fortunately, for the taxpayers of Manitoba, when previous administrations undertook any or most economic enterprises, they generally did return something back in forms of dividends to their shareholders.

Madam Speaker, I ask the First Minister, who obviously has been doing his research, if the First Minister won't indicate that research shows that essentially what the taxpayers were getting back in terms of that earlier involvement with Saudi Arabia, was wages and consideration for the assistance through Bell by Saudi Arabia?

HON. H. PAWLEY: If the honourable member is suggesting that because there was profit and return during 1979, 1980 and 1981, it was okay; whereas this year it is not okay because there's not a return, then indeed, Madam Speaker, they are even more strangers to consistency than I thought they were.

MR. H. ENNS: My colleague, the Member for Pembina, just a few moments ago, indicated the several millions

of dollars of investment that we, the Manitoba taxpayers, have through our public corporation, MTX, in Saudi Arabia. What was the public investment in 1977 and 1981?

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, in answer to the Honourable Member for Lakeside, of course one can argue about the nature of investments, but when one assigns, and allows the highly trained and sophisticated technological people to give of their time and then demands a profit return on that of some hundreds of thousands of dollars, that is an investment. The honourable member may choose to say, well there's a little difference between that and taxpayers' money. It's taxpayers' money that trains the personnel and then hires them out and gets the commission, Madam Speaker. It's an investment, it's a little different kind, but it's still an investment for profit.

Tax return delays - discounters

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, further to the questions from the Member for Ellice.

Madam Speaker, in view of his answers, could the Minister inform and assure the people of Manitoba that they will set an example for the Federal Government in the next tax year, and that the provincial share of income taxes will immediately be available to the people of Manitoba through a refund system, so they won't have to wait and go to tax discounters?

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, honourable members know that in order to save tax dollars, there is an arrangement between the Federal Government and the Provincial Governments to facilitate the collection of taxes at one time; one set of reporting for tax filers, and one processing of those tax returns. If the honourable member is arguing that in consideration of fair taxes in Canada, and reform of taxation in Canada, Manitoba should look to going it alone, of course that's one of the options we will look at, if that's what the honourable member is suggesting. But it seems to me there is no earthly reason why the Federal Government, in processing those tax returns they're generally very simple returns, can't do that in a matter of 48 hours and get a refund cheque out almost immediately.

Sprucedale Industries - late funding

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Community Services.

The Sprucedale Industries in Austin, which is a workshop for the mentally handicapped has been under a great deal of difficulty because their funding cheques are consistently late. Can the Minister tell us why there is a delay in the payments to them?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: I'll take the specific as notice, Madam Speaker, but there was a delay because of the late holding of the Session and the Budget and we've communicated to the workshops and indicated that's not likely to be repeated.

MRS. C. OLESON: Madam Speaker, this is an ongoing project and the people that phone in to the department are told that their cheques are waiting there to be signed, so I wonder if the Minister could ask her staff to sign them and get them out to them?

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, the workshop system in the province has been undergoing coordination and improvement. They have cooperated with us in setting new standards and they qualify for higher per diems when they have demonstrated that they have reached the new standards. That is one reason for the delay in some instances, but the main reason has been the timing of the Estimates process, Madam Speaker.

MTX - status on application forms

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for Manitoba Telephone System.

Can the Minister tell me, tell the House, how MTX determines whether an individual is Jewish when it is my understanding that Crown corporations have application forms which make that prohibitive?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for MTS.

HON. A. MACKLING: Madam Speaker, I trust that MTX does not inquire as to the racial, ethnic or religious status of an individual. If they do, this Minister is going to be very angry about it. I don't believe they do.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

HON. A. MACKLING: But, Madam Speaker, as I indicated earlier, the process that was established under the working arrangements between the MTS and Bell Canada in 1978, that appears to have carried on to this day, is that individual employees who wish to work in a foreign country have to apply for a work permit or a visa from that foreign country's embassy in Ottawa. That embassy determines whether or not the person is suitable to work in that country, and whether or not they will undertake to conform to the laws, traditions, customs and so on of that country.

Certainly if there is discriminatory practice, it is not by MTX or MTS, but I agree with the concerns that honourable members have that we should not be involved in arrangements where discrimination is mandatory in order that those contracts continue.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

HOUSE BUSINESS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, before moving us into the Committee of Supply, I would just indicate and confirm that the Standing Committee on Economic Development will meet tomorrow to review the Annual Report of Manfor, and Thursday as well if it is required.

Perhaps before we move into the Committee, the Opposition Whip has some committee changes to make.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a change to the Economic Development Committee: Downey for Pankratz.

HON. J. COWAN: I move, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, seconded by the Minister responsible for Native Affairs.

MOTION presented and carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Burrows in the Chair for the Department of Health; and the Honourable Member for Kildonan in the Chair for the Department of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN, M. Dolin: We are in Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, Page 69, Resolution 64, Item No. 3, Clean Environment Commission.

The Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Last week, when we started on this department, I was in a good mood and we seemed to be very cooperative. Today I'm not in quite such a good mood and I hope that maybe I can change my attitude a little bit. I wasn't really that pleased with what went on in the Chamber, but I think if I got the chance to think about it a little bit and to cool down from the answers that I heard to questions that were posed, I think maybe we can get back to the same spirit of cooperation that we went through last Thursday.

The first part about it, the Clean Environment Commission, is the duties of the Clean Environment Commission and what type of hearings that go on under the Clean Environment Commission and the people that serve on the Clean Environment Commission.

I also notice on an Order-in-Council that one of the staff, I think, was taken from the Clean Environment Commission and brought in as a special assistant. Is this the Order-in-Council that just went through in the last little while, and has that staff been replaced on the Clean Environment Commission? Will the Minister

advise who serves on the Clean Environment Commission, how many SMY's take place there and how many people are involved, just so we can have a better idea on who are doing the job, this particular, important job for government?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

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

Presently, on the Clean Environment Commission, these are not SMY's or SY's. People who serve on the Clean Environment Commission are appointed by Order-in-Council. Some of the members sitting on the Environment Council have been there for a long time. Other than the chairperson, who is full time, the other members of the Commission sit on the hearings, as long as they meet the requirement for a quorum, then that is all that is required; so not all members of the Clean Environment Commission sit on all of the meetings or hearings of the Clean Environment Commission.

There were eight members of the commission. Presently, there are five, taking into consideration the O/C that the member referred to, and there will be need to appoint new members to the commission in the very near future.

If the member wishes, I can explain. Mr. Stan Eagleton, who is the chairperson, and therefore is the full time, the one that is a civil servant; Mr. Robert Aukes is the commissioner; Mr. Peter Duchek is a commissioner; Mrs. Mamie Hendren, commissioner; and Dr. Barrie Webster is the other commissioner.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Can the Honourable Minister tell us who these people are and maybe just a slight rundown on their background and why they were picked to serve on the Clean Environment Commission?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Stan Eagleton, the chairperson, a civil servant of long date, he's been on the commission 10 years or more. He's a former Deputy Minister in the Civil Service.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Is he retired now and is that all he does?

HON. G. LECUYER: No, no.

MR. A. KOVNATS: He's a former Deputy Minister, he's a civil servant and he's still on the commission, is that correct?

HON. G. LECUYER: That's right. Sir Robert Aukes is a professor at the University of Manitoba - I don't know exactly what sphere of his expertise - I believe he's an economist with the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Peter Duchek is a farmer from Lockport, Manitoba; Mrs. Mamie Hendren is a hospital worker from Thompson, Manitoba; and Dr. Barrie Webster is also a professor at the University of Manitoba in the field of chemistry, I believe, in the pesticide area, pesticide research.

There are, as well, Mr. Chairman, before I finish, an executive secretary, a technical advisor to the commission and there are two secretarial support.

MR. A. KOVNATS: The special assistant, I just don't have her name. It's Ms. something or other.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mrs. Linda Kutchen, who was a member of the Clean Environment Commission, her appointment was rescinded recently and she was appointed as my special assistant because I was without one since the last two-and-a-half to three months.

MR. A. KOVNATS: What is the background of Ms. Kutchen?

HON. G. LECUYER: Mother, housewife, previously a special assistant to the Minister of Highways and Government Services.

MR. A. KOVNATS: The Clean Environment Commission, I see where it's all private citizens who, through public meetings, get together and listen to briefs and presentations. They have vast powers to deal with the particular job that they're doing. One of them only, it appears, has any Civil Service background, not saying that the others aren't qualified, obviously they are. They wouldn't be in the position if they weren't qualified. I'm sure the Minister wouldn't be putting himself in a position of appointing people to the Clean Environment Commission if they weren't qualified.

What instructions are these people given when they're appointed to the Clean Environment Commission and have to attend hearings? As far as making decisions and making recommendations to the government, is it their own decisions as to what recommendations they make to government or are they somewhat advised as to the ground rules by the Minister?

HON. G. LECUYER: The Manitoba Environment Commission has existed since the 1960's - I'm not sure what date; 1968 I'm told - which was according to the provisions provided by The Clean Environment Act. The commission is a quasi-judicial body which operates at arm's length from the government. It has the responsibility to regulate pollution by issuing orders prescribing limits, terms and conditions on air, water and soil of Manitoba; pollutants made by Manitoba industries undertakings; plants or processes in the public and private sectors, whether it be manufacturing, mining, etc.

The Commission also carries out programs of public information and involvement with regard to these operations by the required advertising of pending orders and hearings and a circulation of information.

It also holds public hearings and meetings to receive evidence and representations with regard to such operations that I mentioned. They have the support backing of technical staff from the Department of Environment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, W. Parasiuk: The Member for Portage.

MR. E. CONNERY: Who initiates the hearings?

HON. G. LECUYER: The Clean Environment Commission, operations such as I've just described, for instance, whether they be expansions or new operations which potentially could add pollutants to the environment, are required to register with the Clean Environment Commission and the Clean Environment

Commission will either meet with the industries or pass or impose on these industries certain orders with limits and restrictions, as I've indicated. These orders are then made public through various media so that if there is anybody that might be impacted by these operations, they can appeal the limits set forth in the order or the proponent of the industry itself may wish to appeal the restrictions in the order imposed by the Clean Environment Commission.

Whether it comes from one side to the other, upon there being an appeal registered, the Clean Environment Commission must hold public hearings. Once these public hearings have been held on these orders, there may be appeals again, I understand, and if that should occur after there has been public hearings, wherein the Clean Environment Commission has, through its order, imposed certain restrictions and limits, these appeals then are made to the Minister, and can only be resolved by an Order-in-Council, whether it's varied or whether it's stayed, without any change.

MR. E. CONNERY: How many hearings would the commission hold in a year?

HON. G. LECUYER: I'm going to give you an example, for instance, of the 1985-86 fiscal year, as I have here their draft report for this last year. There were 13 actual hearings, 20 meetings to deal with registrations, suspensions or requests and proposals referred by the Department of the Environment. The Clean Environment Commission also met with the representatives of 18 different industries, Department of Utilities, for the purpose of discussion, the application of limits, terms and conditions.

MR. E. CONNERY: With that low number, on Friday I believe it was, I asked in the House if the Minister wasn't aware of the hearings held in Portage. Does the staff operate in a vacuum on their own or is the Minister advised when hearings are going to be held?

HON. G. LECUYER: I'm advised, Mr. Deputy Chairman, of the hearings, like any other member of the public. When the hearings are held, they are because, as I said awhile ago, they have to be publicized and they are, so that any interested party can intervene in this process.

Now before the Clean Environment Commission holds hearings, these hearings may go on for some time. But even when the hearings have been completed, the members of the commission will want certainly to obtain data and information, facts and scientific information in that particular area of operation, so they know what they're doing when they're imposing limits as part of their order. When they have all that information, they will want to sit down and discuss this as a commission in order to arrive at a decision.

A decision doesn't consist of one particular statement on that. There are quite a few areas that may be involved as part of that commission, how it will be monitored, when it will be changed, etc. So it may be a matter of quite a few months before the commission can come down with an order after a hearing process.

MR. E. CONNERY: Then your department also asked for a Clean Environment Commission hearing.

HON. G. LECUYER: I'm sorry.

MR. E. CONNERY: The Environmental Department can ask for a Clean Environment Commission hearing?

HON. G. LECUYER: The Minister could ask for hearings, yes. After hearings have taken place as part of the appeals process, if the Minister feels that there's new evidence which would justify a new round of hearings, he could proceed to ask the commission, for instance, to proceed to a second round of hearings for that matter.

MR. E. CONNERY: I guess maybe using one incident as part of my concern of the overall environmental department, what triggered the commission calling a hearing on the McCain's plant in Portage?

HON. G. LECUYER: Exactly that process that I described a while ago, because I said that, upon an order being passed by the Clean Environment Commission, and the commission has a responsibility to do that. As I stated a while ago, any time there is a new registration, because industry that will impact on the environment, whether air, water or soil, is required to register with the Clean Environment Commission and then is subject to an order by that commission, once the Clean Environment Commission makes the details of that order known, anyone impacted, whether the proponent themselves or anyone in the public who feels is going to be impacted by the said operation, can write in expressing the grounds under which he wishes that order to be appealed. Upon that happening, then the Clean Environment Commission has to hold hearings.

MR. E. CONNERY: Is there automatically a hearing when there's an expansion or a new building? A new building, there would be. But when there's an expansion, is there automatically a Clean Environment hearing called?

HON. G. LECUYER: Just to correct a little bit, the process there. When the registration takes place, the Clean Environment Commission doesn't proceed immediately to write an order, I'm told. The Clean Environment Commission advertises its intention to the public, gives public notice to the effect that it intends to impose an order. At that point, there may be an intervention, in which case the Clean Environment Commission would hold hearings because any new operation or, for that matter, expansion that produces pollutants then is required to come under the order.

Specifically, the operation which the member referred to was already under an order, so they have to register in regard to an expansion of that operation. Objections were raised and the Clean Environment Commission is required, by the act, to hold public hearings.

MR. E. CONNERY: Was the objection submitted before the Clean Environment Commission advertised that it was having a hearing, or after?

HON. G. LECUYER: It would have to be registered before for the commission to be required to hold hearings.

MR. E. CONNERY: In this case, unless the newspaper article was wrong, it said that there had been no complaints.

HON. G. LECUYER: To confirm that, the article was wrong.

MR. E. CONNERY: You're confirming the article was wrong; people had complained? In the case of McCain's expansion, is the hearing to impose stricter regulations on it?

HON. G. LECUYER: Not necessarily. There was already an order on the existing operation. The registration of an expansion of an operation will create additional emissions and there will be a new order to an operation that is different than before. The new limits will apply to the whole industry with its expansion, not necessarily mean that there will be additional restrictions.

MR. E. CONNERY: In this case, the commission chairman wondered why a hearing was called. He questioned the Environment Department for having this hearing called. Can the Minister explain this?

HON. G. LECUYER: I don't know where the member got that information because no one is aware of this being the case, nor is there any reason for this to be the case because, as I explained before, it is a requirement for the commission to hold hearings on the basis of the fact that there was a public objector.

MR. E. CONNERY: Well, I'm concerned, Mr. Deputy Chairman, with the actions in this case. Will the minutes of the meeting be available, and do they keep exact minutes of what is being said at the hearings?

HON. G. LECUYER: All minutes are kept. All comments made in the public hearings, there's a transcript made of those, and the minutes are available to the public.

MR. E. CONNERY: Is it true, in the case of McCain's, they are attempting to impose residential standards on the company?

HON. G. LECUYER: First of all, let me indicate for the member that the commission, at this point in time, has just held its hearings; therefore, it hasn't made an order in applying to this expanded operation. So we're jumping the gun a little bit at this point in time.

Secondly, the Clean Environment Commission, in its order, takes into consideration, as I said, the impacts of that operation for the neighbouring environment. We're not referring here to residential limits or something like that. We're taking into consideration the environment on which it's going to impact. There's no such thing as referring to environmental limits.

Unless the member is referring to an operation, whether manufacturing or processing of some kind which originates as well from a private home, and I'm sure that's not what he's referring to, where, in imposing limits, the Clean Environment Commission will take into consideration, for instance, how this will affect the total community and how this will affect the local environment, the sewage capacity and what not.

MR. E. CONNERY: Are the standards that have been recommended here in File 1713.10, dated April 4th, are those industrial standards or residential standards?

HON. G. LECUYER: You're talking about the existing order in the operation. What the member gave to me is in those public hearings; invariably, the Department of Environment, just like members of the public, intervenes and makes its recommendations in front of the commission. Now, this is not the order that emanates from the commission.

MR. E. CONNERY: Well, in the letter from McCain's to the Clean Environment Commission, and we can photostat this for you after if your department hasn't got it - it's got the same files, so that has to be the same one - we are concerned that you are considering applying this residential limit to our operation.

HON. G. LECUYER: That's a comment, or fallacy perhaps, to use that kind of terminology. If the operation is in a residential area and will, therefore, impact on the residential area, the Clean Environment Commission certainly will take that into consideration, how it will impact; but to say that it is a residential type of limit more or less again would be a misnomer.

MR. E. CONNERY: Well, the Minister says it's a misnomer, but this person answering this letter is a professional engineer and I wouldn't suppose that he would err in his comments.

I have some real concerns that this McCain's plant, which is in an approved industrial park within the city of Portage la Prairie, the residents who complained are in a rural area of Manitoba, not within the city of Portage la Prairie, this company has been under a lot of undue harassment over some period of time, not necessarily from your department, but had been under a lot of fire.

This is one of the two largest employers, outside of the government, in the city of Portage la Prairie, and these businesses are very important. I think what you're finding is that a very small number of people - I mean you get them all the time that will complain about something regardless of what, and if you check in, that all of those people that have complained moved into that area after McCain's had established, and now you're going to put undue pressure and undue expense on a company that we value the need for in Manitoba. Maybe this explains why McCain's are putting their new juice plant up in Calgary. They are not going to take a look at Manitoba where we have adequate water for them.

HON. G. LECUYER: Well, Mr. Deputy Chairman, we can agree to disagree, but I think that the members of the commission take all that into consideration. The members of the commission are also reasonable people; when they are appointed, that's what they are appointed for.

The member makes these kinds of statements not even knowing at this point in time what the Clean Environment Commission is going to put in its new order for McCain's. McCain's was perfectly aware that it would be required to register with the Clean

Environment Commission when it proceeded to expand. There's nothing new there. These industries are familiar with the process and I don't see where the problem is.

Further, I should add that having taken that and all of these factors into consideration, it doesn't mean that we simply say, well, this industry wants to operate on these conditions and the commission is not going to automatically go along with that. Obviously the Clean Environment Commission, and that's why it's there, it has a responsibility to make sure that in making an order, that it is just and reasonable; that it will protect the environment for which it has been constituted as a commission; that is its role.

Now, as I said, when it does pass these orders, the McCain's, as all of these other industries, especially these larger operations, know perfectly well what recourse they have available and open to them because even at that point in time they can appeal if they feel that the order is unduly restrictive and it's not impacting to the extent that it was understood by the members of the commission, or they have evidence to the contrary, etc. So they can appeal that decision when that happens, but as I stated before, we'll just have the hearings. The commission is far from being at the level to pass an order.

MR. E. CONNERY: It was the Minister's department that initiated the hearing. If McCain's — (Interjection) — Yes, it was. If McCain's had not entertained an expansion, would the hearings have been called?

HON. G. LECUYER: If McCain's had not instituted the expansion, the hearings would not have been called. If, therefore, McCain's proceeded to expand, they knew that there would likely be hearings, therefore, I did not initiate these hearings. The process is in the legislation to that effect and it should not be put otherwise, the process I've explained.

MR. E. CONNERY: If they hadn't expanded, there would have been no hearing. Because they expanded and are creating more jobs and are going to buy more potatoes and contract in Manitoba in around the Portage area, they now could have more severe restrictions put on the existing plant than what was there before?

HON. G. LECUYER: That is pure hypothesizing speculation. I should correct one of my statements I made awhile ago, because even if they had not expanded, it would be possible for their existing order to be the subject of new hearings should there be complaints about their current operation, under the current order, so that is a possibility. But to say that they will have greater restrictions imposed upon them because they are expanding, this is certainly anticipating something that is not founded on any facts at this point in time.

MR. E. CONNERY: Obviously by the request of your department and the comments from McCain's, that you are considering applying this residential limit to our operations, what is happening is that you will be tending to discourage businesses from expanding. This government doesn't have one common thread of

understanding about business. I don't think they really care. They just seem to think that the pot is going to be always there.

You talk about creating jobs - these are the companies that create jobs. They shouldn't be allowed to indiscriminately pollute the air, the water and the ground, but also I think that the department is going a little hairy. I'm told by people involved with them that some of the officials are very pompous and very arrogant and are very domineering. This is not what we need to encourage business to come to this province and to expand in this province. We need to have a climate - which this government doesn't understand anything about climate.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the member is saying, what the member has is when a hearing takes place, there are comments that are made to the commission for expanding the restrictions, for limiting the restrictions. There are comments made. It's just like a court case and it is a quasi-judicial body and the member is saying, well, I want to make a case for one side of this issue and he's free to do so. But to go out and make some of the irresponsible comments I've just heard is uncalled for, because every one of the operations in Manitoba that produces pollutants to the environment is subject to Clean Environment order.

That is so in the other provinces, but we started a little bit late in that process of thinking about the environment, and as a result, Mr. Deputy Chairman, we find situations that the member knows too well in many parts of the country and many parts of other countries, the United States, Canada, Southern Ontario, in particular. To now say here is what the judge is going to decide in this particular situation - the Clean Environment Commission - I am going to make a statement, and that's the approach you're taking, on this decision they're going to make, which hasn't been made yet. To go on to say that this decision is going to be too severe and is going to be such that it prevents business from establishing themselves in Manitoba, is saying I'll only take one side of this issue. I won't consider the potential effects and if we do that, we find ourselves in the situation we did create 20, 30 years ago, and so forth, where there were no such measures or orders being passed on to various operations. If the member thinks that the environment or the public safety is going to be protected in that regard when there's just wide-open carte blanche for such operations, that would also be uncalled for.

MR. E. CONNERY: The Minister is very concerned about the environment. Why has it taken over a year - at last knowledge - have not started to clean up the dump that is upstream from the Portage la Prairie water plant? If the Minister is this concerned about the environment and its effects on the health of people, why did he not do something last summer when you knew about it? You just said you didn't have money and it was left and has still not been started; when the Minister, in the House, said they have started to clean up the dump, but in effect they have not started to clean up the dump.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the member chooses to jump from one issue to the next, but that

does not justify the statements he made before. What I am saying is they're not connected; and secondly, the member is putting words that I did not say in the House. I never said in the House that we did not tackle this issue because we didn't have the money to deal with it. I gave other reasons for that.

I said at the time this was brought to our attention, we wrote to the municipality to inform them of this. We asked them to clean up the process and there were intervals in there but the staff of the department, the public health inspector, were not in a position to fully analyze the situation of that operation until this spring. The member knows, based on that, we've resolved that because there was also another complicating factor because it had to be established who was the landowner and who were the guilty parties polluting this. So to jump from that particular example to the operation of the Clean Environment Commission is to compare oranges and apples.

MR. E. CONNERY: I think what it shows is the inconsistency of the Minister and the department. If it's a business that is making it, possibly, you jump with both feet very quick. When it's something the department has to recognize, it drags on.

I could also ask you: Have you approved for the city of Portage la Prairie to clean out the sludge out of the cells at the lagoon? Has this been approved yet?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would suggest that perhaps if the discussion is going on, I would remind the members of 64(2) and I will quote: "Speeches in a Committee of the Whole House must be strictly relevant to the item or clause under discussion." We are dealing here with the Clean Environment Commission. We've gotten a bit off track. I would . . .

MR. E. CONNERY: Listen, it's the Clean Environment Commission that sets the regulations and gives the approval. We're talking about the Clean Environment Commission and I want to know what you're doing in the Portage lagoon?

HON. G. LECUYER: Again you're correct, Mr. Chairman, because the dump has got nothing to do with the Clean Environment Commission; secondly, the Clean Environment Commission doesn't make any regulations. That is incorrect. It doesn't make any regulations.

MR. E. CONNERY: Are they not waiting for the Clean Environment Commission to allow them to clean out the cells at the Portage Lagoon?

HON. G. LECUYER: No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not exactly on the same train of thought . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: I want to correct one mistake I made. These particular sludge beds, cleaning is part and parcel of an overall agreement which the province

has with the City of Portage la Prairie. The member should know that the City of Portage la Prairie submitted its proposal three weeks ago approximately. The department is looking at that, and will have prepared its submission for the Clean Environment Commission, I am told, prior to mid-September. So the member is talking about lengthy delays, and he should know that the Clean Environment Commission and the department are not in a position to look at it and look at the specs of the actual proposal until they have it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Given that this does relate to the Clean Environment Commission, I think the member's line of questioning then is in order, from the Minister's response. Does the member have another question?

MR. E. CONNERY: I'm going to clarify some more information, and we'll ding him in the Salary section.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I was about to say that I'm not exactly on the same track as the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. What I am concerned about in the Environment is those people who are repetitive violators. I'm just wondering if it's the Clean Environment Commission that lays the order down, or is the judicial body tough enough on them?

HON. G. LECUYER: When an operation is under the Clean Environment order and that order is in place, there are no objectors, let's say, the operation then is required to live by the limits set forth in that order. If they violate the order, and especially if they repeat their violations, they're subject to the penalties that are in the act.

As the member is aware, as I mentioned in the opening remarks to my department, I have stated that we intend to proceed to table the White Paper or discussion bill at the end of the Session for reviewing The Clean Environment Act. In that particular review, we're also looking at increasing the penalties.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I have no hang-up at all on laying it on repetitive people who violate continuously and keep repeating it. I think the law is there to be obeyed.

Take some of these oil spills that we have had that have ended up in both the Assiniboine and the Red River in the past few years. If those people aren't prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law, I think that we're not carrying out what we should be doing.

HON. G. LECUYER: I don't disagree with the member, and I hope he'll pass that on to his colleague from Portage la Prairie. On the other hand, when we're talking about a spill, about something that comes under an order, there is legislation though. It can come under legislation and, whenever we can identify the source based on investigations, the costs of the operation can be charged back to the guilty party. There again, because of the penalties that are provided for in the act, they can be prosecuted on that basis as well.

MR. R. NORDMAN: Thank you.

Monday, 21 July, 1986

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

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

I would like to talk about a specific case in my area. There's an abattoir just southeast of Plum Coulee, and some of you are going to be familiar with it. It's called Pioneer Meats; it's a fairly large operation. It's run by Mr. Bernie Penner; he's the owner. He employs 17 people, and they're doing a good job for the community.

Recently you received a complaint from one of his neighbours that there was some odour coming from the place and, as a result of that, he has been asked to do all kinds of things. I don't remember just exactly what all he told me he was supposed to do. Anyhow, he told me it would take him three days to comply with all the wishes of Clean Environment, all the questions that they had been asking as a result of this one complaint.

Two years ago, he did everything that Clean Environment asked him to. He built two cells; he purchased 17 acres of land; he spent \$115,000 to comply with all the rules and regulations Clean Environment wanted at that particular time. He runs a very clean operation. The place is absolutely spotless, and I can recommend this place highly.

Mr. Penner is also a very hot-tempered person. If people have anything to do with him, they will know. So it's always a matter of trying to smooth things over. So I asked him, would he be happy if Clean Environment came down to inspect the place and take a look at it, rather than him spending all that time, which I know he doesn't have. The man is busy. He tries to do as much of his business as he personally can. He even goes and delivers a lot of the meat himself personally whenever he has time.

So I asked him, would he be happy if Clean Environment would come down, inspect the place and, if there were any recommendations to be made, make them or whatever. He said that he would be more than happy if they were to do this. That would take the onus off his back. It would save him the particular time that he was supposed to spend looking after all the questions which have been asked by your different departments.

So I would request, Mr. Minister, send your people out there. Take a look at the place, and I'm sure that you're going to be impressed. If there are any changes to be made, I think that you'll be able to deal with Mr. Penner.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, I would say, first of all, that the Clean Environment Commission doesn't do these inspections to determine whether any operation complies with the order they've passed on it. That is the responsibility of Environmental Controls, to determine . . .

MR. A. BROWN: Okay, then send them out.

HON. G. LECUYER: All that I can say is, there is an order on this operation. I know that there were charges laid in 1985 for non-compliance of the order in regard to the sewage lagoon operation. New facilities, the member indicated, were built. We know that odors were a problem.

It may help Mr. Penner in his operation if he were to do as was suggested, that he should register his

new facility under the act and then there could be a new order, which would take into consideration his new facility. The results of that order may vary from the existing order on the operation.

MR. A. BROWN: In order for him to register his new facility, how much of his time is this going to take? This is what he was complaining about. He says that he doesn't have that kind of time.

HON. G. LECUYER: Mr. Chairman, that takes about two-and-a-half minutes. All he has to do is indicate it, like saying that he so wishes to have his facility registered, and that's it.

MR. A. BROWN: All he has to say is that he wishes to have it registered, and then what happens?

HON. G. LECUYER: I understand there's a two-page form that he has to fill in and then the department would then go into action.

MR. A. BROWN: Is the department then going to go out to inspect the place to see whether everything is okay?

HON. G. LECUYER: Most certainly.

MR. A. BROWN: Will the man then have to appear before the Clean Environment Commission at any time, take time off his work to spend time here?

HON. G. LECUYER: Then the normal process kicks in. If there are no objectors to the operation, there are no hearings that would take place. That leaves the possibility that there are hearings that can take place and if the hearings take place, he can intervene, or he doesn't have to, and the Clean Environment Commission will base its - there's not a strict requirement that he would appear but I would suppose that if there were hearings, he would normally appear in front of the Clean Environment Commission and state his case.

MR. A. BROWN: Have any of the people involved with the department presently been out there to inspect his facility recently, after he's made the changes?

HON. G. LECUYER: Yes, the last time, two weeks ago.

MR. A. BROWN: Two weeks ago, okay. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3(a) — the Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Can the Honourable Minister advise whether an action by the Clean Environment Commission can take place with one complaint, or do you require more than one complaint? Obviously, in the City of Winnipeg, if I've got a complaint of some activities in the playground behind my home, I phone the police and that activity is investigated, but that's just by one complaint. Do citizens outside of the City of Winnipeg have the same right to complain to the Clean Environment Commission and have the same type of action take place? Is there secrecy within the

Clean Environment Commission as to who makes the complaint?

HON. G. LECUYER: The act states any person who is affected or likely to be affected by an Order of the Commission under subsection (1), and I'm reading a section here, 15(3), and wishes to make representation to the commission may, not later than the date set out in the notice, in writing, so notify to the commission. Therefore the commission, based on that, would hold hearings.

I want to indicate to the member that the commission held 13 public hearings in the 1985-86 fiscal year, and they issued 35 orders. So, by far, the majority of the orders are issued without any complaints or any hearings having taken place.

The enforcement that the member touched upon is not a responsibility of the commission. The commission acts very much like sort of a court system and that's why it's also called a quasi-judicial body. It passes the orders and it's the department that has the responsibility to enforce these orders.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I am kind of concerned that we, private citizens of the Province of Manitoba, have so much power where we can initiate great government agencies into action by writing a written complaint. Now, are there any safeguards if these complaints are unfounded or unwarranted? How does the Clean Environment Commission screen some of these complaints?

HON. G. LECUYER: The various operations, of whatever type we would want to mention, do not trigger Clean Environment Commission involvement in regard to such a complaint because one has been made. It's only when an operation is being set up initially, or transformed, and when they register with the Clean Environment Commission, which then gives notice that it intends to establish an order on that operation, that objectors would complain.

Now, an existing operation which is under Clean Environment order, even though there is a complaint, that will not trigger a Clean Environment hearing. The example I gave, in terms of the number of hearings that took place versus the number of orders this year, illustrates that. Complaints can be frequent.

I suppose, if the complaints were very frequent on a particular operation and the department were to assess that indeed the operation does cause a problem, that operation would then be prosecuted, or under unusual circumstances, it might trigger that the Minister call for new hearings, but that's under unusual circumstances. We would have to verify, through investigations, that the complaints are founded.

So the Clean Environment Commission doesn't receive these complaints on environmental problems. None of the ones received such complaints. We're only talking about an operation that is new, or being transformed, which has been registered with the Clean Environment Commission and upon which the Clean Environment Commission indicates that it intends to pass an order. So it's not the run-of-the-mill complaints that we're talking about.

MR. A. KOVNATS: We had an expansion in a rendering plant over in St. Boniface where the owners, who are

good citizens inasmuch as they were developing their plant and I think spending somewhere around \$2 million in developing their plant and hoping to lessen some of the problems that were there, the smell and things of that nature, and the disposal into the sewer, you know, when it was that hot effluent and I think they were cooling it down. I think they have corrected some of the problems that were there and that people were complaining about, but I didn't notice any Clean Environment Commission meeting covering that. There was an expansion in the plant obviously, and I think the results would have been to this company's great credit.

But what the Minister has just said to me a little earlier, that if somebody had complained about it, that it would have to be investigated, not by choice; it would be a demand by somebody making a complaint because of the expansion in the plant. There have got to be some safeguards in this regard is what I'm suggesting to the Minister. The Minister, I think, has told me that there are no safeguards.

Can he tell us at this point how many spite complaints and spite letters, the type of spite letters that were sent in for the commission to investigate, that the commission has rejected offhand as saying that they're spiteful and just no need to investigate?

HON. G. LECUYER: I repeat something that I said before. First of all, the commission doesn't investigate any of these complaints. It's the . . .

MR. A. KOVNATS: A complaint comes in, action has to be taken by whom?

HON. G. LECUYER: The department, the environmental controls, inspectors in the department would be the ones investigating any problems. If there is an existing order and it is established that there are violations of that order and repeated violations of that order, the operation can be prosecuted. Under the existing provisions of the act, there is no involvement of the Clean Environment Commission in that process.

Now, I repeat again, if it's a new operation or expansion of an operation that is going to cause emissions to the environment, then they are required to register with the department, register with the department, and . . .

MR. A. KOVNATS: Who's your new Deputy Minister going to be?

HON. G. LECUYER: We sometimes get those two interchanged, but it's with the department.

MR. A. KOVNATS: That's okay, I made a mistake quite some time back too.

HON. G. LECUYER: There's no one infallible here; even I make sometimes a few.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I've noticed, Mr. Minister.

HON. G. LECUYER: Rarely. As I say, if it's a new operation, then they register with the department, the department will get its information to submit to the

Monday, 21 July, 1986

Clean Environment Commission and then the process that I have explained already is triggered.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Can the Honourable Minister give me some idea as to the difference between - and I don't want to jump to the next part of it right away - but the difference between the Clean Environment Commission and the Manitoba Environmental Council? What are the duties of the council that are different from the commission? I know because they have to go through hearings also.

HON. G. LECUYER: The Manitoba Environmental Council is an advisory body which consists entirely of volunteers except for a secretary. There are other members on the council, and they are an advisory council which throughout the year studies various issues, prepares briefs and reports which are available, then released and made available to the public, but they are there as an advisory body which is very much a little bit the conscience - I guess that's a proper word - of the population. There are people on there from every walk of life who are interested and concerned about environmental issues and are there to provide advice in all areas of environmental issues, whereas the commission is a duly appointed body by the legislature.

The Manitoba Environmental Council doesn't generally hold any meetings, or hearings - they do have meetings. I suppose the Minister could ask the Environmental Council on a very broad issue to hold somewhat like hearings. I don't know that, that hasn't occurred during my period as Minister. I don't know that there is any provision in the law that prevents this from happening; I don't think there is. I see that from the nods that is correct, so they could, but they don't generally hold hearings.

MR. A. KOVNATS: To get back to the Clean Environment Commission, salaries are \$198,700.00. The Honourable Minister had suggested that there was one chairman who was full time, two secretaries . . .

HON. G. LECUYER: There is a chairman, an executive secretary, a technical advisor, two administrative secretaries and five members to the commission. Now the last part of that . . .

MR. A. KOVNATS: Okay, let's take a look at the salaries of the five members of the commission. What type of remuneration do they receive?

HON. G. LECUYER: The members of the commission are not paid a salary at all. They are paid a commission for when they are called upon to sit on the hearings, or deliberate on the hearings, to prepare their report and are paid a per diem of \$100 a day.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I think we can move to No. 4.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(a)—pass; 3.(b)—pass.

Resolution No. 64: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$327,200 for Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, Clean Environment Commission, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

We're now on Item 4, Manitoba Environmental Council — the Member for Niakwa.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Okay, the Environmental Council — this is that group of 100, approximately, good citizens who relieve the Minister of making decisions and are very, very responsible people who have a background in environment.

One thing that comes to mind is that I was out in a location in a park in the eastern part of the province, I think that the Manitoba Environmental Council had made some recommendations to keep it pure for environmentalists, whereas no motorized vehicles could enter into this park and there would be no hunting or fishing. It would be a straight environmental . . .

MR. D. SCOTT: My kind of park.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Well fair enough then. I think the Member for Inkster was involved with it in that case.

At that time, I wasn't against preserving particularly wildlife areas so that it could stay pure as the beaten snow somewhere in the future. What I suggested at that time when I was first involved is, you know, you're restricting the ability of people like my dad, who was still alive at the time, to go into a location like that because he wasn't able to backpack because of his age. He was 93. There have got to be all kinds of other people who were in the same type of boat, figuratively speaking.

Then it came a little closer to home where I had a touch of gout, and I couldn't walk in. Now it's starting to get to be a little bit more important to me. Why wouldn't I be allowed to take advantage of this natural resource in the Province of Manitoba, and my lack of health or ability to walk would hinder me from taking advantage of it. I'm not against providing the environmentalists with some location like this, but I think we're talking about 200, 300, 400 or 500 people, 1,000 people maybe, when we've got tens of thousands who can't take advantage of it because of their health and their age.

HON. G. LECUYER: Well there is a policy in place with the classification of parks in the Province of Manitoba and the various types of uses that are to be made in those parks under each one of those classifications. The member probably knows the classification better than I know it, because that doesn't come under my department. It comes under the Department of Natural Resources.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I didn't see the Minister of Natural Resources there when I was out investigating.

HON. G. LECUYER: I'm not in a position to comment too much on it, except to say these various classifications are there exactly for that purpose, to try and make available for Manitobans from all walks of life different types of parks to meet different types of interests. Although one particular park may be designated as wilderness, another may be designated as multiple use. The member knows, for instance, the distinction between Atikaki and the Whiteshell. They're not in the same category.

Monday, 21 July, 1986

As I say, I know those differences, and I know the restrictions that are imposed. I think they are there for good reasons. They are there because we don't want to overexploit, cause to disappear some of these natural resources which we have, and are very precious to the heritage of Manitoba. But having said that, I end those remarks by saying what I said at the very beginning. That comes under Natural Resources.

MR. A. KOVNATS: The terms of reference for this commission, they are to prescribe ". . . terms and conditions on the emission of contaminants to the environment."

HON. G. LECUYER: That was the Clean Environment Commission. We're now under the Manitoba Environmental Council, and the member will have probably seen their annual report which I tabled in the House for 1985, this copy here. This is the body which is the advisory body to the Minister, which the Minister appoints from a broad spectrum of society based on recommendations coming from various sources. A number of organizations recommend people to be appointed on there.

The Minister, you may appreciate, doesn't get even to meet all hundred of these members. They come from various parts of Manitoba. They have an executive body or board of directors. As I say, they present briefs with application to Environment and Natural Resources. They hold special functions, and prepare special position papers on various documents, for instance, the Federal Water Policy Issues document. They will hold meetings in various parts of the province. They will hold meetings on specific topics to provide information and to gather information, and be able to arrive at recommendations that they will make in these briefs and reports to the Minister.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I can see where this relieves the Minister of a lot of responsibilities, inasmuch as if he makes a decision and it's not quite as acceptable to the public, then he can always use the excuse, well my advisers told me to do so.

It's the same thing that's going to happen a little bit later on when we come to the sites for hazardous materials. I know the Minister is going to say, well it's not just my decision. I had some recommendations from the Environmental Council, and I also had some recommendations from some people that were there. But the Minister cannot shirk his responsibilities. He's got to give the final stamp of approval on all of these locations somewhere in the future, so the Minister is not going to get off scot-free. He is going to have to make the final decision, regardless of whether he's got these hundred people on the Environmental Council who, I'm sure, aren't giving him lip-service.

I think that, when they join that Environmental Council, they really believe that their recommendations are going to be adhered to, regardless of whether they are politically acceptable or not. But we know better. The Minister will not accept them if they're not politically acceptable. They are just going through the motions.

What type of remuneration do the people from the Environmental Council get? Do they get so much a meeting, or do they just get one banquet a year and

a slap on the back, and are led to believe that they are really contributing?

HON. G. LECUYER: The member got to a question at the end, but he made a few comments before, I think, that I have to deal with as well. I'm not so sure the member was saying that I have to take the blame for not dealing with the recommendations they make, or I have to take the blame for dealing with them. The member was right. He did tell me when we began this that he would have it both ways; he is.

The Environmental Council is indeed a voluntary body. They do not get remuneration, not even a per diem. That's why I certainly felt I would have been remiss for not paying them a complimentary remark at the beginning, because I think they do good work. They do it because they are people interested in the people of Manitoba, in the welfare of Manitoba, in the environment of Manitoba. They do make recommendations frequently with expectations that things will happen like tomorrow, and they would like to see actions taking place as quickly as possible.

I can understand them making recommendations where they see such is required. We have to operate within the framework of our mandate and within the framework of the priorities and the budget that is set, so we cannot always move as rapidly as we would like to.

On the other hand, I do assure the member that it is certainly not my intention and he knows that, to shirk my responsibility in making the decisions that are part of my responsibilities as Minister for the department. The member knows of examples where the Clean Environment Commission, the Manitoba Environmental Council intervene and I can give him examples. For instance, on this nuclear waste disposal issue, on the Atikaki Park, examples on which we certainly were acting even before the Environmental Council intervened. I can say that I was entirely in agreement with their recommendations. In fact, we were acting and have acted on those. Now, as I say, the Environmental Council has subcommittees, there are a hundred people. The areas of interest and concern are broad and therefore we cannot put in place or act entirely and always as quickly as they would like but I take that responsibility.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Well, I've got to agree with the Minister when it comes to the recommendation on that Red River Basin site for nuclear disposal so we agree on that completely, and the Environmental Council, I'm sure, agreed with it too.

But it says here, it says Public Forum on Forestry in Manitoba. I'd like to be specific on the Public Forum on Forestry in Manitoba. This is all advice, they have public forums and advice has come back to the Minister. Is the advice on the allocation of who gets cutting rights on trees? Does it come to that? Does it come to the rehabilitation of areas that have been cut out? Does it come to the rehabilitation and the control of acid rain? Is this all part of this forum that they had on forestry in Manitoba or are they just going through the motions? Again, I'm just trying to establish the importance of this Council.

HON. G. LECUYER: Again, I repeat the Environmental Council deals with all areas that might impact on the

environment and some of those briefs and recommendations they make sometime affect, for instance, energy development, sometimes affect forest resources or other resources or trapping for that matter, the use of park land, or other Crown lands. Some of these recommendations have a direct bearing on the department for which I'm responsible. Some of it come under the responsibilities of other departments. For instance, we're talking about the use of forestry resources. When invariably the Environmental Council makes recommendations which are beyond my responsibility as Minister responsible for Environment, Workplace Safety and Health - what I do in those cases is I submit a letter with their brief to the Minister who is responsible and request a reply. Hopefully, that reply will also indicate the actions that have already been taken or are contemplated or will be contemplated on the basis of the recommendations of the council.

MR. A. KOVNATS: These people seem to have a responsibility. The Honourable Minister should at least maybe send them a Christmas card, a nice Christmas card. I see that they are entitled to go to national forums with other environmental councils so I think we're talking about expense paid trips to some location. So they're really not doing it just out of the goodness of their hearts. I know that I would imagine last year, you know, you're probably going to cut me right down and tell me last year this national council was held at Portage la Prairie, and they didn't really get that good of a trip out of it. Each year I would think that the trips get farther and farther apart and their expenses are paid so, in effect, they're given more than a Christmas card and a thank you. I think that the Honourable Minister would like to comment as to what trips and how many people are sent to these national forums.

HON. G. LECUYER: I wish I could say that we are more generous with the Environmental Council. I have to say to the member that for the first time last year as part of the budget, which is a rather small budget, as you will notice in '86-87, the budgeted amount for the Environmental Council is a total of \$59,400, and we're talking about a council that has 100 members and two staff and therefore you can see the salaries are eating most of that.

Their budgeted amount for transportation is \$3,000 and that is for within Manitoba to come to these forums. They try to hold one meeting in the North a year, so that leaves very little for any outside-the-province travel which I think they should have; unfortunately, as I say, that leaves very little. Last year, for instance, some of the members of the board of the council attended a few meetings and I can give you an example of a meeting they attended recently, the World Conservation Conference in Ottawa, which was following right after the Bruntland Commission meeting in Ottawa or the World Conference on Environment and Economic Development. In fact, there were three or four various meetings taking place in succession in Ottawa which made it absolutely an ideal opportunity for the members of the council to attend; not the whole council, as I say. I believe there were one or two, three members attended that particular one, and that's the sum total of what they'll be able to do approximately this year.

In order to be able to live within the limit of the amount of funding that they have, they have to live with friends or acquaintances and pay part of their own travel cost to attend them. So that's how much is spent; it's very little.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)—pass.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I just want to thank the Honourable Minister for some of the information that he had given me. There are questions that I had asked him last Thursday, and I appreciate that. In the information under Beverage Containers where it says can sales, in Manitoba it was \$150 million a year and the figure that we were given by the Honourable Minister was \$80 million. Now I'm given a figure of \$150 million - which figure is correct? That's total beer cans and soft drink cans?

HON. G. LECUYER: I believe that factor contains the beverage aluminum cans plus others. The \$80 million referred only to the aluminum beverage cans. This refers to - it's that, plus. I expect also the beer cans and the other cans as well.

MR. A. KOVNATS: All right. We'll get back to it later.

HON. G. LECUYER: And confirm that that's the case.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)—pass; 4.(b)—pass.

Resolution No. 65: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$59,400 for Environment and Workplace Safety and Health, Manitoba Environmental Council for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1987—pass.

We now will interrupt the Proceedings for Private Members' Hour and return at 8:00 p.m.

SUPPLY - HEALTH

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

We are on 2.(b)(1) Communicable Disease Control: Salaries, under Community Health Services (Programs) — the Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I take it that some of the questions that the Minister accepted last Thursday, the answers for them aren't available at this time? If they're not, we'll get them later on today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The main question that I remember was that my honourable friend wanted to know some of the work, the document that the Directorate of Research and Planning was doing. I've got the original thing but I'm trying to get copies made so that I can give them to the two on the Official Opposition, and one to the - I don't remember any other questions. The affirmative action is not quite ready.

I believe that the ADM, you wanted to know the expense for the ADM? We'll get that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, is this an area where the monitoring, the chicken monitoring flocks for

encephalitis, that's part of it as well? — (Interjection)
— Very good.

Mr. Chairman, first off, it's my understanding that under Communicable Diseases, a grant for \$80,000, and my numbers may be off slightly, was given to the U of M, presumably the Faculty of Medicine, to do an epidemiological study in the North. Was this grant in fact made through this appropriation to the U of M?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if my honourable friend could be a little more specific. Does he know the nature of the grant or for what kind of research?

MR. D. ORCHARD: I'm told it was a grant to the U of M to do an epidemiological study in the North, for \$80,000.00.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the closest thing to that, that we can find, after consultation, is not a grant. There is a contract that we have with the university, not just for the North, but to give us some advice in epidemiology. I have the same trouble, even more, with that word than my honourable friend. That's the only thing, but we are hiring a doctor at this time, an epidemiologist. But that was strictly a contract with the university, not a grant, to provide the doctors and that with counselling assistance.

MR. D. ORCHARD: My terminology, no doubt, was what caused the problem. Grant, contract, basically an \$80,000 study. I know that the department here has some substantial expertise, for instance, Dr. Stanwick, Dr. Fast herself, as being quite highly capable in those areas. Immediately, when we're talking about budget constraints, the question was posed: Why was this one contracted out at a fairly sizable sum, and providing the \$80,000 is correct, when this line in the department, or this branch in the department has expertise that could quite easily undertake that kind of a study in-house?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: To start with, Dr. Stanwick, who you referred to, is exactly one of those who works for the university, not for us. He was one of the ones hired. There's only Dr. Fast, and I could add that given a total staff of 16 on one line, and exactly, because of that one that we haven't filled for awhile has been a medical officer. So those things have to be concerned. Although we're going to hire one, there's an agreement that the Federal Government, will pay the salary of a doctor that will assist. In fact, he's in place now, isn't he? It's not one of the 16. It's an agreement - the agreement hasn't been signed yet between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government but the doctor is here in place and working with Dr. Fast.

We must remember also that Dr. Fast was fairly new with that item. The expertise was there with the doctor in that capacity - she replaced Dr. Eadie in November. There's been quite a bit of work with AIDS and all the other problems that we've had.

Anyway, there won't be any contract this year, contracting out this year.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Let me make sure I understand the Minister's answer. The Minister is indicating that

the Federal Government is providing a portion, or a major portion of the \$80,000 for which the University of Manitoba is contracting to undertake the study?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I would not want to mislead my honourable friend or the members of the committee. The deal with the Federal Government has not been signed yet. The doctor is here at this time and that will be paid by the Federal Government.

Now, the contract that we had last year will not be renewed - it won't be the same doctor - this is where I want to make sure that we understand each other. There is a contract with the university for a Dr. Young, that will provide some services, because we haven't got enough people or the expertise - it's quite a field - to give us the help needed in The Pas.

MR. D. ORCHARD: From the Minister's answer, do I assume that the \$80,000 contract, no funds will flow this year, that they have already flowed from last year's and the study has been completed or is the study in process?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We have a contract that the university can cover the whole province giving us the advice, and now that there is a contract, it's not the same doctor. It's a Dr. Young that provides the assistance needed in The Pas.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And this Dr. Young is undertaking at the university, under contract, the epidemiological studies. Is that fair to say?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We don't know anything about a study. It's not a study, it's service that we're contracting for. And the 80, approximately - it looks like that amount - that again was service, no grant for study.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So then what the Minister is indicating then is that a portion of the delivery of service under Communicable Disease Control has been contracted out to the University of Manitoba for programmed delivery in the North, out of The Pas.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Actually there is delivery of some of the service dealing with Communicable Disease, but you wouldn't find that there. That would probably be on what we just passed, Program Support. That is under the ADM and it's not only Communicable Disease, it's on the work and that'll be done in The Pas on a contract, hired on a contract through the university people who are paid by the university, a contract with the university for their service.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I have to admit that I'm getting more confused as to what is happening with the University of Manitoba and where the money flows from, because under Program Support, the ADM's office, there's presumably a contract would not be included in Salaries; and presumably it would be included in Other Expenditures, which have gone down, and total \$113,900 in total.

That seems to me to not leave room for an \$80,000 contractual arrangement with the University of

Monday, 21 July, 1986

Manitoba. Where do the funds flow from for this \$80,000 contract with the University of Manitoba?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I thought I'd made that clear that we're contracted with the university for people working for the university that then are assigned, because they're paid by the university to provide this service.

It's not for research or study at all. It is for actually providing the service. The information that I'm given is that we have some funds, but there is also an unfilled position such as the one that I mentioned earlier, the medical doctor that we haven't filled, and part of the funds have come from there to assist us until we can recruit the type of person that we want. It's not that easy. Maybe that's where the confusion comes. I'll try to cover the whole subject.

Further than that, we are fortunate now that this was a program that had been done for awhile, for a number of years on and off, wasn't being done at this time, but with the Federal Government; they are paying for the wages of a doctor. This is an agreement between the two levels of government. That agreement hasn't been signed yet, but I'm told that doctor, that specialist is here now working with Dr. Fast. That is paid by the Federal Government.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That still hasn't told us where the monies come from. If they come from the Federal Government, does that mean the Federal Government pays the salary of the doctor, or is it paid by the Department of Health and should show as shows on other lines Recoverable from Canada? What's the circumstance?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I think the confusion is, that was added information that I gave, that we will have an agreement. The agreement has not been signed yet; it's been agreed to, obviously, that we get a doctor paid for by the Federal Government, period. Forget that now. They pay directly; that has nothing to do with the next.

We have two contracts with the university, to get help or to get part-time help to deliver the services, strictly for services. We're contracting for services and it's not the same need as we had before last year. This year it is in The Pas. There could be a line for outside contracting, but we haven't filled the position that's in part of the 19, under the Program Support, under the Deputy Minister; and there is Chief Medical Officer of Health that we haven't filled yet and we've been using some of that money for that contract for that agreement.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, Mr. Chairman, I think I understand now how the money is flowing to the University of Manitoba. It's really use of what would be a salary appropriation. While the position is not being filled, the services are contracted with the University of Manitoba and are flowing from line 2.(a)(1), presumably in part. Then none of the additional funds, if any, would flow from 2.(b)(2), Other Expenditures in the appropriation that we're dealing with now.

I see staff nodding their heads saying no.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It could be in the same, under 2. somewhere, other positions that aren't filled.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I have some questions to the Minister dealing with chlamydia trachomatis. Can the Minister indicate the number of chlamydia cases which have been . . . What's the most recent statistic on reported chlamydia cases in the Province of Manitoba, and if it was possible to provide a breakdown as to the male/female incidents of those reported cases of chlamydia today?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We have the total cases. We haven't got it here - we probably could provide that, the difference between male and female. The total cases were 3,094 for this year. There's been a tremendous increase, more than 100 percent over the previous year.

MR. D. ORCHARD: When the Minister indicates, for this year, do I assume from the answer that might be a January 1 to June 30 figure of cases reported of 3,094?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: This would be 1985, so it would be for the calendar year 1985. I might as well give you the actual for 1984 which was 1,017 to 3,094 for the calendar year 1985. That's actual in both cases.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister might not have this, but the most recent information I had indicated 974 cases of chlamydia from the period January 1 to June 30, 1985 and the complete year saw the figure rise to 3,094.

Does the Minister have preliminary figures for the first six months, say, of 1986, the current year that we're in? Are there any current figures available?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We'll check to see if we can provide that. We'll have that for the next meeting, if we can. One thing that I can say at this time that the trend is that it's still increasing.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, given . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I think it's important to say this, and I apologize to my honourable friend, it's important to say this that it is not necessarily that these are all new cases. They are identified more readily than previously, where they might have been lumped in with all venereal diseases. I think there's been quite a bit of progress in that. It's certainly not that much of a jump of something new or more disease than in the past.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that last piece of information I think is understood. Now it's my understanding that chlamydia, particularly in women, can have some fairly severe long-term repercussions to their reproductive abilities, I guess is as easy a way to put it as any, and furthermore that the disease itself, the infection chlamydia, the pathogen is a relatively easily controllable pathogen. In other words, positive identification of chlamydia and subsequent prescription of medication is almost 100 percent certain of bringing the infection under control and ceasing its detrimental effects to the individual who is so infected but, more importantly, prevents further spread of chlamydia through sexual contact.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that some of the statistics the Minister has brought up between 1984 and 1985 calendar years, if one did not factor out or was not aware of a greater awareness within the medical profession, one would say we had an epidemic on our hands because there's a better than tripling of the reported cases from 1984 calendar year to 1985 calendar year. I realize that part of it is detection of, say, carriers who are carrying chlamydia as a symptomatic infection where they're not showing the disease symptoms visibly or are physically affected by it and they are acting as carriers.

Mr. Chairman, with similar sexually transmitted diseases, such as syphilis and gonorrhoea, they are under the purview as reportable diseases and hence their tracing within the population has assured, for instance, that gonorrhoea is on the decline in the Province of Manitoba and I believe nationally is on the decline in most provinces.

As it stands right now, chlamydia is not a reportable disease, and given its serious medical problems it can cause in terms of particularly women who are infected with it, and given that it is, to date, a relatively easy infection to treat through medication, would the Minister indicate whether consideration is being given to making chlamydia a reportable disease so that we can basically undertake its eradication and its control in a much similar and as effective a way as we have with other STD's such as syphilis and gonorrhoea?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The indication that my honourable friend gives to the committee is exact. It is very serious but it is something that can be preventable quite easily and can be treated quite reasonably - I'm talking about the costs now - and that's why it is important to identify them. It was in 1981 that the department started a pilot project, a registry, to try to see if it was a problem and they found out that it really was, like my honourable friend also said that it's much more than gonorrhoea probably.

Yes, AIDS and chlamydia are in the process of being classified as recordable diseases. We have to go through the regulations committee, as my honourable friend knows, and that's where it is now. From the information that I've been given, it was in roughly a month or so there should be on the both of them; but especially in the case of AIDS, we've had excellent cooperation from the medical profession, and Dr. Fast knows the specialist that has been referred to - the question of AIDS - and we feel that all the cases that have been reported, although it hasn't been compulsory at this time, but it will be fairly soon.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I have to tell the Minister that I can concur completely with the urgency of the situation and with the government's apparent reaction to it, because in December of 1985, I held a press conference. We weren't in Session then and that was the only opportunity or the only vehicle by which I could voice my concern. At that time I made the recommendation to the Minister that chlamydia become a reportable disease so that we could get on with the control of that.

I simply urge him, as part of the commitment to cooperation I gave him beforehand, to proceed with

making chlamydia a reportable disease as quickly as possible so that we can get on with the very important job of protecting the health of women from STD's in the Province of Manitoba, chlamydia being a very new and, seemingly, a very rapidly spreading STD.

So the Minister has full support on this side of the House for those efforts and I thank him for his announcement that may well be a fact by regulation within the next several months.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move on now to the area of AIDS. We discussed it briefly last year when we got into Estimates in this particular line. Last year the AIDS discussion focused around two primary areas, as I recall. First of all was the incidence of not only Manitobans who are positively identified as suffering from the AIDS syndrome but also those who have present in their immune system the antibody which indicates exposure to the AIDS virus.

At that time there was no mechanism in place, and given that AIDS is a somewhat different disease, if you will, from other STD's in that there may be a prevalence of AIDS exposure to the gay community, there was some concerns about the confidentiality of the normal reportable disease inclusion in that under, as I understand the provisions of the current reportable diseases such as syphilis or gonorrhoea or other STD's, that reporting and identification is done by name so that contact group research and investigation can be undertaken, so that you can trace population exposure to the STD's that I have referred to. Such by-name identification in AIDS caused the Human Rights Commission and the gay community some problems, in that they wanted to avoid personal identification because of potential recrimination from employers, etc., etc.

Now it's my further understanding that the Minister has, in conjunction with this branch of his department, established an encoding system whereby, not individuals who suffer from the AIDS syndrome, but rather those who are exposed to the antibody and are LTV positive in their identification, that those individuals are now identified by an encoding system.

Now at the same time last year, the Minister might recall that we got into a discussion on the PHIN number, the personal health insurance number. It was our understanding that the PHIN number would be a quite secure identification system used internally within the department to trace an individual's medical history for whatever purposes that may have been necessary to do. Our concern, of course, on this side of the House was in terms of the security of the PHIN number because basically, when you have the entire medical record of you for instance, Mr. Chairman, accessible by a nine-digit PHIN number, personal health insurance number, and a computer would automatically spill your particular circumstances up on a display screen for the world to see, security of course was of the utmost concern.

It would appear as if one of two things has happened. If the security of the PHIN number was assured, then one would have been able to make the assumption that the PHIN number would have been adequate in identifying AIDS-positive Manitobans who are carrying the antibodies indicating exposure to the AIDS virus. But since the Minister and his department have developed a second encoding system, a new one specific presumably to AIDS, I'd be pleased if the

Monday, 21 July, 1986

Minister could answer what happened to the security provisions in the PHIN number that it couldn't be used for AIDS identification. Secondly, what is involved in the new encoding system used for AIDS specifically which guarantees its security, for instance, over the PHIN number to all Manitobans?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, those who have the disease of AIDS - eight so far have been known since this has started - now they are known by name because that's pretty well public knowledge. There is no problem there, and that has been discussed with the gay community also. This is acceptable.

The PHIN number is safe, but the name is known to the Commission. The name of the patient is known to the Commission, and it is safe. It'll be used in the hospitals and different areas like that. It's to get the information. Whereas the code number, why we are not using PHIN here, the name is known only to the doctor and the patient himself. So the Commission has no record of name. It's number so and so; Dr., your number so and so, when there is a test from the Cadham Lab or in certain cases the Blue Cross. This is the situation that there would be a code. Nobody in the department or the Commission would have the name. It would be just the particular patient and his or her doctor.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that seems to be an accommodation that has been worked out with the gay community, for instance, as a potential group that has a greater than average exposure to AIDS syndrome, and is designed to provide the strictest of confidence within that community. That still begs the question to the Minister as to the assurance of security on the whole PHIN number system.

It certainly appears to me now that the PHIN number - because bear in mind each Medicare enrollee is already identified by your Medicare number which every one of us probably has on our Medicare card. We get back into the argument of just what the purpose is of the PHIN number, and indeed how secure that PHIN number is. For instance, if the PHIN number is there - and I'll speculate basis the Minister's answers last year - it's there to enable, for instance, certain research to be done so that incidence of disease can be regionalized to see whether there is a regional incidence higher than normal for, let's say, certain types of cancer as they might apply to the workplace. Presumably, that would be a legitimate reason to do research needing some form of identification number.

But similarly, Mr. Chairman, if that kind of research is necessary, I guess it begs the question of the Minister then: is there a cross-reference mechanism between the PHIN number, which presumably each Manitoban now has, and the new encoded number that the Minister has provided by the physician whose patient has been identified as AIDS virus positive? That would allow the true research, the association of groups, to determine whether AIDS is something that can be transmitted beyond a very narrow group of Manitobans that current medical wisdom says is the case. We seem to be at odds in terms of justifying the PHIN number by establishing a new and separate code for the AIDS.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The PHIN numbers are considered safe as far as the Commission is concerned

and as far as we're concerned. It is true that they have the names, but that is not given to anybody without the permission of the doctor and the patient and so on.

My honourable friend covered only part of the necessity or the need or the use of this information. It's for data and so on, in general, but it is also not us who requests that information as much as the hospitals that request information of what we have for a particular patient. Okay? So that's the PHIN number.

Now of course my friend, I'm sure, would know that, for that same security, there is no cross-reference between the code identifying the AIDS patient and the PHIN number. Now it is not that it is not safe, but the gay community themselves would not come forward if they did not have complete - they felt that they wanted a number that nobody but their doctor should know, and that is why it was done. But with that, you certainly would have all the information that you would need, not by names but by number. So you can identify the people, those who have the virus and those who have the disease.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, surely the Minister must recognize the flaw in this, and I understand where he is coming from in cooperation with the gay community in their desire for anonymity. There is no question they don't want it publicized that they may be positive to the AIDS virus, they may have the antibody present in their system, because that may or may not mean that they would be future contractors of full AIDS syndrome disease. But it may also indicate that those individuals are carriers who could infect other Manitobans. Given that AIDS being a very new disease to North America and given that it is such an unknown, in terms of really how it spreads - and, you know, we can get into the precautions, and we will get into the discussion of how various hospitals are handling the staff problem in terms of AIDS-positive identification. Until the medical profession, the research scientists involved in the research on AIDS can tell us, (a), that AIDS is not, for instance, spread by sneezing - I mean, we've got all of these fears out there on this disease. Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, I don't think the Minister disagrees. They are legitimate fears until we know because, AIDS, there is no known cure.

That is why it seems that, with the identification number which provides the protection to a group in society, namely the gay community, provides anonymous protection when they're so identified as being AIDS positive in terms of the antibody. It doesn't allow necessarily, at least I don't see how it allows the Minister and his department and Dr. Fast to undertake legitimate research as to whether the AIDS virus and its exposure in the creation of the antibody in other Manitobans is moving beyond that very narrow group of Manitobans.

For instance, it begs the question, and I pose it to the Minister. There are members no doubt, of the gay community who lead normal heterosexual lives at home. During the course of their gay activities, should they be exposed to the AIDS virus, is that then transmittable to their heterosexual partner? Do we know that, and can we determine that from the kind of information and identity-protected system that's been put in place?

I think it's incumbent on this Minister and Dr. Fast's group to do as much in cooperation with other medical

professionals who are working on how AIDS is spread to try and put some further light on the way that AIDS spreads. I'm not sure that you've done anything more, in terms of a pure research capability with the new encoding system, than simply providing an anonymous identification system for those exposed. I don't detect where it has given you and your department the ability to trace the potential spread of AIDS, whether it's solely within the gay community or, for instance, drug addicts, which are other ones because of exposure to commonly used needles, theoretically, and hence blood exposure between two individuals. Those are the two main groups, but we don't know. I don't believe anyone in research has answered the question as to whether a heterosexual participant in gay activities is able to transmit any contracted exposure to AIDS to his heterosexual partner. I want to try to determine whether the Minister's research or his identification allows that kind of link-by-step identification to take place.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, we have this information.

First of all, certain provinces might be more advanced than we are because of the much larger numbers of cases. It's a concern everywhere, of course, but it's much more of a concern in B.C., for instance, and Ontario, where they might have many more cases and a larger gay community than we have here.

All that information has changed. There is a national committee on that working between the provinces. We've also set up here in Manitoba a committee made of representatives of public health doctors and the gay community also. Now the people, so far what is known, that can contract or give AIDS are homosexuals, also of course the bisexual man, the drug abuser, and also those receiving blood, and the sex partners of all those people. So my honourable friend is right. That is a method of transmitting the disease.

Now in the numbers that we have, we don't know the names, but we know of which one of these groups these special people are. If they are homosexuals, we know that and so on. So with this, we can proceed with the information to try to discover more about AIDS.

Then we're in contact constantly with the medical doctors also because, in most instances, not with the Red Cross but with the others, we have both tests, the preliminary test and the secondary test at the Cadham Lab. So we'll phone the doctor back and say, number so-and-so, this is it. We will be informed. We will get the information that they belong to the gay society or someone else, until we've got that.

I might say, although this is not an announcement - it is definitely premature, but there have been some discussions where we're looking at the possibility - we have some concern - of having a clinic for the gay community. We're a little concerned of having a special clinic, if it was dealing only with AIDS, but apparently it is very difficult to talk to these people. One of the reasons why they didn't want it, if we go to the PHIN, is they are afraid that other government employees will have their names for employment, you know, the discrimination that they're in and the concern that there has been. So it's not the easiest thing. They're coming out of the closet now, but there's more information to have. There is that cooperation and that advisory committee, sub-committee.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I guess the concern the gay community had on the PHIN number and how other members of the department might access themselves to medical information is, of course, the same concern that has always been there in terms of any time you computerize any individual's medical records. That was our concern last year on the introduction of the PHIN number, and that still remains our concern.

I don't believe anything that the Minister has indicated or the department has done in the last year, particularly with the establishment of a new system that is more secure, has done anything but reinforce our concerns about yet another system of identification of Manitobans where the punch-up of nine numbers on a computer screen can basically display any member's medical record. That can be used, as the Minister well knows, in a number of areas from STD's to life insurance, to a whole range of uses adverse to the future well-being of the individual whose information is being so brought out by the use of a PHIN number. So, Mr. Chairman, I only say once again that we have serious concerns on this side that the Minister or the department has not yet addressed on why we're into a PHIN number, and I'll leave it at that.

I've got a rather recent article on AIDS where there's an indication that the projections of AIDS cases - and this is not talking antibody positive, but actual AIDS cases - may approach 40 within five years. Is that the kind of progression that the department is pursuing? Given that there were eight in the last two years, then we're talking almost an arithmetic progression of AIDS in other areas. Is that 40 a legitimate guesstimate, or may that in fact be a low estimate?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, before we leave the PHIN system, there is no doubt that, once you've got the name, it is more dangerous than if you have no information at all. You have to select. Do you go to that man - and a lot of things in this modern life are doing that. You're losing certain rights if you're going to do that, the same as you're destroying the birds in the forest and so on in the name of progress.

I want to state to my honourable friend that the day that we register somebody at the Commission for services, exactly the same thing, even if we didn't have FIP, the number that we have gives us the name, and we could have done that before, no problem. We must remember that. The minute that you try it, the Social Insurance number that we get from the Federal Government, we can get that.

So what my honourable friend is saying, there's a certain amount of truth to that. I think that we have to be diligent, to try to take the advantages of something like that, and make sure that the regulations and the rules and so on are tough, that they are not used for anything else. But there's always that danger, I'm not going to deny that, but it was there before. It doesn't maximize anything except maybe you can get it. It's not reliable but you can get the information faster and so on.

Now as far as AIDs, my honourable friend wanted to know if 40 cases was an educated guess. I think that it is a guess that's probably low. We have to assume the worst, and it's going to take a while.

The last meeting that I attended of the Ministers of Health, they felt they were pretty optimistic that

something will be discovered fairly soon that will immunize people in the future, but once you've got it, that's it. You could be a carrier for many years and it could go even further than 10 years. They talked about once you've got the disease, it's a heck of a cure, but the only way you can get rid of it is death and that's usually from two, two-and-a-half years or so, and it could go to five years. Once you've got the virus, it could be dormant for awhile and then it can come back, it could go even more than 10 years. They're talking about 10 years. So if you discovered a method of preventing it today, you'll have to worry about it for 10 years.

I think one of the most important things that these committees must do, the Canadian committee, and I guess they work with the world organization on that, too, is that we don't add to the panic of people; it's bad enough. Mind you, we shouldn't want to give them false security either. I think that's one of the concerns, but it's an education because at times it could make things even more difficult.

The situation is serious. We think - we hope we're wrong - we think that 40 is too low a number because we want to anticipate the worst. As I say, every day it adds on because people that are infected, if they have the virus, that could last quite awhile.

I could say for this information, also, that the cost could be pretty darned high, which is a factor, I think. For every case, it is approximately \$40,000 for the treatment annually.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister's answer on the PHIN number - I promise this is my final comment - in that he indicated they already had that system in place before they brought in the PHIN, was the original proposition we made, you didn't need PHIN.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I didn't say they had the PHIN number; obviously, before it was brought in, they didn't have it. What I said was the day that we register a person in Manitoba under the Manitoba Health Services Commission, we've got the information if we want to use it. You don't need PHIN. PHIN is a system that streamlines the operation. It will be less costly, it won't be manual and it is an improvement, let's say, as far as computers and so on will permit. If you wanted to get information on somebody before the PHIN before last year, or the year before, you could get number so-and-so and you'd look it up, it might take you a little longer, and you'd have the same information.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Exactly, Mr. Chairman, and it begged the question of the establishment of the PHIN system.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move into an area of immunization. We had, over the winter months, measles described as an epidemic; however, a measles outbreak in the Province of Manitoba. I have to indicate to the Minister that I was personally involved in this with a 12-year-old son who came down with the measles on the way out to British Columbia to go skiing for his school break. I have to tell you he had some very unkind things to say about the immunization process in the Province of Manitoba that assured him he would not get measles on his only skiing trip in his mid-term break or whatever they describe it in grade school now.

Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate to me the number of cases of measles that were positively identified in this past outbreak period of time? I'm not sure how long that outbreak was considered to be there.

I'd like to further know the age range, if there was a predominant age range which was subject to contracting measles despite their immunization. Where I'm zeroing in on specifically is whether there was a year of immunization wherein there can be a greater identification of failed immunization by that process.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The number of cases that I have - of course, there was this epidemic in Thompson - was 3,183. Now this is a system that's not compulsory in the real sense of the word that they would have to - they could sign a document for religious or other reasons and be exempted.

When this happened in Thompson, we couldn't force them, but what we did, we kept them out of school. I've had some criticism of that. I don't remember; I remember I think it was at one of the times for the member of the house. It's not important, I don't remember who, but we were talking about the PHIN thing and the independence, people who don't want their names and so on. There's a lot of people who don't want this compulsion. But that has been working quite well, the measles. I am told that we can't do anything about that. There's approximately 5 percent of immunized people that will get measles anyway.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister indicating to us that the 3,183 cases, I believe, those weren't strictly in Thompson, those were presumably spread throughout the province; that there was no particular identification to an age group so that an outsider taking a look at the Province of Manitoba would say that in the year 1973 the vaccination process was not assured? Is the Minister indicating that those 3,183 cases were across a wide age range of young Manitobans so that it didn't zero in on one particular year of immunization?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The number that I gave to my honourable friend and members of the committee is everybody at all ages, but the majority of them are younger children. I'll give you a breakdown of that, that you probably would want.

In Winnipeg, there were 699; Parklands, 20; Eastman, 349; Westman, 667; Norman, 45; Central, 293; the Interlake 13, where I was puzzled here, there is Winnipeg City 627 and I already gave 699, but there is the city and the region that is covered outside the city part of it. Interlake 225 and Thompson 474. We have no reason in the information that we have, that no, there is no special year that the serum, or whatever, wasn't functioning. It's the same percentage roughly of 5 percent every year, every

MR. D. ORCHARD: It's my understanding that shortly after the child's first birthday, that the measles vaccination is to be administered. That's the present requirement. Is that requirement under review right now and do other jurisdictions adhere to the same 12 months, or do a number of jurisdictions in fact use an immunization at age 15 months rather than 12 months?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The recommendations vary, for instance, in Canada and the States. Here the recommendation is 12 months or one year and in the U.S., it's between 12 and 15 months. Here the Canadian recommendations are 12 months . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the reason I posed that question, and I don't know how accurate my information is, but the information that I have received on the immunization process for measles is that you achieve approximately 87 percent immunity with an immunization process undertaken at age 12 months. If you do that same immunization process at 15 months, you develop closer to a 95 percent immunity. Now, if that were the case - and that should be a relatively easy statistic to confirm - it would certainly beg the question as to whether our requirements should not be reviewed with the recommendation for immunization being taken at 15 months rather than the current 12 months?

A further question, I've got an immunization record for the Province of Manitoba and it indicates on here: Age or school grade of child, approximate - and they indicate approximate. For measles, mumps and rubella, they have 12 months in there. That begs another series of questions, but there is nothing magical and specific about the 12-month age. In the immunization record, it says approximate there, yet with the outbreak in Manitoba, the reaction by the Department of Health was that any child, I believe I'm correct, who was immunized even a few days prior to achieving their first birthday, or being 12 months old, were required to re-immunize and that did draw some ire in that, particularly, when some of the immunizations were done five days before the first birthday, just five days short of the 12 months. The immunization card, the immunization record says approximate in which the date given is to be added in and the doctor's or nurse's initials, but yet the department appeared to adhere very, very strictly to the 12 months when their own record-keeping cards said approximate was close enough. A lot of parents objected seriously to an automatic re-immunization simply because they may have had their child immunized, or the doctor may have done it, or a nurse may have immunized the child three, four, five days prior to their first birthday.

You know, the Minister might want to indicate whether the regulations, whether the processes under review to accomplish both things that I have suggested. First of all, a possible review, if the statistics I've got are correct in terms of 95 percent effectiveness versus 87 percent effectiveness, simply by moving the vaccination date from 15 months to 12 months.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if my honourable friend still has that information, or that review, or that article that he has. If he could share that with me, and I would ask the director of this program to check with the Federal Government.

What I'm told now is that the guidelines for Manitoba is 12 months and in the States it's a little different. So definitely, if there is nothing to lose, but I'd check with the Federal Government, especially if we could refer an article to them. My honourable friend said that he was reading some information. If that's possible, we

can ask them to check. Dr. Fast is here now and I'll ask Dr. Fast to check with the Federal Government to see if there is any change to make sure that we don't miss any . . .

This has been brought to my attention, the question of this five or six days before the birthday. As a lay person, I thought that was odd. I thought it was somebody sticking to the rules a little too much. Of course, when they got this epidemic they wanted to be careful. Let's remember though that these people were not forced. If they didn't want to go ahead, but the child was not admitted to school. I think that was one of these things. These things are done with the best intentions, especially when you have a situation like that, and my honourable friend just mentioned that his son wasn't too happy when he missed that ski trip and, you know, you're damned if you do and you're damned if you don't in certain areas.

When I checked that, I was told that was over the weekend. When I checked, this was resolved already. Some probably submitted voluntarily, not too happily, of course, but to revaccination, but some who refused that, they keep their children out of school. I think it was only a day or day-and-a-half, or something like that. We will look into it again to see if there is any change, if there is something that we should do differently.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I guess, although I didn't formally protest to the Minister at the time, but I did think the requirement that children who are immunized prior to their first birthday, even by a few days, was quite draconian in terms of - the Minister said it was voluntary, they didn't have to re-immunize - but it wasn't voluntary, because if the parents wanted the children to be in school, I mean, they couldn't go unless they were re-immunized. That begged the question as to what the particular threat was. No. 1, even though the child had been immunized, let's say, five days prior to their first birthday, that by itself was not an indication that that child would come down with measles and hence spread the infection to other children; and secondly, and more importantly, the children who are at school, presumably are all ones who are properly vaccinated. Even someone carrying the measles disease to school would not have posed those other children in the classroom any problem. But yet, the imposition was put there; either you obey, and you know the anomaly was on the immunization record where it says approximate. It says approximately 12 months.

For five days shy, in one particular case, and this mother is still carrying on the battle over this, but basically by being five days too soon with an immunization, the child was either required to go through re-immunization or was kept out of school. The question legitimately was posed, what threat could a child be who was immunized five days early to other children who are there because they are immunized properly according to the department regulations? That was a very good question; it was never answered.

Secondly, the other thing, the Minister mentioned in his opening remarks that now there is a new process on the department in terms of re-immunizations, wherein by religious or other reasons a child can forego

re-immunization if so ordered, as was the case this winter. Well, it's my understanding that a blood test will indicate whether the immunization, even if it's five days prior to the first birthday, has been effective; a blood test will identify that. But the department took and physicians within the department took a very hard-nosed stand that, even though a parent did not want the child reimmunized because some children apparently that were reimmunized developed temporary breathing problems and other things - I'm not familiar with the medical problems - but parents who said, no, I don't want my child reimmunized if the child has already been immunized according to the approximate dates on the immunization record. If you wish to determine whether my child should not be in school, then simply do a blood test to determine whether the original immunization worked. That process was refused by the Department of Health, by the Minister's staff members, because of the cost which, I'm led to believe, is some \$50 for a blood test to determine whether in fact the immunization protection was there from the original immunization.

It's a difficult area for me to be critical, because Dr. Fast and her group were there to attempt to protect Manitoba children from a measles outbreak, and that is the mandate of this particular department. But I do think there's room for criticism in terms of some haste in terms of the methods used to assure that protection. You see, I can't answer from a medical standpoint or even from a common-sense standpoint as to what threat a child would be in who was immunized five days prior to the child's first birthday in going to school and associating with other children who have been properly immunized. I personally don't see the difficulty in that.

If the child had never been immunized, yes. I can see that as a potential problem where, with a measles outbreak, you would say to the parent, the child should be immunized. But these children were immunized according to the regulations, and done by medical professionals who were undertaking the immunization according to the accepted practice of the province. Then all of a sudden, the immunization process is not deemed adequate and the children are put through further stress and strain of reimmunization for what I think were maybe not entirely justifiable reasons, given some of the fall-back tests that were in place, such as a blood test, to see whether the child indeed was immune to measles.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not being sarcastic or critical when I say that, but it's always easier - and my friend will recognize that - to find something wrong after the fact, not in the midst of an epidemic to start with. It's a bit like a Monday morning quarterback after a game. You've got all the reasons why a team has lost, and that's fine. That helps the progress in looking at the mistakes and learning from your mistakes. But I'm sure that my honourable friend will agree with me that all this was done in good faith to protect his children, my children and all the children in Manitoba.

The situation is this, especially in a place like Thompson where at one time a lot of these children had not been immunized, and it took awhile to get this thing going. Then there's always the 5 percent also

where the immunization won't work, and that was a concern. With the large number for Thompson during that period of 474 cases, that was a real concern. Also, looking at the situation in the United States where they've been very successful in being fairly strict on this - they haven't got the same guidelines. I mentioned that, and that's what we can check. We're getting that from the Federal Government. That's why you have the Federal Department of Health also, to give this information and guidelines to all Canadians, to all provinces. So the situation is that they've been quite successful in the States.

Now I had the same reaction when it was first - I don't remember if it was my honourable friend or some other MLA who brought it to my attention, and I checked immediately at that time. I couldn't see what five or six days difference made but, at the time, you've got to remember that they were dealing with a large number of children, and they've got to make a rule. If they say six days, why not twelve? There's that concern. I've had that when we talk about what age can you play junior hockey or juvenile hockey or whatever, and there's always this thing if you start somewhere. So you say, well there has to be a rule, rightly or wrongly. Maybe we could learn from that but, especially at the time, it's not a time to experiment. You're going to lean on the side of more protection, more security and so on, even if some people don't like the idea.

The blood test with all the cases that we had, if you do it for one, anybody can ask for it. You have to have rules. There is no way that Cadham Lab could handle all those tests at that time. Sure if you say one today, well then if you do it for one, why not for the other? I would imagine that it wouldn't take very long, if they found out that they didn't have it or the kids don't like these immunizations and so on, these vaccinations, there would be a request from the parents to have the blood test. Why should they have another go at it if it wasn't needed? So that was one, and the cost also.

We're told that we have to get the best for our dollars, and there are so many things and so many other priorities. Fine, I think that the people will have to appreciate these things. It's not the end of the world; getting another vaccination is not the end of the world. If they don't want to, they have to accept some responsibility themselves, not always blame government and the taxpayers. We're doing everything that we can to help these people, to protect these people and, if they choose for any reason - and I'm not debating their reason. But why is it that the government should always be there and at a much added cost, just because they don't want their kids to get a vaccination and so on?

Apparently - well not apparently, they definitely had one. You're going to have a blood test to see if they're still immune or it worked and so on. That means that they had a vaccination. It's not the end of the world having another vaccination. I would think that eventually there might be more things where you will force them. I would advocate at certain times, and I'll be criticized for that, that they don't even give them that way out to say, if you bring a paper that you don't want the children vaccinated. I would find it very, very difficult to say that, if they found something, a vaccination that would work on AIDS for instance, I would find it very difficult to say, oh well you don't believe in it; you don't have to have it. It would be a tough decision to make,

so I think that we have to look at these things, these considerations.

We will look at it to see if these four or five days - as I say, my reaction was, what difference does that make. What difference does five days or four days make? I'm certainly saying that I want to look at it and instruct staff to look at it. I want to make sure that I'm not criticizing them at all. I know it was done with the best intentions in the world, to protect the children. Especially you have to take into consideration the facilities and where they have to deal with a pretty busy lab and people around them being sick, and a bit of panic in the air. I think we have to take all that into consideration. There's no problem with reviewing our operations, reviewing our rules, checking with the Federal Government to make sure that there's no way. We should be in constant contact, and I'm sure we are, with the Federal Government to see if there are any changes, any new instructions, anything that can improve the situation. We certainly will try to do that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that's exactly why I'm posing these questions and putting those pieces of information on the record to determine how factual they are, because I don't know whether some States use 15 months, and I don't know whether the vaccination is indeed 95 percent effective at that age compared to 87 percent at age 12 months. But if those facts are indeed facts, if that information is factual, then certainly it begs a re-examination of our present system in Manitoba, and of course that's why we're here, to do just that.

The question I'd like to ask of the Minister now is: how many children were reimmunized? Do you have those numbers?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The immunization was done to all those that hadn't been immunized and all those that was done prior to a certain date. We haven't got this information but this might be helpful though. We had to buy 40 of that, being it's both groups, we got an extra 40,000 doses.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that doesn't really indicate how many children had to be reimmunized from that number. That's probably a difficult one and it may not be available and it's not important at this stage of the game because we're talking past history.

I just want to point out to the Minister that in terms of the blood test the Minister has indicated that that would have been costly, and I agree it would have been costly, but the alternative the government chose was to require parents to make two choices for their children: either reimmunize or stay out of school, and the alternative to that would have been a blood test which may have cost substantial dollars. Budget constraints disallowed the blood test and we ended up in a situation where parents were forced to make the decision to immunize or else not have their children in school.

I think that is a circumstance and a decision-making process that is indeed open to review by this Minister and by future governments as to whether that is a proper decision to force upon parents. I use the word "force" because I can't think of any other way, like the choice was clear, either you reimmunize or your children

don't go to school. Parents were required to make a choice based on what I think were not always sound reasonings in terms of the danger of not having their children reimmunized and entering school.

As the Minister has indicated earlier on, there is approximately 5 percent, and that would seem to conform with the information on the 15-month vaccination, that it's 95 percent immunity. That means a residual 5 percent of children, even in 15 months, do not present immunity to measles so that you always have that danger in the school system.

The point I'm making is that the reimmunization did not necessarily guarantee the safety of the children immunized, reimmunized, or the children that were at school properly immunized. That decision to require reimmunization, I don't think necessarily protected the children in either case: the reimmunized ones or the ones that were at school.

So I think it's a good lesson for Dr. Fast and her group to do some additional research on, now that the pressure is off, to determine whether similar action would be taken another year, say measles were to break out two or three years hence, to see whether the same and identical procedures would be taken.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's what I said earlier, that the conditions and the time and the speed and a lot of concern and the concern of the parents made it very difficult at that time.

Now when I said that we will look and certainly check with the Federal Government, because we much rely on our Federal Government to give us this information, a place like Manitoba can't do all this research and reinvent the wheel and try to get this information, so we must go pretty well with the Federal Government. What I'd want to know mostly is is it 12 or 15 months or what? What is the best, that's No. 1, the first thing; and, secondly, to find out does that mean the age, exactly the minutes, a full 12 months after you're born, or is there a period of leeway there? I think that's the important thing. I don't know if I'd do things any differently though, except those two things.

We are talking about reimmunization of people. That means that the first decision was made that these people had no religious reason why they can't have the vaccination because they got it already. It wouldn't be very difficult. Of course, I can't speak for all people of Manitoba. There's always somebody that will find a reason and I'm sure they think they're very valid. But when you're trying to protect your children and so on, you've already made a decision that there was a vaccination, it wouldn't be very difficult for me, as a parent, to say yes. In fact I'd go the other way. If they'd say, okay, 12 months and if it was a few days over, I'd say, well, try to find out if you can get the vaccination again, it's not the end of the world. I think that's the important thing.

Now I think the last words my honourable friend said is very important, not in that period of rush and a bit of panic in certain cases and difficulty. I think that maybe we should look at the situation, test these people to see if it works or not, to see if a revaccination and so on will protect that same 5 percent or maybe it doesn't work on them at all. I'm sure that is being done. There must be some research to say is it just something that

Monday, 21 July, 1986

this day it doesn't work but the next time it'll work, or is it that if there's nothing they can do with a special case. I would imagine that is being done, so that might be some kind of a research that should be done in normal times.

Now to say that that didn't do anything, I don't agree with that. I think that it helped, unless we find out that if it doesn't work with you once, it'll never work again. That's why I'm suggesting in normal times there should be that research. I'm sure that is being done somewhere. But the situation is those that are not immunized, they had a vaccination but it hasn't worked for some reason or other, you might protect him the second time around and then the danger of spreading this to those - well, as I said, in the case of Thompson, many of them had not been done at all and the others could be in the 5 percent, but normally the immunization hasn't worked but if they're not in contact with somebody then they won't get the disease.

So anyway this is a question until you find out. There's probably a lot of things that you do that you wouldn't do and it will keep on. I take the suggestions of my honourable friend in the manner in which I'm sure he presented them to myself and the committee and we'll see if we can improve the situation.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I think we dealt with that area reasonably well.

I'd like to ask the Minister, in terms of Other Expenditures, we've got an \$187,800 increase, which is a fairly substantive increase compared to other lines we've dealt with in terms of Other Expenditures. Could the Minister indicate what is the reason for the increase in Other Expenditures in this line please?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are we now going to 2.(b)(2)?

MR. D. ORCHARD: We're dealing with (b).

MR. CHAIRMAN: I haven't called No. 2 yet.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, who cares, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, 2.(b)(2).

HON. L. DESJARDINS: In this case it would be 2.(b)(2), I think. There has been an increase of 16,000 for an increase of 16 percent in animal volume and one additional plant inspection. That's with the Federal Government, the inspection of plants.

An increase of approximately 10 percent to suppliers of biologics - oh excuse me, the first one was 16,000, this is 143.6 percent. Just a minute, let me start again, I got this percent. All right, there's an increase of 16 percent in animal volume and one additional plant inspection. That's a \$16,000 increase, an increase of approximately 10 percent to suppliers of biologic, that's \$143.6 thousand.

Trade off of proposal to terminate the Western Equine Encephalitis Surveillance Program, that is \$64,000 to the good. In other words, maybe you won't like my choice of words, but that money is not spent, we saved on that. An increase of approximately 10 percent to suppliers of lifesaving drugs, and that's quite a thing in this program, that's \$43.4 thousand. A 30 percent

increase in patients receiving lifesaving drugs, so there are the suppliers, the cost, the drugs and also the addition of more and more people, that's \$59.6 thousand. There's another reduction in professional services, \$2.9 thousand. Office equipment transferred to Government Services, a reduction of 1,000 and general operating reduction 6.9 thousand, for a total of \$216.8 thousand. That's the increase.

There's been quite a bit in the lifesaving drugs, that's a problem that we will have to look at, at this time. We have the Pharmacare but besides that we have the lifesaving drugs where there is a needs and a means test. The means test is not too sophisticated, but there's supposed to be a means test also. We'll have to look at that to see if it should be rolled in with Pharmacare or a different program or should it be done and insured through the hospitals.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I'm not familiar with the first part of the answer in terms of the animal volume in the one additional plant inspection. Is this to do with killing plant facilities and to determine - I didn't realize you had responsibility in that. Is that ancillary to the Federal Health of Animals? And that begs the question as to why are we paralleling a Federal Health of Animals service in a killing plant inspection with our own inspectors? Do we not have sufficient confidence in the Federal Government expenditures to assure quality control on canker worms?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, that is federal but we pay for that service. It's done by federal inspectors and we pay for it.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay. Now, can the Minister indicate what lifesaving drugs are available under this line of Other Expenditures and what sort of medical problems are they designed to rectify?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'll give you an example. These are drugs that if people would stop taking them they would probably die. That's why the name, lifesaving drug. Now, it is, for instance, there are some instances where the children won't grow at all, they have to take drugs and I'm told that the cost could be up to, what? - \$3,000.00. Anyway I can give you an example of one that we're concerned when it's not their cost, there are not too many people that have that but apparently that's increasing and that could be up to \$20,000 a year, and some people can't afford that. Then we'll have to change the system - I had to smile a bit in the question period that we pay our bills a little sooner in that area.

The situation, for instance, cancer drugs or even drugs that I take for — (Interjection) — No, don't worry, don't worry, I'm not. Think I'd tell you if I was? No, I pay for mine. I'm very pleased that I'm under Pharmacare. But anyway those are the drugs: asthma, diabetes, arteriosclerosis and other heart disease programs, cancer, chronic renal disease, chronic obstructive lung disease and so on. There are a number of them and those would be in the cardiac area.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Is there a mean's test.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There's a mean's test. It's not too sophisticated. You see at one time the two parties

in government since we brought Pharmacare wrestled with that. I know that I was, I guess I was Chairman of the Commission when they brought in the Pharmacare Program and it was intended then that all the drugs would be in there. Before that there were certain drugs like that program pre-dated Pharmacare, and it was felt that that would be rolled in with Pharmacare but it didn't. In fact, I think that we tried to pull it out one time, and it was brought back in but we tried to phase it out, not to accept more people. But lately there's been more drugs and so on, and it's become a problem because as you see there are more people and the cost of drugs is higher. So there's supposed to be a means test - well, you can just imagine if there wasn't - just the drugs for cardiac patients, for instance, what the cost would be. But we admit that it's not too sophisticated and we're looking at the situation and asked for a decision by Cabinet, what should be done on that because the cost could be quite high.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 4:30 p.m. it's time for Private Members' Hour. I'm therefore interrupting the proceedings of the committee. The committee will return at 8:00 p.m.

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

RES. NO. 1 - RETENTION OF THE PSYCHIATRIC SCHOOL OF NURSING AT THE MANITOBA DEVELOPMENTAL CENTRE

MADAM SPEAKER: On the Proposed Resolution No. 1, the Honourable Member for River Heights has 15 minutes remaining.

MRS. S. CARSTAIRS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

What we are talking about today is the closure of the nursing school at the Manitoba Developmental Centre. Before I begin to speak as to my reasons why I don't think the school should close, I would like to congratulate the Minister on her initiatives in the Welcome Home Program because I think that there are many who are now living at the Manitoba Developmental Centre and there are certainly many who live throughout the province who will in fact receive great benefit from living within the community setting. And the Minister has been, Madam Speaker, very wise in her decision not to move too rapidly in this direction because she has seen what has happened in other cities, primarily American cities, which have led to certainly unfavourable living conditions for many of the mentally retarded. So we have moved in the Province of Manitoba to the maintenance of homes for the mentally retarded, institutions if you will, while at the same time finding alternative and hopefully better methods for their care.

But no one has suggested in the Province of Manitoba that we should, in fact, do away with the Manitoba Developmental Centre, and therefore one must question why when we have not decided to do away with the

centre, why we have decided to do away with the nursing school. In order to understand, I think, the problem with regard to the closure of the school, it is necessary to take a look at the Manitoba Developmental Centre itself, and to discuss briefly what it is and what will it be in the future.

We have been informed by the Minister that the institution will be in existence in the long term, and that it will probably be in existence with 550 beds. Those 550 residents in those beds will require a properly trained nursing staff, and that is what we are considering today. If we need a properly trained nursing staff to look after those 550 residents, then surely they must be properly trained in a setting such as the Manitoba Developmental Centre.

The present nurses who are working at that centre do not come from Selkirk and they don't come from Brandon. They come, for the most part, from the Portage School and from the training that they receive there, both men and women. They come from the Portage setting, because many of them have grown and have been raised in that town and have decided, when they were making their career choice, that is where they wanted to spend their life's work. I don't believe that properly trained nurses will be nearly so available from training centres in Brandon and in Selkirk, and that will, in fact, be a tragedy for the Manitoba Developmental Centre.

Like many in this province, I think I was shocked at my first visit to the Manitoba Developmental Centre. Having spent a considerable number of visits at St. Amant here in Winnipeg, I had made the decision and jumped to the conclusion that the two centres were in some way similar. Tragically, I learned that they were not. Where there was carpet and bright colours and beautifully coordinated furniture and draperies and spreads and light, airy places for the residents to eat, such conditions do not exist at the Manitoba Developmental Centre.

The Manitoba Developmental Centre is a cold and airless area with insufficient lighting, high ceilings, poor scrap furniture. The only thing that is, in fact, similar between the two institutions is the quality of care which is received by the residents.

I was moved, as I visited the centre, to watch the care being afforded to the residents, be it a young man who was cutting the toenails of a severely-retarded young person, whether it was another being escorted by a resident who was not only mentally-retarded but also blind, one had to be touched by the sense of caring that was exhibited by the staff there. Yes, the staff for the most part has been trained in an institutional setting, but we must remember that is where they will be providing their care.

The Minister has said that one of the reasons for the move and the consolidation of two schools from three is that they needed a broader-based training, and with that I can agree. But there was no reason why that training could not be provided within the City of Portage as easily as it could have been provided in Brandon or in Selkirk.

Yes, the training should be within the community setting as well as within the institution, so those that we are training have an option to choose where they would like to work, whether that work would take place within the institution or whether that work would take

place within the community. We have decided, tragically I believe, to close down a nursing school which is training for the future within that institution. The Minister would argue that, yes, there will be practicums and those young people in training will come from Brandon and come from Selkirk, and they will spend some time at the Manitoba Developmental Centre. But I would argue very strongly, that is not the same kind of training that is received on a somewhat permanent basis at the Manitoba Developmental Centre. It is also not the same kind of training that makes an individual choose to be trained there. For example, if I want to be an obstetrical nurse, I will not ask for my training to take place in a children's hospital. Therefore, if I want to be a nurse whose primary concern and care will be in the field of mental retardation, then I would want to receive that training in an institution dedicated to the work of the mentally retarded.

We have a decision which seems to be final, but no decision in any society should ever be final. The nursing school is still physically in existence. Those who have been trained to provide a service to those in training are still available. We have certainly the residents who have great need of that kind of care, and the Minister herself, and I repeat, has indicated that this institution will go on for a very long time. Surely if that institution is to go on for a very long time, the residents of that institution should be given only the very best of care.

The Minister is correct in moving slowly and in maintaining the institution. Where I believe her department has erred is in their lack of concern displayed for those who live in the institution called the Manitoba Developmental Centre. I have said once before in this House, and I would say it again, that it should be a compulsory trip for every single member who sits in this House because very few, according to the Manitoba Developmental Centre, have indeed been there.

We have tragically in the past believed that the best way to deal with the mentally retarded is to put them away so that we don't look at them, so that we don't have to see them. That is why I support the Minister's initiatives in the field of Welcome Home. Yes, we must get these residents back into the community when the community has the facilities and the personnel and the capability to look after them in a better way than they are being looked after at the present time. Bad community living is worse than institutional care. Good institutional care will always be better than poor community care.

That is what is being provided at the Manitoba Developmental Centre at the present time, good institutional care. We must maintain that good institutional care. We must ensure that there is proper funding for the facilities at that institutional care. We must not rob Peter to pay Paul. We must not take money from MDC to put it into Welcome Home. It must be new money for Welcome Home. Additional funding must be found for Welcome Home, but nothing should be done to deteriorate the living condition of those individuals who will live out their lives at the Manitoba Developmental Centre. Their living conditions are improved by first-class, quality nursing care. That first-class, quality nursing care can be best provided and best trained at the Portage School of Nursing, located at the Manitoba Developmental Centre.

I hope that the Minister will reconsider her decision, because I believe that 550 residents now and in the future depend on her having an open mind.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, I rise to address this particular Private Member's Resolution, which I think is a very thoughtful and sincere resolution based very much on the perspective and experience of one community, namely Portage la Prairie, which has over the years played a very strong and important role in the care of the mentally-retarded citizens of Manitoba; a community that has, during the high period of preference for institutional care for the retarded, indeed, invested of their time and their energy and their personal interest, and extending in many cases to training for work in that particular institution. So I understand and have a great deal of appreciation for the citizens of Portage la Prairie and for the particular contribution that they have made to the citizens of Manitoba who have found themselves living at the institution.

But, Madam Speaker, as the care of the mentally retarded citizens has gone through many shifts and changes, there was a time when there were not institutions able to support the mentally retarded, there was a time when there was not good medical care for infants who were born with mental retardation, and the numbers that we had to deal with were small. They also were dealt with primarily by their families. But in the fullness of time, people lobbied for and achieved large institutions such as the MDC located in a semi-rural setting.

A visit to the MDC is, I think, instructive for many reasons. I think it is an important place for all of us to go and visit and realize the strengths and possibly the weaknesses in terms of a future pattern of service delivery that can be found by that visit. The grounds are spacious, the buildings are large institutional-type buildings, there are a few cottage-type buildings that have been added relatively recently and, of course, there will be, with the sod turning next week, the building of a vocational and activities building to augment the services and programs for the mentally retarded Manitobans who will continue to use that facility on into the future.

But, Madam Speaker, for the Minister responsible for delivering care and services to mentally retarded Manitobans not to heed some of the changes in philosophy, some of the improvements in training and some of the new visions, new demonstrations of how the mentally retarded can successfully and happily live in the community, not to open to that option and to develop a more balanced system in Manitoba would, I think, be an error of a very profound sort.

We believe that the system for meeting the needs of the mentally retarded must first and foremost consider the well-being and the optimization of opportunity for those individuals. We must then look at the pattern of service we have. We must see its strengths and weaknesses and where it is found wanting; in fact, build up the other side of the service.

In so doing, and in so applying that approach to the MDC, we have concluded that it should, for the

immediate future, target itself at a downsizing to approximately 550. I remind members that it peaked at over 1,000 at a time when there were very many fewer mentally retarded members in the community or Manitobans with that particular difficulty.

At the same time, to build up the range of services in the community, it's that that we must do to the system. We must redirect it, retaining and improving the institutional portion of the care but build up the community options because it has been demonstrated, Madam Speaker, that even quite profoundly disabled individuals with appropriate supports are able to function, and function with more variety in their life, more opportunity for development, however limited that development might be, for a better quality of life. So that has been our overriding purpose.

Madam Speaker, as we reviewed all the expenditures in the mental retardation field, we have added new money to the community residence and varieties of residential support options in the community, to respite care for parents, to day activity vocational workshop services, and to a whole range of support services in the community.

Madam Speaker, we have not done it by reducing the per capita monies available to the people in the institution. The only place where reduction has occurred, Madam Speaker, is where we felt a service such as training of staff could be achieved by a rearrangement of a training pattern. We have in no way reduced the dollars or the staff inmate ratios or the programs. We have in fact improved on each of those factors.

Now let's get down to the question of training. How do we train sufficient numbers of people with the appropriate skills for the service that the mentally disabled people require?

I can understand people who worked in the MDC School of Nursing believing that it was a unique school. I guess that's one of the secrets of any institution that the people who work there have committed themselves to it in a very personal and special way and they come to see its strengths as something very unique and of great pride for the particular community. I respect those feelings, Madam Speaker, but I also have responsibility for several other aspects of training.

This was the only school for training nurses. Remember, we're training people in the specialty of registered psychiatric nursing, a specialty that once they have acquired their training fits the individual not only to work with the mentally retarded but also to work with the special needs of the psychogeriatric people and with the mentally ill.

This school was the only school that was being operated by Community Services for what is admittedly a nursing field. There were two other schools, also small, being operated in the Selkirk and Brandon areas. Each of the schools over time, although the psych nursing certificate was what we call a generic certificate, in other words it testified to the fact that students had covered the basic requirements for theory and practice as psych nurses, in fact, each school did develop something of a specialty. There was some movement in practicum placement and some shared theory among the three schools.

Madam Speaker, what we have done - and there has been not an enormous money saving, but there has been substantial saving - was to consolidate three

schools into two to require a revamping of the curriculum for all the psych nurses of the future to ensure that the theory and the practice they required in each of these areas where they would find employment in the future was strengthened and where there would also be some potential for specialization as undergrads and certainly as graduates.

Madam Speaker, we have not simply closed one school and left two others. We have consolidated three, strengthened their curriculum and the practicum placements. Now all the students who go into the psych nursing training put in extended time in the theory and the practice related to mental retardation. So I do not think that there has been any weakening of the quality of care; in fact, I can only see strengthening.

We train, Madam Speaker, for the future; we do not train for the past. A school which used to meet the needs of an institution with 1,100 inmates will now stabilize at meeting the prime nursing need for 550. Some of the people trained as psych nurses will find themselves into the community delivery of service, but it's not been our experience that that's the main training that is finding itself to be most appropriate in the community delivery. We are committed to building up the appropriate training as the community service develops.

Madam Speaker, we train for the future. We consulted with the Health Department which had commissioned a report on nursing requirements on into the future. This was carried out by the Honourable Joe O'Sullivan. In that report, he assessed the role of the particular specialty of registered psychiatric nurses.

Now I should remind members that this specialty is not a nursing specialty found right across Canada. In fact, east of Manitoba, it's not a specialty that is found at all. The mentally disabled are served by ordinary registered nurses who may, in their actual placement, take in-services and so on to fully adapt their skills to the needs of the mentally disabled, but it's not a pattern of service delivery universally applied across the country.

In the provinces to the west of us where the specialty of psych nursing has persisted, Madam Speaker, in Saskatchewan, they have gone completely away from hospital-based training of psychiatric nurses. In Manitoba, the path has been charted for retaining, especially for the two-year training of nurses, the hospital-base nursing. Again that's made up of a fair bit of theory, but is augmented with the practice and also with the benefits of being on-site in an institution.

So we have guaranteed that there is a future for this specialty. But when we looked at the detail, Madam Speaker, of this particular specialty, we found that the future projections for need show a decrease in the need in the psych nursing area for the mentally disabled, possibly a decrease on the mental health side as we move into more community delivery, and an increase in the psychogeriatric side.

Madam Speaker, we believe that the new consolidation of the training and the schools is the most responsible and the most cost-effective way to deal with the training needs for the mentally disabled and for the community-based institution combination service system for the future.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

Monday, 21 July, 1986

MR. H. ENNS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move just to add a few comments to this resolution, this very worthwhile resolution put forward to this Chamber by the Member for Portage la Prairie.

It was my privilege, Madam Speaker, last Friday to attend the graduating exercises of the last graduating class of MDC, and it was a somewhat moving experience. Among other features of the evening program, they had a roll call of the 47 years, I believe, the school was in active practice with the exception of perhaps one of the war years, in 1941 or 1942, when there were no graduating students. Surprisingly, Madam Speaker, attending the graduating exercises last Friday at Portage la Prairie, there were graduates from virtually all those many years present at the dinner that evening.

Madam Speaker, I just believe the government and the Minister and her contribution to the resolution has simply not made the case - I believe that was brought out forcibly even during the last Session - for any real substantive improvements, either in cost savings as the Minister referred to, and/or improving in general the opportunities for this special branch of nursing to get its training.

I found the remarks by the Member for River Heights particularly appropriate. I believe that institutions will have to and will continue to have to have the very best of personnel and personnel that has a specific training and background to service those.

I happen to believe, Madam Speaker, and I may be somewhat out of step with some of the current thinking, that institutions will be here. I'm certainly supportive of the Welcome Home Program. I have a number of constituents in my constituency who are participating in that program. I am supportive of that program, and that will be an ongoing program. Hopefully, it will accelerate in the future.

Madam Speaker, some of the statistical evidence in terms of the numbers of actual people who have been welcomed home is not all that encouraging in the sense that institutions such as the Manitoba Developmental Centre at Portage la Prairie will shortly close its doors. That, I believe, will simply not happen. I think the Member for River Heights acknowledged that's not going to happen in the immediate future, and certainly the Minister and the government responses indicate that they recognize that some institutional care will continue to be provided.

It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that some of the advice that the Minister has heard from this side of the House - I include the Member for River Heights - is advice that could be well taken. One simply cannot accept the priorities of this government that will, on the one hand, allow such serious hemorrhage of public funds in some of their ill-founded business ventures, and then bring forward closing of a school of psychiatric nursing in Portage la Prairie that has operated and operated successfully, has served the people of Manitoba well, served the centre well for some 47 years, for some very very marginal savings, and with just her assurances that the new arrangements that she speaks of will be better than what has been going on at Portage la Prairie.

Madam Speaker, I simply wanted to put on the record my support for this where I would hope that the dedicated staff, people involved in this school over many years - and many of them have been involved for a

number of years. I believe the shortest service by any of the current staff members is some four years. Many of them have spent a good period of their working lives dedicated to that institution. It would be my hope that they would be given every consideration in terms of new roles in the field that they have dedicated the better part of their lives to.

I think the government has made a mistake, is making a mistake. I believe the Minister has not shown this Chamber nor the people of Manitoba the kind of sound reasoning that one hopes governments, ministries, departments undertake before these kinds of changes are effected. It would be my hope that this resolution would find support in this Chamber.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elice.

MR. H. SMITH: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I think this subject is a very important one. Just hearing the last speaker, it concerns me somewhat that he wants to hold on to something that has had its presence for years and years, and he is resistant to change.

I don't know if any of the members opposite watched "60 Minutes" two Sundays ago, where they showed a retarded person learning to get on the bus. It was emphasizing home care versus institutional care. This person felt a great deal happier with her life being at home, rather than in an institution.

I think it's an important development, an important trend. It's an important trend, because it means a better lifestyle for those people who are born retarded. I don't think one should want to hold on to an institution when we have advancements in the field to show a better quality of life and a better quality of care. It's important to make that change in the Portage home.

Now it's amazing, by the way - when we were debating this last time and the member brought the resolution forward, he said, are there any members on this side of the House who would come with him. He would rent a bus and take them out to Portage, and show them this institution. I raised my hand; I volunteered; and I reminded the member time and time again. But I've had no invite. I've had no real concern.

So I really question some of the comments from the Member for Portage. I think they're parochial in nature. It reminds me, quite truthfully, of the fight on schools. When I moved out to Birtle, the Birtlites were fighting the Foxwarriors. They wanted their school to survive, and they didn't care about the rest. I think it's a question of where the Member for Portage sees a certain number of jobs and refers in his speech to this fact, that he's fighting to retain those jobs in Portage. I think he should be concerned about the care and the direction. Quite truthfully, rationalizing the schools down to two instead of three makes a lot of sense because, first of all, you have the population for institutional care dropping and it makes some sense to rationalize.

I can remember the Member for Brandon over there talking about the ball and chain. You can't have it both ways. You seem to want to keep the ball and chain. The fact is, if we can save money and improve the quality of care, would that not be worthwhile? The fact is you have to go ahead and make changes. —

(Interjection) — It's not to save money, it's to improve the care.

Let's look at this resolution, some of the WHEREASES. The MDC School of Nursing is unique in North America. It's unique in the sense that it is probably the last one to keep to the narrow specialization, which is very inefficient and narrows the scope of training. So it is unique in that way.

Three, by closing the school, students will lose their hands-on experience. The fact is there will be practicums. They will be stationed there for a certain period of time to get that hands-on training. The Member for River Heights said that it was not quite the same training because they would be there for a short period and then moved out, and that's not the same as being there for a permanently long period of time.

I know that is true, as every teacher will tell you that is true, but people adjust very quickly and I think if a good program of training is in existence, the students will not have any trouble adjusting from the hands-on experience. Now, there has to be the hands-on experience. It's necessary, but it doesn't have to be the length of time that the Member for River Heights assumes it should be.

The fourth WHEREAS: If students are trained elsewhere, Portage will not attract the most qualified graduates. Let me tell you, I don't think there's anything wrong with Portage. I think people will come to Portage just like they'll come to Brandon, or come to Selkirk, especially if they're hired in this time of — (Interjection) — jobs, they will be there. You cannot back that statement up in any way.

Five, it is difficult to attract to the MDC if they are not trained there. You know, that's the same argument. I do not understand why someone would not go to Portage if they are trained to do the job and they have a job there. Portage isn't such a bad place, is it? I think they will go. I think that's a faulty assumption.

Mind you, if they were trained there and they have a residence there, I think it might be easier to get them to stay there, but I think people will go where the jobs are and I think that they'll go where they're being paid. So it seems to me there's no back-up, there's no explanation or understanding of why that is in the WHEREAS.

Of course, you say there'll be no financial saving by closing the school. There will be a financial saving, but that's not the important thing. The important thing that this whole resolution ignores is the quality of training and care. It's more important to have people out in the community. Now, it's not going to be forced. By the way, the Member for Portage says that people are harassed and forced to, in effect, have their child leave that institution.

The Minister has repeatedly asked for confirmation of names, repeatedly asked and said give it to us, let us know. Yet we've had not one word from the Member for Portage.

In closing, this resolution is very lightweight. There is nothing valid in it in the WHEREASES or in the conclusion. If you're going to go ahead and say something, at least back it up. — (Interjection) — I've read your speech. I've listened to your speech and I think your insincerity shows. — (Interjection) — To make it clearer, you even say this in your speech. You quite

clearly say this. You say that maybe if it wasn't in Portage, it would be saved. You are the Member for Portage and you've taken a great interest in this and in preserving the jobs. I think it's very clear-cut. If one of your other members got up and talked this way, I would accept it.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

Would the honourable member please address his comments through the Chair and not directly at a member.

MR. H. SMITH: —(Interjection) — I am nice to you; I have always been nice to you. I felt so sorry for your foot being in your mouth so often that I really sympathized for you.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

Could I remind the honourable member again, even his facetious comments, could he address through the Chair.

MR. H. SMITH: Okay, Madam Speaker. I'm making it very short now.

The fact is times change and it is time that we go ahead and improve the quality of care. Home care out of the institution is more important than insisting on saving the institution and saving those jobs. It's more important for those children that we are concerned with. — (Interjection) — I'm not being facetious. It is very important and I would say to you that should be uppermost in your mind, not the jobs in Portage, Madam Speaker.

Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Employment Services.

HON. L. EVANS: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

I'd like to say a few words in this debate regarding the future of the Manitoba Developmental Centre, most particularly the role of the Psychiatric School of Nursing locations in this province and the specific issue of the closure of the school in Portage la Prairie.

I gathered from some of the remarks made earlier this afternoon that we have been invited, all of us in this House have been invited to attend the Manitoba Developmental Centre at some point or another to see what goes on there. As a former Minister of Community Services, I can tell the Members of the House that I've had the opportunity to be there at least on two occasions, if not more, at which time I toured the facility and had a very close look at the conditions and had an excellent opportunity to speak to the staff.

I've had the opportunity to attend the St. Amant Centre and I certainly have been impressed by what goes on at St. Amant and the physical circumstances at St. Amant, the beautiful equipment that they have and, generally, the very friendly atmosphere that exists at the St. Amant Centre. I guess I could agree with the Honourable Member for River Heights that the St. Amant Centre seems to compare favourably with the Portage School.

I guess the question arises why is this, because I'm sure it's not because of the dedication, or the lack of

dedication by the staff at the Portage School. I think we've got some excellent staff there; they're very dedicated and I think they want the best for the retarded people, as every member in this Chamber does.

I don't know why it is, then, that the Portage School compares rather unfavourably with St. Amant. I wondered whether it's because there was less family support for people at the Portage School, at the MDC.

Having said that, or having asked that question, I do know that there are many very dedicated parents, very dedicated families who go faithfully to see their children or their relatives at the school in Portage. So there is that support. There is an organization, an auxiliary that does do its very best to help out and I congratulate them for their efforts and for their dedication.

I still ask the question why is it, why is one seemingly of a lower standard compared to the other? And I don't know what the answer is. I think maybe we just need more dedication on the part of the families. There are some that are, as I've said, very dedicated, but there are others that perhaps, for whatever reason, are not visiting, not supporting their relatives, their children in the institution.

Of course, there is the phenomenon today of mentally-retarded people living longer than ever more. Thanks to medical advance, new drugs, mentally-retarded individuals do live longer today than they did 10 year, 15 years, 20 years ago. That is a fact and this may be creating a phenomenon where you have mentally retarded people whose parents have aged to a point that they cannot look after them any more or cannot even visit them or perhaps they've passed on.

At any rate, it is an interesting question as to why the Portage Centre doesn't compare quite as well with the St. Amant Centre. I think we would all wish it in this House. I would wish it in this House. - (Interjection) - well, St. Amant, for whatever reason, does get a lot of support from the community and there's always been the pressure to support the St. Amant Centre.

With regard to the school itself, it has been a very excellent school. I've attended at least two graduating ceremonies, apart from visiting the centre, and I've always been very impressed with the young graduating students, full of vitality and hope and I'm sure, in every case, a job that they would go to.

Therefore, no one does wish to see the school close, but as the Minister of Community Services stated, that somewhere, somehow, the government has to contain spending. It's always a very difficult chore for whoever is in government as to where do you save the money. I guess just about every area you pick you'll find arguments being brought forward as to why you shouldn't do it, so this is what makes it very difficult to be in government today because we have to look at areas of saving.

I suppose it's fine from one point of view, but it isn't so fine from the point of view of that community or from the point of view of the staff involved or the centre involved, but we do have to look for areas of saving where there is duplication. Apparently, there is deemed to be some duplication in this area to the extent that we do have three schools of psychiatric training in the province and that a case was made that we could reduce spending by having a consolidated approach. Indeed, this is now being followed and, presumably, through

these arrangements, through this reorganization, we are going to be training a sufficient number of psychiatric nurses to meet the needs within the province.

I just make a point at this time, Madam Speaker, about the medical approach in the whole area of care for the mentally retarded because the Minister herself has mentioned this, and the question is - and I guess there's an argument out there as to whether we are relying too much on the medical approach - to what extent does a medically retarded person require a psychiatric nurse as opposed to someone, some individual, who will give tender loving care?

At some point, the nursing profession, the training as a nurse is required, but in many, many instances, I can tell you from my understanding of the matter, it is not necessary to have nursing care per se. It is necessary to have people who are qualified to care and people who have the right attitude to look after disadvantaged people.

There's been an argument made that perhaps there are changes going on around the country and that we are not participating in these changes, changes in the training of psychiatric nurses. In Ontario, I understand, the registered psychiatric nurses' category has disappeared entirely. In the province to the west of us, our sister province of Saskatchewan, I understand that RPN's are not trained in any psychiatric hospital or psychiatric facility. They are trained in the community colleges. I suppose an argument could be made that therefore we should be training more people in the community colleges.

I understand that Red River, in fact, is offering outreach training in Portage la Prairie, and I understand 200 people are currently enrolled in the Red River College branch facility in the community of Portage. The Member for Portage la Prairie says, but not for the mentally retarded program. Maybe not, but the fact is that we do have an obligation to deliver the best quality program to the mentally retarded, but I'm suggesting, Madam Speaker, that this can be done in different ways and it need not necessarily depend on having a percentage of psychiatric nurses.

The Minister of Community Services very well explained how we were providing a coordinated approach involving both Brandon and Selkirk schools, that in fact the curriculum is being revised to ensure theory and practical experience for each student in each area of potential specialization under the general heading of psychiatry; and that, in addition, special options in theory and practice for concentration in the mentally retarded field are being developed.

I also understand, Madam Speaker, that the facilities at the Manitoba Developmental Centre are going to be used for at least 22 weeks of the year to accommodate rotating placements of the students who come from Brandon and Selkirk. With regard to the teaching staff, I understand they will all be redeployed or transferred in one way or another. So what we've got, in effect, is two institutions handling the work of three but, hopefully, no deterioration; in fact, maintaining of the level of training and maintaining the necessary supply of nurses in this area.

There is another phenomenon at work which is not a recent phenomenon and that is the population at the Developmental Centre has diminished over the years. I don't have all the statistics with me, but I understand

that the current population is 740 people and in a few months from now, a year or so from now, it will probably be a lot less with the Welcome Home Program. Going back a few years, if you went back to 1970, there were 1,100 people there, so you could make a case for downscaling the number of psychiatric nurses that may be required at that particular centre simply based on the declining population.

The other point I'd like to make, Madam Speaker, is that there are other changes that are occurring in our society and, partly because of medical advances, we are able to treat the mentally ill in a different fashion. They need not necessarily be in an institution, and I think there's a good case to be made for deinstitutionalizing of the mentally retarded. I think the pressure is out there in the community that we have fewer people retained in the institutions.

Having said that, I believe the Minister of Community Services has indicated that there will always be a need for a centre at Portage la Prairie, at least for the foreseeable future. I don't know if she's agreed or not. Just as we believe that we must have a balanced approach in the field of mental illness, so we should have a balanced approach in the field of dealing with the mentally retarded.

Regrettably, there will always be a number of cases of severe retardation which will have to be looked after, relying heavily on the medical approach, relying on institutional care, but hopefully more and more will be able to live in the community. Hopefully, we will be able to expand the Welcome Home Program over the years

so that more of the mentally retarded will live a normal life and will be cared for by all of us in the community, all of us who should be concerned about our fellow man and woman.

Madam Speaker, while I can appreciate the concerns of the Member for Portage la Prairie as outlined in his resolution, I can't agree with his arguments, and I'm satisfied, having obtained some information as to what's happening, having obtained some explanation by the Minister of Community Services that certainly there'll be no lessening of care at the centre in Portage la Prairie and that there'll be no reduction in the adequate supply of psychiatric nurses to meet the needs of Manitoba institutions.

So for that reason, Madam Speaker, I cannot support the resolution. I would ask members of the House to consider this carefully also, and if it comes to a vote, to vote against it.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I, too, would like to rise and speak on this very important . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Is it the will of the House to call it 5:30? (Agreed). In that case, I will leave the resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Minister.

I am leaving the Chair then with the understanding that the House will reconvene at 8:00 p.m. in Committee of Supply.