

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Tuesday, 28 April, 1987.

Time — 1:30 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

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. C. SANTOS: Madam Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions, directs me to report the same, and asks leave to sit again.

Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS AND TABLING OF REPORTS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Highways and Transportation.

HON. J. PLOHMAN: Yes, Madam Speaker, I wish to table the Highways Construction Program for 1987-88, and I understand there are copies available for the members.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology.

HON. V. SCHROEDER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to table the Annual Report for A.E. McKenzie.

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion . . . Introduction of Bills . . .

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MADAM SPEAKER: Before moving to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of honourable members to the gallery, where we have 28 students from Grade 9 from the Elmwood High School, under the direction of Mrs. Terry Garther. The school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

We have 29 students from Red Lake, Ontario, from the Balmertown Public School, under the direction of Mrs. Judy Mayhew.

We have in the Speaker's Gallery, 23 members of the Peguis Choralaires High School Students from the Peguis Central School, who returned yesterday from the International Music Festival in Hawaii where they won the two Bronze Medals in the Small Co-ed Choir and the All-Girls Choir categories. The students are

under the direction of Mr. Ken Perry, and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

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

ORAL QUESTIONS

Gunn, N.D.- loan from Communities Economic Development Fund

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, I have a question to the Minister of Northern Affairs.

Can he confirm that he and his Cabinet approved a \$350,000 loan in April of 1986 for one Mr. N.D. Gunn through the Economic Development Fund?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. E. HARPER: Yes, I can indicate that we provided that loan as indicated in this morning's meeting.

Min. of Northern Affairs - rental of 41 Higgins as campaign office

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, in view of the fact the Premier is now here, I have a question for the First Minister.

In view of the fact that his Minister and the committee this morning were told that he and his government approved a \$350,000 loan to Mr. N.D. Gunn in April of 1986, was the Premier aware that his Minister without portfolio at that time, the Member for Rupertsland - I appreciate questions of awareness are out of order, Madam Speaker. Did the First Minister know that the Member for Rupertsland, a Minister sitting in his Cabinet without portfolio, had used 41 Higgins, which is the address of Mr. N.D. Gunn, as his campaign headquarters or a portion of his campaign headquarters? Did the Premier know this?

MADAM SPEAKER: Could the honourable member please rephrase his question so it is in the administrative responsibility of the government?

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, to the First Minister, was the First Minister informed that the Member for Rupertsland had used the facilities at 41 Higgins Avenue for his campaign in the election of March 18?

MADAM SPEAKER: In my opinion, a question about election proceedings is not within the administrative competence of the government.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, to the First Minister, did the First Minister know that his colleague sitting in Cabinet had used the facilities of 41 Higgins Avenue a month prior to the approval of the loan of \$350,000 of taxpayers' money?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, it is not my information that the Member for Rupertsland rented the quarters in question from Mr. Gunn. It is my information that the quarters were, in fact, rented by someone else. As well, Madam Speaker, I'm not aware of any conflict of interest on the part of the Member for Rupertsland.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, does the Premier not want to clear the air on behalf of his Cabinet colleague and indicate whether or not he had knowledge of whether or not the facility was rented, on behalf of or in the interests of the Member for Rupertsland? That's fairly straightforward, Madam Speaker.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I had no information pertaining to the quarters on Higgins Avenue, but I want to say to the honourable member that those quarters were rented by the Manitoba New Democratic Party, on behalf of the Rupertsland Constituency Association. Madam Speaker, I see no conflict of interest; they were not rented.

Madam Speaker, if we're going to start this, then I would suggest honourable members be ready to declare every piece of stationery that their constituency associations bought, every office rental that their constituency associations rented during the process of the last election.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, order please. Order please.

May I remind honourable members that questions should be within the administrative responsibility of the government, not of a political party.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, on a point of order.

The making of the loan is clearly within the administrative competence of the government. The questions are intended to elicit information with respect to the role, or any other matter, such as the use of certain premises played in granting that role, and they're perfectly in order, Madam Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Arthur with a question within the administrative responsibility of the government.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader has correctly referred to the loan being within the administrative responsibility of the government.

Min. of Northern Affairs - absence at meeting re loan to Gunn, N.D.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, in view of the fact - and I appreciate why the First Minister is so sensitive and touchy on these issues. I mean, it's not the first one that he has had to deal with, Madam Speaker. There is certainly a reflection now being put on his government and a cloud over their heads.

A further question, Madam Speaker, to the First Minister, in view of the fact that his Cabinet in April of 1986 approved a \$350,000 taxpayers' money loan to Mr. N.D. Gunn, Madam Speaker, the Minister who had the premises of Mr. N.D. Gunn made available to him by the New Democratic Party for the Province of Manitoba, to the First Minister: Did the Member for Rupertsland, the then Minister without portfolio, absent himself from that Cabinet decision in April?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, there certainly was no requirement by the Member for Rupertsland to do so. There was no personal conflict, no personal interest insofar as the Member for Rupertsland is concerned.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, we were told this morning at committee by the Communities Economic Development manager that all loans over \$150,000 go to Cabinet for their approval. That fund helped to finance Mr. N.D. Gunn's facilities on the business which he carried out, of which the Member for Rupertsland had his campaign headquarters for the 1986 election campaign.

My question to the First Minister: In view of all this shadow and the cloud that's over his and his colleague's head, will he assure us, Madam Speaker, that all information dealing with this whole case - the loan which was made, the questionable loan which was made by him of \$350,000, the involvement of his colleague, the Member for Rupertsland, the Minister without portfolio, in use of taxpayers' money for possible political activity - will he assure us and the people of Manitoba that all, and I say all, documentation pertaining to this situation is made available to the members of the Opposition and the committee when it is heard again in the next week or so, All information for the people of Manitoba to know that their taxpayers' money is not being used improperly for political purposes?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, this matter was dealt with in committee this morning. I believe it would be appropriate to put on the record in the House what was stated in committee because, while there is not a direct inference that we were not going to provide that information, the comments from the Member for Arthur could be misinterpreted in that way. I know that he is certain that he would not want his comments

misinterpreted by anyone, either in this Chamber, the general public, or by the media.

Madam Speaker, first I think the whole matter of providing information on these sorts of questions, and the way in which we have responded to these matters in the past should be put on the record. I can recall, Madam Speaker, when there were discussions that took place in committee when they were government and when members came into this House, when members came into this Chamber to ask those questions, members opposite, most likely the Opposition House Leader now when he was Government House Leader or perhaps his colleague - in this instance it was Mr. Jorgenson - very clearly stated that the questions which are forbidden during daily question period - and one of them is to seek information about proceedings in a committee which has not yet made its report to the House. So they wouldn't even answer the questions, much less provide the information, and I think that very clearly demonstrates a difference between a government which wants the facts on the record in a true and complete fashion, versus a government that, when they were in power, did everything they could to subvert that process of providing full factual information.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

Min. of Northern Affairs - request for resignation

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister.

In view of this unfortunate situation where taxpayers' money is in question, and I say in serious question, under his administration, in view of the questions that are brought about, about his colleague, a Minister of the Crown, a Minister responsible for Northern Affairs, a very heavy responsibility; in view of the shadows that have been cast upon him and the whole activity of he and his government, will he ask the Minister to step aside from Cabinet until this matter is cleared up fully?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, I'm really surprised at the depth to which the Honourable Member for Arthur is attempting to stoop. I suppose I ought not to be surprised, Madam Speaker, because we've seen their attempts to sling mud repeatedly over the last 18 months.

Madam Speaker, the Member for Rupertsland was introduced to Cabinet some time subsequent to the expiry of the lease on these premises. These premises were leased for purposes of the election by the Manitoba New Democratic Party, and were rented by the Manitoba New Democratic Party on behalf of the Rupertsland Constituency Association for the sum total of \$300.00.

Insofar as the Member for Rupertsland, he was appointed to Cabinet as a Minister without portfolio subsequent to the expiry of the lease on March 18 and, at that time, was not the Minister responsible for Communities Economic Development Fund, in any

event. Lastly, Madam Speaker, there was no personal gain, no personal interest received by the Member for Rupertsland. It would be the height of idiocy, Madam Speaker, to remove or - unfortunately, it is the height of idiocy for the Member for Arthur to even suggest the removal of the Member of Rupertsland under such circumstances.

Sargeant, Terry - duties with Dept. of Northern Affairs

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Minnedosa.

MR. D. BLAKE: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister responsible for Northern Affairs and Native Affairs.

I wonder if he could inform the House what the duties of one Terry Sargeant, former M.P., are now with his department?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. E. HARPER: I believe he's director of the research and development services within Northern Affairs.

Sargeant, Terry - position bulletined

MR. D. BLAKE: Sorry, Madam Speaker, I didn't catch all the answer. Could the Minister tell us if that position was bulletined?

HON. E. HARPER: I'll have to take that question as notice, because I believe Mr. Sargeant has been in place for some time, so I'll take it as notice.

Goertzen, Jeanette - duties with Dept. of Northern Affairs

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes. I wonder if the Minister could also inform the House what the duties are of one Jeanette Goertzen, the former special assistant to the Honourable Member for Brandon East.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Northern Affairs.

HON. E. HARPER: I believe Mrs. Jeanette Goertzen is working in the Special ARDA office at this time, at Colony Square.

Gunn, N.D.- T4's for Gunn Const. prepared by Dept. of Northern Affairs staff

MR. D. BLAKE: Yes. I wonder now maybe if the Minister can inform the House, Madam Speaker, if the T4 slips for the employees of N.D. Gunn Ltd., or Gunn Construction were prepared in his office by his staff.

HON. E. HARPER: I cannot confirm that, I'll have to take it as notice.

**Premier - criteria for removal
of Ministers**

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my question is for the First Minister.

We've had examples of scandal, of incompetence, of use of political influence by members of this First Minister's Cabinet. I wonder if the First Minister could indicate to the members of the House and the public just what one of his Ministers has to do in order to be removed from Cabinet.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. H. PAWLEY: I'm pleased to have the opportunity to clear the record, Madam Speaker, because what we've had since May of 1986, commencing with the Minister responsible for Energy and throughout, is a series of unfounded allegations.

Madam Speaker, there has been not one iota - (Interjection)- The Honourable Leader of the Opposition talks about reinsurance. Let me point out that, insofar as the reinsurance issue is concerned, 65-70 percent of the losses took place while the honourable member and colleagues around him were, in fact, in government. So let him not talk about scandal, about losses that took place during treaties written under the Lyon Administration of the Province of Manitoba. Madam Speaker, if the honourable member would talk about scandal, then he'd better watch from whence he throws charges of scandal.

Madam Speaker, just as the allegations pertaining to the Minister of Energy where they were muckracking, similar charges involving other Ministers, have been clearly demonstrated to be muckraking because this Opposition is afraid to discuss the issues of jobs, tax reform and agriculture. But when they're in trouble, they constantly dig into the mud, Madam Speaker, and they only end up with it being stuck on themselves.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, the First Minister obviously can't remember McKenzie Seeds; can't remember MTX; can't remember the reinsurance losses at MPIC . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. Question period is not the time for debate.

Does the Honourable Leader of the Opposition have a question?

MR. G. FILMON: Yes, Madam Speaker, we know the answer. The answer is that under no circumstances will he remove a Minister for any wrongdoing of any kind in his government.

**Constitutional Conference - Man.
Gov't Position paper re Quebec**

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, my further question to the First Minister is, tomorrow he leaves for Meech

Lake for a conference of First Ministers on the Constitution. He has made a commitment to lay before us the agenda of Manitoba, the position paper of Manitoba, with respect to that conference. My question to the Premier is: When will we receive the information on Manitoba's position with respect to Quebec entering the Constitution?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, a first preamble was permitted to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition which I must respond to. Madam Speaker, during the term of this government, since 1981, I am proud to say that not one Minister has gained personally from his or her dealings as a Minister of this government, and I'm prepared to . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

HON. H. PAWLEY: . . . challenge any other administration in Canada to demonstrate as scandal-free a situation as this province has had since 1981.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: May I remind the Honourable Minister that answers to questions should deal with the matter raised and not provoke debate.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. G. FILMON: Madam Speaker, is the First Minister going to answer the question on Quebec and the Constitution?

HON. H. PAWLEY: Madam Speaker, now that the honourable member has asked a question without irrelevant preamble, we will be making a statement tomorrow pertaining to the position that Manitoba will be taking to the Meech Lake discussion.

MGEA contract - no-layoff clause

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Finance.

Given that previous MGEA contracts that have been negotiated by his government have included no-layoff clauses in the contract; and given that negotiations will be ongoing for contract renewals this fall; will the government be renewing the no-layoff provisions of previous MGEA contracts?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. E. KOSTYRA: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The subject of any negotiations and issues that the government, or indeed the other party to the negotiations, may place on the table are best left for that process once it commences. It will not be commencing until some time later this summer.

I can say, Madam Speaker, that overall our policy of working with our employees to look at ways of dealing with reductions and changes in the methods of

operation has ensured, on one hand, that the overall level of Civil Service in this province is at levels that, on a per-capita basis, are at the average point or below the average point in Canada and on an absolute basis has seen an overall stability in terms of the numbers of civil servants.

We've done it in a way, Madam Speaker, where there have been changes between different departments that may have seen reduction in programs, other departments that may have seen expanding programs, by not merely laying off employees, but by reallocating and retraining within. I would contrast that with the position that's been adopted by his colleagues in Alberta and Saskatchewan where there have been wholesale changes and layoffs without any due consideration for employees.

MGEA contract - no-layoff clause, hospitals

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, Madam Speaker, given that with all this cooperation the Minister has indicated is present in the negotiations, the ranks of the Civil Service over the previous five years have swelled by 43 percent, almost half as many again civil servants as in 1981; and given that last night in Health Estimates the Minister indicated that when beds are closed in the hospitals, that layoffs will follow, my question to the Minister of the Civil Service: Will contract negotiations allow those layoffs to take place as indicated by the Minister of Health last night in Estimates?

MADAM SPEAKER: Excuse me. Could the honourable member please clarify if he is talking about hospitals or the provincial Civil Service? The provincial Civil Service is under the jurisdiction of this Minister.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, possibly if I could clarify on a point of order. The MGEA contract, which has been negotiated by the New Democrats over the last two terms, I believe, has included a no-layoff provision. That has been followed by contracts in the hospital services, wherein those contracts have also been no-layoff provisions, so that staff reductions cannot be made. Last night the issue of hospital bed closures was discussed with the Minister of Health, and the Minister of Health indicated last night that accompanying those bed closures naturally would be layoffs. That is why I'm posing the question to the Minister responsible for the MGEA negotiations, whether no layoffs will be a provision they will allow to be retained in the next MGEA contract, which will prevent those layoffs to take place, as the Minister said would be necessary in the Department of Health. That's the nature of the question, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I'd like to set something straight. It is true that we did discuss the question of bed closures or deinstitutionalizing in the hospitals. What I did say to the question was that, if there is going to be any savings, obviously when 75 percent of the costs of the hospitals is wages, that

something would have to be done. I did say that. As far as layoffs, I said that it would be by attrition to start with, which there wouldn't be any layoffs, I said, No. 1; and No. 2, that we would discuss with that particular institution to see if there can be a redirecting of staff, and also between institutions; and No. 3, I said that we would close those beds in an orderly fashion, if need be, only when services would be in place to provide another option to service the patients, for instance, in the community, and that these people would have the first chance to work in the community.

So, fine, we will definitely, if we're going to save funds, will have to have less people in the hospitals, less staff, but we will need more people working in health, in community health.

MONA contract - Min. of Health to allow no-layoff clause

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

Given that last night in Estimates - and Hansard will show that he did indicate that layoffs would be a follow-through of bed closures in the orderly cutback that he is presiding over in the hospital system - given that the president of MONA has indicated their next contract negotiations will involve no-layoff provisions in that contract, can the Minister indicate to the House whether he will permit negotiators, on behalf of the hospital facilities, to include no-layoff clauses in the next MONA contract?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Health to the extent that's in his jurisdiction.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, on a point of order.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I realize that you appear to be concerned about this not being within the relevance of the Honourable Minister of Health's Department. Last night my colleague for Brandon East pointed out how the government had allowed and paid a \$200,000 union supplement . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, order please. Order please.

The honourable member rose on a point of order, I presume to suggest that this particular question is within the Minister's responsibility. I'm asking the Minister to answer the question based on the areas of the question that were in his responsibility.

The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Madam Speaker, the Minister indicated across the floor that he had forgotten the question in view of the delay in answering. Madam Speaker, the question very simply is, that no-layoff provisions are about to become, if the President of MONA is carrying out her intended statements today, that she will be negotiating no-layoff provisions in the next MONA contract. My question to the Minister is:

Will he, as Minister of Health responsible for the funding of all those facilities, allow no-layoff provisions in the next MONA contract to be negotiated?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Of course MONA, negotiating for the nurses, is free to negotiate as they wish. The people negotiating for the hospital with the help, in such cases, and if we establish a policy, if the commission or the government establish a policy, they'd have to go along with that. I would be very surprised if we could not get along together. We've had meetings, there is good cooperation. The nurses know what we're trying to do. They agree that it should be done in an orderly fashion. I would be very surprised if we can't reach a decision to work together to get the saving and protect the health care program that we have.

Workers Compensation Board - coverage for mentally handicapped workers

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River East.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Community Services.

Can the Minister inform the House whether the Workers Compensation Board provides coverage for the mentally handicapped adults who are involved in training programs in commercial and industrial work sites?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Community Services.

HON. M. SMITH: I'll take that question as notice, Madam Speaker.

WASO - re WCB mentally handicapped workers

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: While the Minister is taking that question as notice, maybe she could find out, given that WASO Incorporated, a non-profit training centre and workshop for the mentally handicapped, has attempted to provide meaningful work experience to its handicapped adults, has found that the employer does not have protection under the Workers Compensation Board for itself and for those experiencing work there, will the Minister take some action to assure the safety and protection for the mentally retarded and the businesses involved?

HON. M. SMITH: Madam Speaker, I'll take that one as notice, too. In general, I would just like to comment that the workshop situation is not completely equivalent to a work situation, but I think it is important that there is assessment and training going on, but I will take this question as notice, as well.

Workers Compensation Board - coverage for the mentally handicapped workers

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: My final question is for the Minister responsible for the Workers Compensation Board.

Will the Minister responsible assure this House that an Order-in-Council or something similar will be passed to compensate the workers, in accordance with The Workers Compensation Act, to set up proper safety and regulatory measures to assure that these useful programs do not fail?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Workers Compensation.

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, I am pleased that the member would have asked the question about Workers Compensation, because today, April 28, has been chosen as a day of mourning for killed and injured workers.

It is done because April 28 was the day that the first Workers Compensation was passed in Ontario. It is done in memory of workers who have been tragically killed and injured in our workplace. In 1986, there were 43 of our brothers and sisters killed in a workplace while performing their work, which may have made a major contribution in the workplace to make our lives better.

But on the specific question of dealing with the members of those workshops, yes, there have been several examples of where Orders-in-Council have been passed to cover these workers. If this particular workshop is not covered at this time, then we will certainly be passing an Order-in-Council and regulation to make sure that these people do receive the coverage that is required.

WASO - WCB re coverage for mentally handicapped workers

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: A final supplementary to the same Minister.

Given that WASO Incorporated has been writing letters and communicating with this government since last May, Madam Speaker, to try and get some coverage for the mentally handicapped, will the Minister not take some action now on behalf of the mentally retarded in the Province of Manitoba and ensure that something will be done so they can maintain these jobs and these programs will not fail?

HON. H. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, that problem is presently being addressed and that should be resolved within a short period of time.

Winnipeg Arts Club - closed

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Cooperative Development. In 1985, the Arts Club received a loan from the Credit Union Central for \$100,000, guaranteed by the Province of Manitoba. It also received a \$94,000 grant from the Jobs Fund.

Would the Minister tell this House whether the 115 Bannatyne Avenue Arts Club is closed?

Tuesday, 28 April, 1987

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

HON. J. COWAN: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. It's my understanding that certainly the Winnipeg Arts Club is closed. As the facility no longer operates, the Winnipeg Arts Club building, the facility, was sold, or the operation of that facility was turned over to a private sector operator and there have been discussions with that new owner on an ongoing basis in respect to the loan guarantee by the Provincial Government.

I am informed that we expect that we will fully recover the outstanding loan from that operation if that private sector operator is successful. We have every reason to believe that they will be so. So the indebtedness in the loan guarantees and the provisions were carried over to the new owner. We believe that the provincial financing, which was put into that operation through my own department and its agencies, is well secured at the present time.

Winnipeg Arts Club - gov't loan guaranteed

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Madam Speaker, to the same Minister.

The \$100,000 at this time that the - I was going to say the Steinbach Credit Union - the Credit Union Central has loaned the Arts Club, is that also guaranteed by the Province of Manitoba?

HON. J. COWAN: I can certainly provide all the specific detail to the member at a later time; but what I can indicate to him, and I'll confirm this to make certain that my perception of the situation is correct at the moment, but it is my understanding that the funding that was put in by the Credit Union Central and the financing that was put in by the government is secured and both organizations hope to realize and expect to realize the return on the financing which they provided to that organization. Now having said that, it's important to note that when providing loans and dealing with any organization or any operation, conditions and circumstances change from time to time. So all we can provide now is a forecast based on our best available information. The latest information I received in that respect is that we should recover our financing, and the Credit Union Central as well, should recover their financing.

Winnipeg Arts Club - Premier a member

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Thank you, Madam Speaker. A new question to the Premier.

Did the Premier become a member of this Arts Club as he stated he would last year?

SPEAKER'S RULING

MADAM SPEAKER: That question is totally out of order, it is not within the administrative responsibility of the government.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Yes, Madam Speaker. We have just heard two questions related to the security of a loan made by the government. The Premier stated in this House last year that he was going to become a member; we're dealing with his membership in a club which the government loaned money to. Surely the question is in order, Madam Speaker, if you'd just . . .

A MEMBER: We just want it repaid.

MR. G. MERCIER: If I may, with respect, Madam Speaker, suggest that you just not interfere with the questioning and allow the questions to be put and the answers to be given, the question period will go much smoother.

MADAM SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Opposition House Leader please withdraw those last remarks which are instructive to the Speaker.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

Would the Honourable Opposition House Leader please withdraw those last remarks which were instructive to the Speaker.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, they were meant to be helpful.

Madam Speaker, the comments were only made in an effort to expedite the business of the House, and to be helpful.

MADAM SPEAKER: The comments were most unnecessary and, under our Rules, honourable members do not give instructions to the Chair in that manner.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Madam Speaker, I was not attempting to instruct the Chair, just to make some helpful suggestions.

MADAM SPEAKER: Thank you.

The question is out of order. A member's private membership in a private club is not within the administrative competence of the government.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader on the point of order.

MR. G. MERCIER: Yes, Madam Speaker, with all due respect, I challenge your ruling.

MADAM SPEAKER: The ruling of the Chair has been challenged.

Those in favour, please say aye; those opposed, please say nay. In my opinion the ayes have it.

The Honourable Opposition House Leader.

MR. G. MERCIER: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Tuesday, 28 April, 1987

The question before the House is: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Ashton, Baker, Bucklaschuk, Cowan, Desjardins, Doer, Dolin, Evans, Harapiak (Swan River), Harapiak (The Pas), Harper, Hemphill, Kostyra, Mackling, Maloway, Schroeder, Parasiuk, Pawley, Plohman, Santos, Scott, Smith (Ellice), Smith (Osborne), Uruski, Walding, Wasylycia-Leis.

NAYS

Birt, Blake, Connery, Cummings, Derkach, Downey, Driedger, Ducharme, Enns, Ernst, Filmon, Hammond, Kovnats, McCrae, Mercier, Mitchelson, Nordman, Oleson, Orchard, Pankratz, Rocan, Roch.

MR. CLERK, W. Remnant: Yeas, 26; Nays, 22.

MADAM SPEAKER: The motion is accordingly carried.

Forest fire conditions

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Natural Resources.

Could the Minister give us an update as to the forest fire situation in the Province of Manitoba?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Madam Speaker, we are facing some very dry conditions in the southern part of the province. Precipitation has been much below normal, so we have had to action some 42 fires to date. They are all in hand.

Conditions north of the 53rd Parallel are not in critical condition, but in the southern part of the province, given the dry conditions that we have and the wind conditions, we are asking everyone to cooperate and be very cautious.

I should point out that all of the fires that have been actioned to date were relatively small; all were caused by activities of man.

Forest fire conditions - travel restrictions

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Madam Speaker, to the same Minister.

With the fishing season opening on May 9, is the Minister contemplating any restrictions in certain areas, so that people would know in advance as to when they make their plans or trips, etc.?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Certainly, Madam Speaker, at this time, we are not anticipating that there will be but,

depending on the conditions of weather between now and the opening of the season, if it were necessary for us to impose any travel restrictions, we would ensure that, through the House and through the other media, we would give ample notice of any restrictions.

Business fund - time frame

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. E. CONNERY: Thank you, Madam Speaker, to the Minister of Business Development.

A year ago, in the Budget or the Throne Speech, it was announced there would be a new fund for businesses in Manitoba. The Minister said she was working on it. Can she give us an update as to when we will finally see the details of the fund?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Business Development and Tourism.

HON. M. HEMPHILL: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Quite soon.

Western Canada Games, 1990 - location of

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: The 1991 Western Canada Games will be held somewhere in Manitoba. Where?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister responsible for Sport.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It'll be in 1990 probably. So far, if the City of Winnipeg makes the final arrangements, it would be held in Winnipeg.

Western Canada Games - application from City of Winnipeg

MR. J. McCRAE: The Minister has given us a hypothetical answer and said that, if the City of Winnipeg comes through. Has the City of Winnipeg applied for these games? If the Minister's mind has been made up, why has he kept the committee from the City of Brandon waiting since his meeting with them last June?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I haven't kept anybody waiting. I told them exactly what the situation was last June. In the meantime, yes, the City of Winnipeg has made an application, and that is being discussed at this time.

MR. J. McCRAE: When did the Minister receive the application from the City of Winnipeg?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I think it was February 3 or 2, early February this year.

Tuesday, 28 April, 1987

Western Canada Games - advise Brandon of location decision

MR. J. McCRAE: Would the Minister extend at least a modicum of courtesy to the City of Brandon and let them know what his decision is?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'd be pleased to, when I know.

Sugar beet industry - tripartite agreement

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture.

Would he be willing to update us as to the position of the tripartite agreement with the Federal Government in regard to sugar beets?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, we have had discussions with the Federal Government. I have no news to report in terms of what they will be coming back with in terms of our discussions earlier. As soon as I have something to report, Madam Speaker, I certainly will make it available.

MR. H. PANKRATZ: Would the Minister of Agriculture be willing to put forward what position he has taken, or what agreement he is prepared to accept?

HON. B. URUSKI: Madam Speaker, the honourable member should be aware that, on March 20, the Province of Manitoba made a proposal to the Federal Government which moved a considerable way above the agreement that we had with them which called on the province not to put any money into the industry beyond the 1985 crop.

There was no response from the Federal Government until our telex a week and a half ago, Madam Speaker, by now it's almost two weeks ago, at which time we asked the Federal Government to meet further. Our staff worked up a number of proposals for consideration of both governments, which we have accepted the majority of those proposals. However, we have not had a response from the Federal Government as to how flexible they have indicated they are prepared to be. Quite frankly, Madam Speaker, our bottom line is we will not sign a blank cheque.

MADAM SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY HOUSE BUSINESS

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Government House Leader.

Order please. If honourable members want to carry on private conversations, they can do so elsewhere.

The Honourable Government House Leader has the floor.

HON. J. COWAN: Madam Speaker, on a matter of House Business, I believe there's an inclination on the

part of all members to dispense with Private Members' Hour today. We would continue on with the consideration of Estimates.

We will be beginning Natural Resources in the Chamber and continuing on with Health in the Committee Room.

Accordingly, Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour, 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.

MOTION presented.

MATTER OF GRIEVANCE

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Madam Speaker, I wish to grieve. I was on my feet, and you had not noticed me, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur then.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I want to say that I find it extremely difficult, the situation in which we see ourselves and the Legislature sees itself in today, and that this government has again seen come upon it.

How many more, Madam Speaker, how many more issues, how many more activities of which either his Cabinet or members of his government are involved in which are questionable, which brings to the mind of every one of us here how difficult it is to make sure that everything is carried out well?

I know the First Minister of the Province of Manitoba is going to point fingers at the Member for Arthur. He's going to go all through the Alcan scandal that the press perpetuated, my colleague for Lakeside, that total involvement, but that's okay, Madam Speaker. That's okay. I lived through that and the First Minister won the election. He had the golden opportunity to have a full investigation, but he forgot that it was an issue. And I have no difficulty, Madam Speaker, in standing here today and letting my total record of my political history, my whole activities be fully scrutinized. That is not what I'm rising for.

I'm rising, Madam Speaker, because again we see in the Province of Manitoba the squandering and what appears to be the misuse of taxpayers' money. Whose money are we appointed, whose money are they appointed, are they elected to look after, hard-earned money, yes, by the labourers, wage earners and the union people of this province; yes, by the people who have invested and worked their lives in this province for a better future for their children, Madam Speaker; yes, people who wanted to have better health services, to have better social services, and all those things that are essential to a higher standard of life. That's what their taxes are supposed to be used for.

Yes, Madam Speaker, and in certain situations, it is the responsibility of government to use the taxpayers' money to help those who are less fortunate in society

and business; yes, to help those, whether it be a farmer, where in fact there are not sufficient funds from other sources to make a viable operation carry on. Yes, and it seems to become a socially accepted thing, before any business starts up or before any activity takes place that in fact, Madam Speaker, we have people calling on the government to put money in.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker, C. Santos, in the Chair.)

We have the Communities Economic Development Program, Mr. Deputy Speaker, which is not, by any means, new. It's carried out a series of loans, I guess probably \$21 million is what the corporation is responsible for. Loans, yes, I'm sure that have carried out the responsibilities that the mandate was given to the corporation. But then, we have many loans that are coming under question. You know, one can even back off if there were some advancing of funds. If in fact it was a judgment call, one could be less harsh. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we cannot be less harsh when we see the advancement of a \$350,000 loan which, No. 1, is questionable because, if a credit check had been run by the government, by the Communities Economic Development Fund, they would have found out that the individual, a year earlier, couldn't have repaid any of the money. But we come to April of 1986, the Cabinet, the Premier no less and all the front-bench people were sitting in, saying we'll give them another \$350,000 in loans or loan guarantee. Well, that's questionable.

But the other point that really is bringing a shadow - and I'm not after the Member for Rupertsland in a personal, slanderous way, not in any way, shape or form. In fact, I have learned from the Minister and the member something about his way of life and his people, and I, in no way, shape or form, will stand here and be accused of being a racist because I believe, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that he is a Manitoban and a Canadian as equal as anyone else here.

But where the question rises, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is his activity and involvement with his campaign headquarters being in - or I shouldn't say, campaign headquarters - but part of his campaign headquarters being at the location of which Mr. N.D. Gunn is at on 41 Higgins in Winnipeg. One has to question why would he be approved for a loan in the first place, because it's for northern businesses, it's for northern Native employment.

Yes, we were told by the manager all the locations of the loans. Do you know where N.D. Gunn was listed as? Listed as Norway House. Well, interesting, Norway House, so a researcher went to do some research to check, to call Mr. Gunn's business, to see, legitimately find out what was going on with the business. Strangely enough, Mr. Deputy Speaker, no number for Mr. Gunn, no business, address unknown. We were misled to some degree by the committee that this was the headquarters of Mr. N.D. Gunn Company.

What do you do next? You proceed to find out what other activities. Why would this all be? Further indications have come to us, we find that the Member for Rupertsland, Minister, sitting in the Cabinet, elected on the 18th of March, a part of approval of a Cabinet decision in April to give this individual where he had his office - by the way, I understand the arrangement of the office was made by his executive assistant. I'm

not sure of the individual's last name, but I'm sure it's Elaine. I know her first name; I know that she has been certainly working for the New Democratic Party and and this Cabinet Minister's office for quite some time, so she apparently made the arrangements for this. The Premier comes back with the argument, well it's okay, the Minister really doesn't have anything to worry about because it was done by the central office, by the ND Party of Manitoba.

But on whose behalf? It doesn't make it any less important because they do it, but it was done by his executive assistant, yes, maybe paid for by the election offices, but it was in fact carried out by the Minister's executive assistant on behalf of the Minister.

Okay, let's clear the air, let's get that information confirmed or denied. But I think it'll be confirmed - \$300.00. Everybody talks about the \$300.00. What's the issue? Have they paid for it? Well, there's an issue there. How, in fact, and why - (Interjection) - That's right. The question is, did they? The question is, why - so interested in this whole political connection. None of the \$350,000, we're not accusing the \$350,000 went back to the party for the political campaign. We're not saying that at all.

But there is something very strange when you've got a company that's in a very serious financial situation which, by the way, we were told by the Communities Economic Committee, by the Chairman, that they get a monthly report on every loan, the status of it, that every loan over \$150,000 has to be approved by Cabinet, that in April, a month after the election of which my friend, the Member for Rupertsland, had his campaign office in, in Higgins - I mean, he's from Rupertsland. Why it would be in Higgins in Winnipeg, for the life of me, I can't figure that one out and, a month later, he gets a \$350,000 loan.

The Member for Swan River has hard-working people who put that money up. The Member for The Pas has people who work hard and put that money up, and goodness' sakes, the Member for Lac du Bonnet knows how hard his constituency works, and the labourers in the Member for Inkster's constituency work very hard to earn for the taxpayers to have spent in this manner.

It's wrong, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to have the funds used in this manner, if in fact they have been used for the betterment of the Minister and his election.

The First Minister said, so what, he didn't benefit from it. I tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, who benefited from it, the election of the ND Party probably was part of it, deprived the Progressive Conservative Party, my leader, Gary Filmon, from becoming the Premier of the province and running what is called a responsible government. That's where the deprivation came. - (Interjection) - That's right. And the public have seen \$350,000.00.

The Minister of Finance, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has to put money, has to collect taxpayers' money; he has to increase the payroll tax; he has to increase the sales tax; he has to increase the personal income tax; he has to increase everybody's tax. Why? Three hundred and fifty thousand dollars. That's one small example. We've got the \$28 million in MTX; we've got the \$100 million in Flyer Bus; we've got all these areas that they're continuing to put money, but they won't take hold of their responsibility, Mr. Deputy Speaker, they won't take hold of their responsibility.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to as well address the whole question of why I've asked the Minister, possibly the First Minister, to take the Minister and say, look, until this matter is fully cleared up, maybe it would be just as well to not be a part of Cabinet decisions. It's going to have to be discussed, I'm not saying make the decision, you're out, let's get the information, but I think precedent has been set. Look in the House of Commons, and who makes more to-do about what's happened in Ottawa, whether it's Mr. Coates going to a night club in Germany that wasn't quite right, whether it's the Minister who was looking into their election irregularities. There are some election irregularities here, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

What I'm trying to say, there is a direct comparison. There is a question now being raised about irregularities in the election expenses and the privileges given, or the funds given to a supporter or an individual who got \$350,000.00. There is substantial evidence, that's the case I'm trying to make to this Assembly here today. There has been a precedent set where a Cabinet Minister in Ottawa, because of what was apparent or appeared to be some election irregularities, he said, I will step aside until the air is cleared. The Premier today has had a golden opportunity to say it was done in Ottawa - and let's look what happened in Ottawa. The Minister is back in his Cabinet position. And I say, the same thing could well happen here. And I think it is being unfair to the Minister for Northern Affairs and Native Affairs not to be given that opportunity. I think it's only a responsible action; a precedent has been set.

Now they've taken the other approach. At the end of committee today, the Minister made a brief comment, thinking that because the central party paid for it, that it would get him off the hook. The Premier said in the House today, the central party paid for it, so it made it okay, that there is a direct connection with Mr. Gunn and the party, even though it's Mr. Harper's campaign office, it was in his facilities and, in fact, it's okay.

The public, Mr. Deputy Speaker, are fed up. They're fed up with many politicians, and they're upset about certain things politicians do. And they're particularly upset when they don't get the full information about what's happening with their money. And that's where we're at. The Premier didn't give a very satisfactory answer today; the Minister of Northern Affairs hasn't given a very satisfactory answer; there is a multitude of information that has to be brought forward, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to clear the air. Why, for the life of me, would the First Minister and the Minister involved not step aside, and have the air cleared?

I think back - it's very difficult - I can remember when I was accused, and I'll talk briefly about that, of having some involvement or knowing where the Alcan smelter was going to be placed, and here I am out, bought a piece of ground it was going to be placed on. Had I known, Mr. Deputy Speaker, where the Alcan smelter was going to be built, I wouldn't have been five miles one way or the other from it, I'd have been right underneath it. Nobody has told me yet what benefit it is to be five or six miles beside an Alcan smelter with all the stuff spewing out of it, the acid rains and the acid aluminums and all this. I have yet to be told what benefits I would have received from that, Mr. Deputy Speaker. - (Interjection)- fluorides. The Member for Inkster helped me out. It would have been fluorides.

But the whole point is, it's hard, it's difficult, but Mr. Deputy Speaker, there was no substance to it. There was absolutely no substance to it. The Premier said we should call a public inquiry. That's before he got elected, should call a public inquiry, an investigation. He became elected, all at once he forgot about it. For some reason, it wasn't of any import any more. Two reasons, No. 1, he won the election; No. 2, there wasn't any substantiation to it. And he knew it.

But Mr. Deputy Speaker - and I don't have any notes, minutes, I'm sure I'm causing some problems for members who want to get into committee, but I felt compelled to rise. But there's one issue that I want to touch on, and touch on because it's really an important part of the area that I represent.

We have seen this kind of activity by the Premier who, with the Attorney-General, with his other colleagues, has made a major decision for the constituency of Arthur, nothing to do with conflict, nothing to do with anything other than the protection of the livelihood, the lives and the properties of my constituents. They made a decision - and note this, Mr. Deputy Speaker - they made the decision because they said they were going to save money for the taxpayers. They were going to cut the RCMP services in Reston by three to no detachment at all, and the same thing in Deloraine, cut it by two. That was in the interests of saving money, Mr. Deputy Speaker. That's the point I want to make.

We have the Premier and his Cabinet literally throwing money away through Crown corporations, through questionable loans which have a certain amount of question about them and the involvement of his Cabinet Ministers. Yet, the constituency of Arthur gets the reward of losing RCMP protection in the interests of cash or savings for the taxpayers - absolutely bloody ridiculous, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that we've got this kind of irresponsible government carrying out that activity. It's rape and pillage of the people of the Province of Manitoba and their money, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and we've had enough of it! The taxpayers have had enough of it.

We've got a Minister of Community Services who has been continually challenged and charged by my colleague from St. Norbert, from the Member for Portage la Prairie in her incompetent handling of lives of people. What have we had? More rhetoric and platitudes. Yes, my colleague from Gladstone says more platitudes from the Premier. Well, enough is enough, and the taxpayers are saying let's clean this mess up.

We have a mandate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, from the people of Manitoba. Yes, we were defeated in 1981, and we lost again in 1986, March, of which the Member for Rupertsland used a very nice constituency office in Winnipeg, of which a month later the individual they rented it from received a \$350,000 loan, even though he was probably \$500,000 in debt with other creditors the year before, and they knew all this. Yet, yes, we'll give him another \$350,000.00.

The Premier says to pay for it, we'll take the RCMP out of Reston and Deloraine. Those lives don't matter for those people. Their property doesn't matter. We'll shake the confidence of those old pioneers who worked and saw the RCMP all their lives to give them the security they needed in their years of retirement. We'll take that away just to cushion some of those areas that we think are important.

Well, as I said, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if he thinks the people - I don't care whether they're, yes, union supporters. I know very well that union supporters in this province are traditionally supporters of NDP. But I can tell you, I know a lot of union people who don't support their position on abortion. They've got high moral standards, those same people, and they won't tolerate the kind of activities that we've seen time and time again by this government.

You know, we -(Interjection)- Well, the Minister doesn't understand it. Well, I told him the other day, he's quite prepared to take an innocent, unborn baby's life by abortion, yet he won't stand up and support the capital punishment and the taking of a criminal's life because they took someone else's. That just doesn't square with me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, a philosophy like that. Is it any wonder we've got Ministers that we had that should have resigned from MTS? My goodness' sakes, yes, he resigned from MTS, shouldn't be sitting in Cabinet. Goodness' sake, what kind of system have we come to in this province, in this country!

Yes, the Minister of Finance, I have to be honest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, with the Minister. You know, when he started in that portfolio, I looked upon him as maybe being the one person who would shoot straight, would come forward and give the kind of information, and he was. But you know, all at once, there was a deviation from that path, whether it was because he changed or whether he was forced to change by the Premier because the image that he was portraying was a little different than he wanted.- (Interjection)- The Member from where? Said get my mind out of where? Out of the gutter. Oh, yes, we've got the former city councillor, former Conservative, but I don't say that my mind's in the gutter. I don't consider my mind in the gutter if I stand up and speak it and say the honest truth. I've never been penalized for telling the truth. I've been penalized if I deviated from it as a young person growing up, but that was one principle that I was raised with, and that's that you tell the truth.

But my colleague from Charleswood, here's where we're really at with this government. My colleague from Charleswood, the other day, points out what the Minister of Cultural Affairs is up to - again, remember whose money it is, taxpayers' money. The NDP don't just go and take it out of the shelves, they take it from the pockets of our taxpayers. Everybody should understand that. They don't get very much money from our resources. In fact, they spend more money in the Crown corporations trying to take advantage of the resources than they ever make out of it.

The Minister thought it was justifiable to give money to a group in society that the majority of people say are highly questionable about the practices that are carried out by those individuals, but because it's supported by the arts groups of some kind, that legitimizes it. Well, let me tell you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Legislature or nobody can legitimize in our society what is wrong, wrong, wrong. You can try all you like but a Legislature -(Interjection)- for some reason, the Member for Elice seems somewhat sensitive on this particular issue. I wonder why.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I said you cannot legislate a wrong right. And what is wrong in society will always be wrong.- (Interjection)- The Minister of Finance says I'm sick, I'm sick. Well, if I'm sick -(Interjection)- The

Minister says who am I going to attack next? Mr. Deputy Speaker, it's interesting to note that she's now listening. She says I'm sick.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I can understand why they're getting upset, because it is our job as an Opposition to disclose what they're doing with the taxpayers' money. Why would they get upset? If they're doing everything that's copacetic and aboveboard and everybody would support it, why would they get upset? Why am I sick because I'm disclosing what they're doing?

The Minister of Autopac - my goodness' sakes, you know, here we have the Minister responsible for Autopac, who does what? Oh, he's got a memory problem, oh yes, but then all at once some records of his happen to get shredded that went over to the Archives. I'll say -(Interjection)- now he's getting upset with me, Mr. Deputy Speaker. It seems that it's a sensitive day for the New Democratic Government. I will review in Hansard what I said, but I don't think I said anything that hasn't been put on the record or said publicly. But one has to question why his records were shredded. Yet for the convenience of the government, my colleague from Lakeside's records, all at once, happen to show up. It's a matter of coincidence, that all at once, my colleague's records show up. You know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are far too many things that are appearing to be coincidental.

Mr. Deputy Speaker . . .

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. D. ORCHARD: Stand up and put it on the record.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the member wants to have the floor, he can have the floor sometime.

The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we're talking about the taxpayers' money and I know that there's a sensitivity on the part of every Minister over there.

I want to address something else, and you know it's quite timely that we got the Minister of Highways' allocations or their program on our desks at this particular time. Why do we now have the taxpayers of Manitoba investing in a bridge - yes, whose property is it on, or whose property is involved? The former Member for Lac du Bonnet, coincidence again, another coincidence, just happened to be. Whose constituency is it in? Well, it's next to the Premier's, you know, another coincidence.

What's happening while all this money is being spent, Mr. Deputy Speaker? That money being spent is the money that should be going, yes, for the road in my colleague's constituency in Gladstone, Minnedosa. My colleague from River East needs a section built on the Perimeter Highway, and I'm sure the majority of people in Winnipeg, and they should have this reported to them, would like to have four lanes joining them with the United States so that they could enjoy some beneficial commerce of people coming to the racetrack.

But our priorities - no, it's not to help the majority of the people of Manitoba or to put another piece of good road out there to haul some resources on, our priority is to build a \$20-plus million bridge, yes, property that the former Minister of Highways was involved in, yes, next to the Premier's constituency. I don't particularly think the taxpayers like to have their money spent in those ways.

I don't particularly like giving a speech like this, but I don't have any other material to speak about with this government. If I were to stand up and give them some positive things, what could I talk about, Mr. Deputy Speaker? I challenge them to tell me what I could speak about. Could I speak about the Minister of Agriculture, who says he's not going to give the sugar industry a blank cheque? Yet he's prepared through the Communities Economic Development Fund to give Mr. N.D. Gunn a blank cheque. Even though he's in financial trouble, he says, go and spend some more.

You know, the \$350,000 guarantee in April of '86, that's more money for one person than 400 farmers were going to get in one year for support. More money than 200-and-some full- and part-time workers were going to get in the sugar beet industry, and more than 60-some workers were going to get to support the sugar beet industry in Manitoba. One person gets it.

Who was that person? Well, that person seemed to have some magic way of getting this money from the government. Again, Mr. Deputy Speaker, the government doesn't need to get mad at me and tear me to pieces for disclosing what has happened in their shop. I mean, are they that sensitive? Are they that concerned that they've done something wrong, that they have to get mad and say I'm in the gutter and I'm throwing mud? That's not the intent of what I'm doing, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

I want members like the Member for Lac du Bonnet to be fully aware of how my constituents feel; I want the Member for Swan River to know how his and my constituents feel; I want the Member for The Pas to have some sensitivity as to how, whether it's the railway workers, the Manfor workers, the farmers, some knowledge and sensitivity as to how they're using the taxpayers' money.

You know, the one that really hurts me the most, Mr. Deputy Speaker, is the loss of the RCMP in two communities. The reason they're closing it down is because they haven't got any money.-(Interjection)- Oh, yes, my colleague from Gladstone says they close hospital beds for the same reason. You know, the Minister of Health comes in with his big, big story about, we want to spend more money. No, Mr. Deputy Speaker, we don't want to spend more money, we just want to take that hard-earned money of the taxpayers and use it in a proper manner. That's all. It's not that difficult to figure out. You don't have to be - the Minister of Finance, I'm sure can understand it and figure it out. But he comes out and says what do you want us to spend more money for? You want more services, so we have to spend more money. Yes, we want essential services provided and we want to use that hard-earned taxpayers' money for that purpose, not for the kind of political support which is appearing to be prevalent in most of the activities that are spent, whether it's Crown corporations within government.

Could you tell me, Sir, how much time I have left?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member has 10 minutes left.

MR. J. DOWNEY: 10 minutes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to go back to the issue which encouraged me to rise today, and that's the committee this morning where we asked, first of all, didn't have the total story told to us about Mr. N.D. Gunn and where his residence was, and the fact that the Minister couldn't come straight forward and say, no, he didn't have any involvement in a Cabinet decision that gave him \$350,000.00. You know, those are the kinds of answers that clear the air. Direct, concise, decisive answers clear the air. There was too much question.

(Madam Speaker in the Chair.)

The Honourable Government House Leader had to get involved in the action. Old "damage control" had to move in. You know, when my colleague from Emerson asked about forest fires, it's strange, it seems to me that's what the House Leader has been doing all through this Session and the Session before, putting out fires, trying to put out fires. But after awhile, Madam Speaker, it starts to stick on the government, and I think it's sticking.

As I said, I hate to have to give this kind of a speech, I really do. But I tell you, Madam Speaker, I haven't been given any other information to deal with. You see? That's the reason I have to give this kind of speech is because I haven't been given any other kind of information that I can deal with. Madam Speaker, we have more information which we hope to get out of the Economic Development Committee.

You know, the Minister may think that this will blow over today. From what I can tell, Madam Speaker, it won't blow over today and it won't blow over tomorrow, but there will be a continual examination not only by the Opposition, but I'm sure the media have now somewhat of an interest in this whole activity. That's one loan, Madam Speaker, that we're asking about. There are a series of more loans, which I'll give the government notice right now and the First Minister, which we're going to want some information on.

You know, I can refer to them, if the Minister would like, but maybe I'll leave it till next committee meeting because there'll be more opportunity, and I can complete my remarks now. I'll leave that for a later time, and we'll have the opportunity at that committee meeting to deal with some other, what we would consider, questionable uses of taxpayers' money.

Madam Speaker, we had an unfortunate situation develop here today. We had an unfortunate situation develop when my colleague, the Leader, the Member for Pembina, spent so much time to disclose what was happening in the Manitoba Telephone System. We have seen - I know the Member for Ellice kind of crinkles up his face. He doesn't like to hear those words. The Minister responsible for Labour gets upset because it's bad news when this kind of thing comes about.

These are the letters that are starting to come in, and they aren't coming from Conservative supporters. They're saying how long do we have to wait? Is there any way that we can recall a government who are so bad and so incompetent as the one we have? That,

of course, is a campaign of one of the political parties that are trying to make some noises, that they have a recall. It's these kinds of people in government and their incompetent handling of provincial or public affairs that ask people to put recall instruments into election acts or constitutions.- (Interjection)- Yes, it's that kind of government that requests recall, because it's so bad that's the kind of letters I'm now getting.

I plead with the government, Madam Speaker, I plead with you, I plead with the government, to clear the air on the matter that deals with the Communities Economic Development Fund, and the Minister who is responsible for Northern Affairs. I ask the air be cleared. I pointed out that there has been a precedent set in Ottawa where a Minister stepped down because of what was perceived to be some election irregularities. It's an election irregularity that appears here, plus a \$350,000 loan to follow. They cannot divorce themselves from the public attitude that is now held about government. They perpetuate the case against Ottawa, as a New Democratic Party, they perpetuate the case against Ottawa. Now they have to reap the rewards of the same kind of policies and principles that they advocate in this regard.

Let's let them carry out, for themselves and on themselves, what they have asked for other people. It's only fair. I have to be honest, Madam Speaker, I haven't touched on a couple of other areas. I'll touch on them briefly. McKenzie Seeds is going to come again before the committee. Well, we know the history of McKenzie Seeds; it hasn't been a very pretty picture. We're seeing the employees of the province having to pick up the deficit of a Workers Compensation unfunded liability, to use the term of the government, but an \$84 million deficit which developed since 1981. Yes, there may have been some workers who maybe weren't treated fairly and maybe there had to be some changes made, but it didn't have to go to an \$84 million deficit. Are you sure the workers are the ones who got all the benefits, the injured workers got all the benefits, or did somebody else? Let's have a look at it.

I hope the injured workers got the benefits of that deficit, but for some particular reason, one has to question it.- (Interjection)- I disregard the Member for Ellice. His record is yet to be written too, as far as his activities are concerned, and we'll watch his performance over time and his activities.

I'm going to conclude my remarks today, Madam Speaker, by saying to the people of the communities of Reston and Deloraine that I, as a member of the Legislature for those communities, am not going to rest until we get into government and replace the services of the RCMP that were taken away by this irresponsible government. I can assure you, Madam Speaker, that I'll be taking the funds away from those people, those ill-conceived projects and programs and patronage handouts that this government has perceived in its best interests to carry out. That's where the funds will come from, Madam Speaker. The people of Manitoba, not only in Reston and Deloraine, can be assured that the members of the Conservative caucus do believe in the safety, in the health, in the lives of people, in the protection of property and that it is a government's responsibility to carry that out, the senior government's responsibility that the transfer of that cost to municipal people, to municipal taxpayers, is not fair, and we don't subscribe to the principles that this government does.

It's unfortunate that the Minister of Northern Affairs finds himself today in such a situation. It's unfortunate that the Premier hadn't agreed to do the honourable thing and ask him to step aside from Cabinet until the air was totally cleared. But until, and I say until, the air is totally cleared and all suspicions and all doubts are removed, Madam Speaker, then we will continue to question. The Opposition will continue to question, the people will continue to question, and the electorate won't rest until they have turfed this incompetent, this money-squandering group of people out of office, Madam Speaker. In most people's minds, that can't come soon enough, and I'm going to put every bit of my energy and strength forward, Madam Speaker, to see that happens in the next few months.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

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 Natural Resources; and the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet in the Chair for the Department of Health.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY - HEALTH

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Baker: Committee, come to order.
Mr. Minister.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, as I promised yesterday, I'll give the Health critic of the Official Opposition a copy of the Master Aircraft Lease as requested.

The Home Care Orderly - I'll give you the number of orderlies that we had in '84, '85, '86 and '87 and what the clients were in the same year.

In August 1984, we had 20 orderlies with 120 clients; in July '85, 40 orderlies with 420 clients; March '86, 45 orderlies with 450 clients; and April 15, 1987, 66 orderlies with 780 clients. The total cost, that is the travel and the fee, the pay - the wages - and for those 20 orderlies, it was \$406.7 thousand. Excuse me, that's for '82-83, that was \$406.7 thousand, when it was still operated privately, and now what is anticipated for this year is \$1.024 million. That gives us over three times the number of orderlies, six times the number of clients and it's costing us about two-and-a-half more than it cost us before.

The average unit of services, that is a unit of services, one hour of client activity, in '84-85, it was 4,059; in '85-86, 6,187; in '86-87, the average was 7,028. Last week there were 2,785 visits made by Home Care orderlies. The reasons for that, for the big increase, more hospital discharge requiring heavier care, more active younger physically disabled requiring service in more locations, that is, the home work and social settings, increase in hour services, weekdays 6:00 a.m. to midnight, and weekends, 6:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m., increased number of specially trained staff who move around the city with particular clients. The Home Care orderlies are part of the Home Care attendant staff. They are paid the same and both provide personal care homes.

So I'll just give the information and I won't comment at this time on the answers.

The Home Care orderlies make more frequent and much shorter visits with clients who are generally more active. Home Care orderlies are managed out of one region, Winnipeg North, where they are dispatched city-wide, whereas all other Home Care attendants are managed in each of the three regions and assigned within those regions. That's one.

The number of the supervisors and the people who - is there something wrong? Am I going too fast or what? The people who were authorizing expenses, the signing authority, that is, every expense has to be signed, and in 1985-86 there were 22 signing authorities in the Winnipeg Region; in '87-88 there are 26 signing authorities in the three regions - not forty-something, the supervision. All supervisors in the new system are expected to know about and authorize expenditures of staff directly responsible to them, scrutinize and authorize expense accounts and mileage reports.

The main change in supervisory patterns are as a result of reorganization is that all staff have one supervisor to whom they are totally accountable. In the former system, most staff were accountable to two senior people and the one who has operational responsibilities, you dominate the area directors, generally scrutinize and approve staff accounts. The total number of senior people in Winnipeg remains the same. So the senior people remains the same. Everyone reports only to one and these people are, instead of signing and authorizing 40, for 40 people in some area, that they hardly knew what they were doing. Now these people are working with their own staff and that has to be signed anyway, so we think it's an improvement.

The Health Education tax levy - Manitoba Health Services Commission, Administration - that's the health levy, that's the increase, \$90,000; Cadham Lab and X-ray units, \$77,700; and the facilities, \$4,539 million, for a total of \$4.706 million. Hydro - Manitoba Health Services Commission, \$5,000; Cadham Lab, \$23,000; facilities, \$650,000 for a total of \$678,000.00. The telephone, that is a guess, that's not finished yet; there's no decision. We put in the Manitoba Health Services Administration, 1.5; Cadham Lab, 1; and facilities, 34. Now that would be an increase of 1 percent, would equate to the amount shown above. In other words, 36.5 would be for 1 percent. They got 1 percent for telephone - \$36.5 thousand for each 1 percent.

MR. D. ORCHARD: For each 1 percent of telephone rate increase, it's \$36,500.00.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: So we got 11.5 percent, so we're at . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We don't know that yet, whatever.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, fair enough.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: And the Hydro, that includes 5 percent effective April 1, 1987, plus one-time increase of 4.7. That's what I heard.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The one-time forever increase.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, one time. If you take it off, then it's gone, that's not one time any more.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's what one time used to mean.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Based on an increase of 1.5 and 2.2, that is the health education. Okay.

I'd like to make a correction, as yesterday we talked about Pharmacare, I'd like the record to show that the correct projected increase in Pharmacare claims for the benefit year 1986 over the previous year will be approximately 2,300, not 20,000; 2,300 and I think we had 20,000.

The Northern Patient Transportation Program, the warrants issued for calendar year, January 1, 1985 and '86, that's effective transport are controlled and funded through a budget allocated to each region, these being Flin Flon, The Pas, Thompson, Churchill and Winnipeg for the area east of Lake Winnipeg, between the 53rd and 51st.

Emergency transport are controlled and funded from Manitoba Health Commission, Winnipeg office. I will give you the 1985 to start with, the region, the number of elective, the number of emergencies and the total.

Thompson, 5,939; emergency 1,127, for a total of 7,066 - that's the Northern Patient Transportation Program, I don't know if I mentioned that - The Pas, elective 2,711, emergency 550, for a total 3,261; Flin Flon, 2,310 elective, 399 emergency, total 2,709; Churchill, 184 elective, 77 emergency, total 261; Winnipeg, elective 1,172, emergency 275, total 1,447; the totals, elective 12,316, emergency 2,428, and total 14,744.

Now, the same thing for the next year, in '86: Thompson, elective 5,707, emergency 982, for a total of 6,689; The Pas, elective 2,332, emergency 292, total 2,624; Flin Flon, 2,206 elective, 242 emergency, total 2,448 total; Churchill, 109 elective, 66 emergency, 175 total; Winnipeg, 1,191 elective, 290 emergency, total 1,481; emergency, 11,545; elective, 1,872; in total, 13,417.

The payments for the Health Services Commission, that is the external audit, the facilities audit fees, that is the institution, \$650,000.00. The Manitoba Health Services Commission, the internal audit, that's \$133,175; the financial consultants, that is \$588,757, for a total of the Manitoba Health Services Commission of \$721,932.00. That's for the audits. Do you want me to give it to you again?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Okay. Facilities audit fees, that's payments by hospitals and personal care homes to external auditor for the audit of their operation, \$650,000.00.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's for all facilities, hospital and personal care homes?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes. The Manitoba Health Services Commission, first, the internal audit - that's the internal audit staff. There are three of them of the commission which undertake ongoing audit and review

of the commission's internal operation, that is \$133,175.00. The financial consultant, that's commission financial consultant on officers who review hospitals and personal care homes, budget appeals, year-end approval costs, monitoring of commission payment, facilities and so on, those are the consultants, there's \$588,757.00. The total for the commission is \$721,932, and the total for the commission and facilities, \$1,371,932.00.

Brandon and Selkirk Mental Health Centre, staff to patient ratio, average daily patient census, 1970, was 1,508. In five years, the next five years was 891 in '75; in '80 was 916; '85, 783. The number of staff went down to 1,278, a ratio of .85 in '75, 1,204 for a ratio of 1.35; 1980, 1,047, for a ratio of 1.14; and '85 number of staff, 1,056 for a ratio of 1.33. This represents a five-year moving average for both staff years and number of patients.

In '87-88, 14 staff years are transferred from the Selkirk Mental Health Centre complement of staff to the Winnipeg Region. This is in keeping with the administrative realignment recommended in the report of the mental health working group.

The increased ratio of staff to patient reflects the requirement for part of it anyway, for the additional staff to cover holiday relief and maternity leave but highlights the possibility to transfer additional staff years to support the Community Mental Health Program. However, to facilitate this transfer successfully, negotiations are under way and require the retraining of workers to meet community mental health needs.

Finally, staff committed to outpatient caseload to service the community mental health needs of Brandon and Selkirk and outreach activities in the seven rural health and social service regions are reflected in the inpatient staff complement of the two mental health centres.

Computers - number of computers with the department of the Manitoba Health Services Commission. The department, Manitoba Health, presently has a decentralized computer environment consisting of 9 mini-computers and 16 personal computers installed in various areas of the department. In addition, the department also uses Manitoba Data Service, MDS, for processing and storing other data, that is, public health nursing statistics and so on. These computers are used for a variety of functions, including immunization monitoring, homemaker payroll, word processing and other support functions to departmental programs. The first one I was just talking on was the department.

Now, the Manitoba Health Services Commission - the commission has an agreement with Manitoba Data Services whereby almost all of its data processing for the programs the commission is responsible for is done at MDS. Data is transmitted to and from MDS through a mini-computer and various display terminals are located at the Manitoba Health Services Commission office. As well, a very small portion of the commission's computing requirements is done on 10 personal computers.

Additional information about the red-circling question for regional staff - letters were sent to all potentially affected people. The 11 positions might potentially be affected, that is seven presently in Health and Social Services, specialists, six jobs; and four in resource

coordinators, scheduling clerks' job, etc. No red-circling instruction has yet been sent to the Civil Service Commission - none.

There will be no change of relative pay level for any employees, at least until a new MGEA contract is struck this fall. It is anticipated that all job classification reviews will be completed by the end of June and staff advised of the outcome.

Now, red-circling called over-range provision of the Civil Service Commission are standard practices when change occurs and are taken to ease the change transition as opposed to immediate downward reclassification. The term "red-circling" indicates that, at a certain date, the individual's salary would be frozen but not reduced for a two-year period pending reclassification review.

I think that's all. If there is anything else, we'll probably give it to you as soon as possible.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, yesterday when we were talking in terms of hospital funding, I believe we came to a figure that in the increase this year of \$60-some-odd million, \$21 million of that is in effect new dollar funding or increased dollar funding for existing hospital facilities. So, if we take the year-over-year of identical facilities, we've got \$21 million, I believe, in rough figures of additional dollars.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now, do you have a similar figure that you can pull on personal care homes wherein there is a \$13.6 million increase, comparing identical facilities, no new additions, etc., etc.? Can you pull that figure for me as well, please?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I hope it's a comparable figure, not a similar one - I'm being funny, it's not that much.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Only John Bucklaschuk gets into confusion over how it should be worded. It was the magnitude of the . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Two million, eight six - will you quit flapping your gums when I'm giving you all this information?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Wait a minute, Don, \$7.6424 million. I can give you that in proprietary homes. Do you want that divided into nonproprietary homes and community therapy service, drug programs, adult day cares? Do you just want the total?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes, that's fine.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Okay.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, as long as I'm understanding correctly, and I hope I am because we're running out of time this afternoon but, if we take the Personal Care Home and Hospital lines, we have a funding of roughly \$800 million, and I'm rounding substantially. Assuming that on the identical facilities,

no new beds, no new facilities, we got - and I'm willing to round the new monies up to \$30 million between personal care homes and additional funding for the identical last year's facilities - we got a \$30 million increase which, if I can do a quick calculation, is about a 4 percent increase to the facilities, assuming all \$30 million was able to be used to cover increased costs.

But the point I want to make with the Minister - and I'm glad to see the Minister of Finance is here - because, of that \$30 million in new money to fund the existing program in last year's identical personal care homes and hospitals, we've got rough figures, once again, because the total for payroll tax, hydro and telephone in the MHSC is approaching \$5.7 million, \$5.75 million, and I'm using a telephone rate increase of only 10 percent, not the 11.5 percent that they've applied for. So I say that roughly \$5 million of that is probably applicable to the hospitals and personal care homes, which is ballpark I will admit.

So that you've got fully one-sixth of that increase or one-sixth of the 4 percent increase already eaten up by measures brought down by the Minister of Finance. The proposition I will make to you, with the Minister of Finance here, is that you, as Minister of Health, will do one of two things. You will see, within the personal care homes and the hospitals, a decrease in the level of service offered to accommodate that \$5 million of additional cost through the budget and through the Crown corporations that provide services to those homes; or you will be going back to the Minister of Finance for Special Warrant which will increase his deficit, either lowered services in the facilities or a sizeable increase to the deficit.

Mr. Chairman, that impact, as I say, is applicable in all of the hospitals, personal care homes. It's applicable to Eden Mental Health Centre, Brandon Mental Health Centre, Selkirk Mental Health Centre, as funded institutions. It's applicable to the Alcohol Foundation of Manitoba where they didn't get a 4 percent increase. They got almost a 1 percent decrease in funding. They're expecting to substantially increase recoveries, but the increased taxes, payroll tax and telephone and hydro are probably going to amount to two of those vacant positions that they won't be able to fill to deliver additional programs.

So the point I want to make with the Minister is that this Budget, which was the largest tax grab in the history of the province, is going to see reduced services in our health care facilities. When we get to Education, the same thing is going to be evident there. Either you will reduce services, or you will go and drive the deficit up further by asking for more money, one of the two.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is confirming pretty well what I said yesterday, that we were negotiating. Of course, if we are allowed to get the money to allow to add this money to the facilities and so on, well then, fine. It's either higher taxes or the deficit; in this case, it would be a deficit. Or it could be that we will recoup some of that and maybe not all of it, so that is still, as I said yesterday, being negotiated, discussed with the Department of Finance and also Treasury and the facilities.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, as we talked about last night and maybe we'll get time to reaffirm or get

into the discussion briefly, these contract negotiations that are currently going to be entered into with the MGEA, previous contracts have been, I must say, quite generous and lucrative. I gave the Minister a copy of an analysis I did in terms of the block of additional monies that has been included in each and every year's deficit from rather generous MGEA contract negotiations since the Federal Government's 6 and 5 program. Those contracts have been negotiated and are trendsetters in your health care facilities. You can't get away from it. When there's an extra week in MGEA, it affected Brandon and Selkirk, and additional staff is required to cover off. You alluded to that in your answer.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, the contract settlement in MGEA has, as I say, been the target that CUPE and other support services, MONA, and other groups in the health care facilities will target on.

That's why it's important, after having the discussion last night, if you come to the option in the health care facilities, the hospitals, that bed closure is the remedy to budget control, after having presumably studied whether there are management efficiencies to be achieved, etc., etc., you come to the conclusion that bed cuts are the only reason, then the natural follow-through, as you said last night yourself, would be that there would not be the staff necessary if your beds aren't being utilized.

That means that if the Minister of Finance negotiates another no lay-off MGEA contract, you're in serious trouble, because that will set the precedent as the President of MONA has already said today. That's going to be one of their negotiating features, and this is a time when government has to show some leadership. And it's not only incumbent on you, Mr. Minister, but the Minister of Finance who's here today. He has a great deal to play in a leadership role in the next series of negotiations that you're going to be very highly impacted by in the health care system.

Mr. Chairman, what I'd like to do now is ask some questions in a rather rapid order on the Personal Care Home line but, before I get into that, I want to deal just briefly with the Medical line. Can the Minister indicate to me what is - you had your arbitration award which granted 6 point-some percent, in the final analysis it was 6 point-some percent.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Which one?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Your binding arbitration . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Binding arbitration.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Six point-some?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, it's more than that. It's approximately \$11 million. It was 5.7, I think, yes, it was 6.5, all together 6.5, wasn't it or 7.5? It's 6.5 isn't it? Yes, that increased the fees by 5.6 percent.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now, Mr. Chairman, does my memory serve me correctly in that that was retroactive back into last year's fiscal year?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, it was for last year.

Tuesday, 28 April, 1987

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay. Does the adjusted vote reflect that in the Medical Program?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The adjusted vote of last year?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, just this year's Estimates, because last year that was only - what? - practically at the end of March when that was paid.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That was my question. The settlement was a retroactive settlement, and did it not have impact on the '86-87 fiscal year?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And that was \$11 million of impact?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes. That's not paid out yet though.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, but is that included . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It's included in the '87-88. It'll be paid out in '87-88.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That stems the question then, is that part of the Main Estimates expenditure request of \$234.75 million?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It will be Special Warrant for '86-87. It's part of that 234 that you have in front of you, which is what I said.

MR. D. ORCHARD: The Medical Program is increasing by \$26 million, ballpark figure; \$11 million of that is the retroactive payment to cover the binding arbitration settlement with the MMA for fiscal year '86-87.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Right.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then an additional \$15 million is presumably to accomplish (a) fee increase, and (b) volume increase for the MMA payments under the Medical Program line for fiscal year '87-88.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There is a sum of \$7 million for price increase and volume increase for this year, roughly.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Pardon my confusion, Mr. Chairman, but if \$11 million - the increase in Medical Program, adjusted vote is the correct one because that factored out - the community health facilities were factored out of the Medical line and put into the Hospital Program, so therefore the adjusted vote of \$208 million is a correct adjusted vote which was short, I understand it, by \$11 million. Right?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Because of the retroactive binding arbitration settlement.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now the total increase is \$26 million that you're projecting to increase spending by. Now, if \$11 million of that is last year's settlement on the binding arbitration, there is \$15 million in addition to that in the \$26 million requested increase. You're indicating only \$7 million of that is required for price increase and volume for fiscal 1987-88. What is the other \$8 million to be used for?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You forget, it's the volume last year. What we need is \$19 million for the price increase and the volume for last year.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Then the figure you gave me a few minutes ago of \$11 million is not correct?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, that's the figure that you used for price. That's correct for price, but I'm saying that there is a volume also. It is that \$11 million plus the price, which gives you \$19 million or around the \$19 million.

You know what, you're getting set to find out what is in there, and me to make this public. It would be a hell of a way to negotiate with the medical profession for this year. I've never given those figures before, you know that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I assure you, I'm not negotiating on behalf of MMA.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I know, but they read Hansard also.

MR. D. ORCHARD: A lot of people read Hansard.

Mr. Chairman, I've already done the calculation before the Minister's comment, but that means you've got an allowance for fee and volume of some 3 percent then, year-over-year.

The Minister doesn't have to answer that. The binding arbitration, was that just for last year, '86-87, and you're going through the process again for '87-88, or have you withdrawn from binding arbitration? What is the government's position?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm glad you mentioned that. What we did at the request of the MMA a few years ago, they started talking directly with the Minister. So we've had meetings and I agreed on the understanding that we wouldn't be just talking about the fees, because there was no point. Then it would be like the union and it should be done with the people negotiating for them. They assured me that, no, they were interested in helping us with the reform and so on, so we have a very good relationship at this time now.

One of the agreements that we signed was that it was a four-year, call it pilot project, whatever it was. It would be a program that, of course, you could tighten up or change. It was for four years to see if we could get along; it could be changed every year, so that was done. We at one time felt that when we first discussed it, it was a Letter of Intent that I think I tabled in the House a few years ago between the MMA and the government and our office and then there was an

Tuesday, 28 April, 1987

agreement that we had. It gave binding arbitration and it was going to be reviewed. Nobody on either side said anything; that contract would have continued year after year for four years. We had said that we wanted a policy. Binding arbitration was all right. We weren't that crazy about binding arbitration. It was given to them and so on and they were recommending themselves to cooperate and work with the nurses and with the groups, and they did in many ways.

All right, I'll try to make it shorter. Anyway, when we wanted to have some control over volume, you saw the difference in volume and there's not much point in having binding arbitration if you can add what you want to the volume. So we said we want a handle on that and so on, so we tried. While we were deciding on the award, and at no time did we refuse to pay the award - at no time. What we did say, our solicitor and our negotiator, that is the way we interpret the ruling. We said, all right, we'll go and find out. We went with what the solicitor said and then we paid it immediately without any argument at all.

So the decision then was, we said do you want to delay that? It came in around Christmastime; they delayed it for one month. In other words, we agreed that we could go another month without giving notice, so we wouldn't give notice if we could straighten it out. They said, well okay, we'll need more time now, so we said, all right. Well, then we served notice that we want to terminate this agreement, we'll renegotiate it. We didn't want that. We were ready to go along to keep binding arbitration but under certain conditions. There is no way - and I'll say very clearly, they want binding arbitration now, but there is no way if we can't have some kind of control on the volume because it would be ridiculous. So they're at the table negotiating now; there hasn't been too much action for this current year. There hasn't been too much action, because we're talking to them on the question of the possibility of decreasing or controlling the number of new doctors or whatever with legislation or some action by university or whatever. We're meeting with a group of representatives from MMA, the College of Physicians and Surgeons at the university, and the interns and the medical students.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, then I take it that you're back at the table. Is it still binding arbitration on the fee schedule aspect of it, i.e., if you can't . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Right now, there is no agreement. You see, the thing is it took so long to go to arbitration through nobody's fault. Then the first we heard was I think a day or two days before Christmas, and we worked on that. We had to give them notice by New Year's Day.

MR. D. ORCHARD: They gave you the extension to allow that to happen.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, there was an extension for one month or so, and after that . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, what I want to establish is, right now, when you are negotiating with the MMA, are you still under the provision that if you

don't come to a mutual agreement on price to go to binding arbitration?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, there is no contract right now. There is no contract.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay. So you're back to the same old method of negotiation that binding arbitration was theoretically to replace. Is that correct?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes. Binding arbitration was part of the agreement for that year and then, when there was no contract, all that goes by the board. I'm not saying there's never going to be confrontation, but there is no confrontation at this time on that. We're just trying to negotiate. You see, the MMA took the stand, we are not going to talk about the future until the award of the arbitrator is paid. We said, all right, as soon as we find out what that is and, if there's a misunderstanding, the contract provided for that, we go to court or whatever. If there was any confrontation, it was at that area. They felt we shouldn't listen to our lawyer and so on, pay right away. We said, well, we're certainly going to do that, whatever it is. In fact, we asked them to go back to the main arbitrator, the chairman, who then said, well, I haven't got the authority or something to give you that. This is what I said the award was. We said, all right, pay it; that was it.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Just a couple of comments, Mr. Chairman, and then we'll move on to Personal Care Homes.

There are several things now impacting on our ability to deliver medical services, particularly through physicians. We're under legislation, federally and provincially, which has the entire income of the medical profession coming from the government. There are no external sources available. That's outlined, no extra billing.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Oh, no extra billing. I see, but there are some who are being employed.

MR. D. ORCHARD: All that I mean is fee for service, it's whatever the government's fee for service is.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Right.

MR. D. ORCHARD: There is no option. Now, having closed that option of income supplement - whether you agree or disagree is irrelevant, but that option has been closed. Then the next option I perceive that is troublesome to government as the funder is the volume increase. Where the fee for service has not increased sufficiently to cover costs, then physicians may have a tendency to see more patients. So the second option is then volume of business.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Some extra volume could be justified - now I want to make that clear - but not the way it's going now.

MR. D. ORCHARD: But that avenue is now in the stages of negotiation to be closed.

The third option that is being asked to be looked at is the option of physician numbers, where we may be

Tuesday, 28 April, 1987

going to the medical faculty and say, entries by legislation may be restricted, etc., etc. We don't know what the Minister is going to propose, etc., etc. But we now have the medical profession completely subordinate to the will of government.

Now, we don't have time to debate the philosophy of that and where that will lead today, but that's essentially where we are heading with Medicare in Canada now.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You're talking about fees.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes, and I mean, as far as fees go, the option for a physician is to completely opt out of the program and charge entirely outside the program, but he can't even do that. A physician now is probably like no other person in Canada, where he cannot do anything unless government approves. Now we're even talking about determining how many of his colleagues he may have to work with. I mean, this has fairly significant implications and will be, no doubt, the subject of debate at later years. But those are the three steps that we are now taking in the drive to keep the medical costs of Medicare within "reasonable limit."

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, it's not just the medical costs, that's an important thing. To me, it's not the most important thing. The important thing when we're talking about numbers of doctors, it is the impact that the doctors practising here in Manitoba have on the whole plan, all right. Now, the Federal Government, the three parties involved, three political parties went along and said, this is what we want and that's ready. It wasn't a factor in Manitoba, and you know that I always said that this government agrees with the principle, but we weren't pushing it because it wasn't a factor. It was only 5 percent or whatever, it was a small group, okay, No. 1.

No. 2, they asked for binding arbitration. Now we said binding arbitration, fine, but you've got to remember that binding arbitration - I kind of agree, to be honest with you, with Sherman on that, to say you're abdicating your responsibility up to a certain point. But they felt it was a hell of a thing for the Minister of Health, being in confrontation constantly, in any Minister of Health including Sherman. So we didn't have an agreement for close to a year or over a year, so that goes for everybody. If you're going to have that kind of thing, you're going to have a confrontation.

So this is something they wanted badly and we said, all right, with cooperation, let's try it. But let's remember that you're serving Manitobans, you're paid by Manitobans. Let's have a policy that we can strike out, made in Manitoba, and that hasn't been done. That hasn't been done really - and the awards. Who do you choose? You take somebody who will work for a couple of weeks or a month, make an award and that's it. He doesn't have to answer to anybody, and that's the same concern that I share with Sherman but, if it can improve the relationship especially at this time when you need so many changes, we bend over backwards to work with them. So that's No. 1, binding arbitration.

Now we met with this committee. We want to bring legislation only if we need to. I can tell you now that they've offered, and they are reducing the number of

young students that they will take in the Faculty of Medicine right now, voluntarily. They are working on that now.

Now, another thing that will have a factor on this is the interns. We're working on that and, if we can discuss some of those other things, we have a concern over the question of walk-in clinics, some concern. We haven't got enough facts now to tell you exactly what the score is. We're discussing that with the medical profession and, if we can arrive at a voluntary thing, well then we'll go ahead, but you're right.

Now there's another thing that I think, if we bring in legislation, certainly it will have to be looked at, the point that you made that now they can't even say we want to opt out and to heck with the plan. That might be reinstated, if we do that. That might be reinstated in this way, because you could do that. You can have them write out, the act will permit that, but I can tell you now, that would be allowed only if the geographical situation, if there are only five doctors in an area and they all want to do it, that couldn't work. But then, what is so different with other professionals and so on? These people still bill so far up to \$900,000 and so on, so you know it's not that bad. We're not trying to control them, we're trying to get a reasonable price. With the same population, we don't want to keep on going and going and going.

You know that we're going to try with some of them to explore the possibility - and we've had the first meeting. Some of the staff have met today with some clinics, and we're looking with the other departments to have a co-op clinic. That would be capitation, that would be another form that we would be willing to try as a pilot project.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether it was Newsweek or whether it was Time - I forget which - but they ran a very extensive article . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Newsweek.

MR. D. ORCHARD: . . . and there was some very insightful information in that. They had the same problem in the U.S. medical system of growing numbers of doctors, and really money was no object. The system was driven by, every time there was an increase in demand, the money was there, and the system just grew enormously, physician numbers grew enormously. Now that the system is under contraction, that great number of physicians is in fact turning out to be something of an advantage, wherein you have competing groups bidding for service to keep costs down. There is actually marketplace discipline in the incomes that physicians can demand for their services. I mean, that is happening.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: But it's not the same setup as we have here.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Exactly. The Minister says that's not the same setup that we have here, and that's exactly correct. Their system, under these market forces, is appearing to settle itself out in a lot of ways without legislation controlling or restricting numbers.

I have to tell you, we could really get into a lot of discussion on this. When you have the current crop of

medical doctors in the province saying, yes, we will agree to restrict resident entry to medical programming, I say you're getting awful close to the kind of decisions that marketing boards make - and this is a very rough analogy - of new entrants into production of controlled commodities in agriculture, because the ones who are in there are guaranteed a level of income and any newcomers only dilute it. Naturally, you're going to have the existing numbers of physicians in MMA say, yep, we'll restrict this . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Oh, they're fighting that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, they're fighting but, in the system across the 49th Paralle, the competition has actually driven the costs down and certainly hasn't jeopardized the quality.- (Interjection)- Mr. Chairman, if the Minister of Community Services wants to get into this debate, she might do it in the House some time but, right now, we're on rather a restricted time element.

There are going to be a number of people in Canada, whether it's 30 million which is whatever percent, 10 percent or 15 percent of the U.S. population, we're going to have people in Canada who don't have access to medical services through our state-controlled system. That's happened in Great Britain, it'll happen in Canada.

So one system or the other, there are going to be rationing and deficiencies and unavailable services in the system. I have to tell you that certainly my eyes were opened as to the way the U.S. system is evolving having some market discipline forces placed on it. That's why I made the suggestion to the Minister earlier. Don't throw out the possibility of bringing in an administrator of a major U.S. hospital who has gone through the contraction in demand for acute care beds to see whether that individual can offer you some insight on where efficiencies can be achieved in the health care system in Manitoba. I think it could well be there, could well be there.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: But, Mr. Chairman, surely my honourable friends see the problem that we face. When you're talking about the situation in the United States, you're forgetting one thing. It was completely out of control; they had to come down somewhere. The situation was allowed to go. Let me give you an example. When they're spending way more money than we are and we have a universal program and they've got 30 million people who have no insurance at all, another 20 who have very little. So let's not compare the United States. If you're talking about the type of service and so on, there's no comparison. I'm not talking about the elite, I'm talking as a universal plan.

Now the situation, you talked about everything. It is a government plan. I agree that we would have to look at the possibility of maybe, in certain areas, letting some practice where neither the patient nor the doctor would be covered if we do that. But the situation - are we wrong? Are you telling me that I shouldn't worry about the numbers? I shouldn't worry of just trying to keep the number for those who are retiring or leaving or dying, and are we going to keep on adding more and more doctors all the time? If that is the case, you would be the first one, I'm sure and I would agree with you, to say to any - let's say, somebody in the

manufacturing game or something or in an area where they're oversaturated, you'd say, all right, you want to protect your people. You want more jobs, you want more of them. We'll go ahead, we won't fire anybody, but the volume will be the same. I'm saying, fine, if we can control part of the volume or at least get a handle on it - I don't think my honourable friend, I've never heard him say that this is not a problem or that we should forget about that until the doctors themselves go down.

Unless you change the whole system completely, they won't. Right now, it has certainly some advantages but disadvantages also. You take a doctor, you can take - and, thank God, we haven't got too many of them in this province. But you can have a real nincompoop. He can go ahead and make a living with the setup that we have now. Instead of having so many clients, he can have five and tell them to come and see me this afternoon, come and see me this evening, and he sends the bill to the commission. That's a concern.

So we're saying we don't want to start bringing all kinds of legislation, but we're saying there has to be cooperation. It might be that there has to be and there will be some confrontation at some stage. We've got to make some changes. We've done everything to say, what do you propose, but hurry up. I mean, it's your program also. We can't say yes to everything. We're ready to give you some incentive and so on, but let's have the number of doctors that we need, especially when they all want to stay in the city.

That's why I gave you the tables in my opening remarks about what the situation is now. We're ready to go ahead on a voluntary reduction and so on, providing that we can do something to control some of the volume and providing the administration in the hospitals change. They all need the impact, and that's what's happening in Brandon. With the doctors that they have, they used all the beds there.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, let's move into the Personal Care Home area.

What are the current per diem charges per resident in personal care homes, and has the Minister received approval for a schedule of increases for this fiscal year?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: In 1987-88, residential charge will be increasing by 30 cents per day and each quarter, effective May 1, 1987. It is estimated the '87-88 average minimum monthly disposal income for a single pensioner will amount to \$118.95 per month or 17 percent of monthly based income.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN, H. Smith: The Member for Pembina.

MR. D. ORCHARD: What's the fee rate now?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yeah, that's what I'm going to give you.

It's \$18.40; on May 1, it'll go up to \$18.70. It would go to \$19 on August 1; it goes to \$19.30 on November 1; and \$19.60 on February 1 of '88.

MR. D. ORCHARD: This time next year, in one year hence, you're going to be at \$19.60 per day.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Right.

MR. D. ORCHARD: That's a 6.5 percent increase in costs. Patients are going to pick up a 6.5 percent increase of the cost for per diems, year over year.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: They're paying about 25 percent of the actual cost.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And it's now 25 percent. Is that an increasing percentage with the per diems going up on a schedule?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It pretty well remains the same. Lately for a long time, we were spending more and more subsidizing it, because we weren't putting any increase at all.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now how many panelled patients are currently waiting for a personal care home bed?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Was the question, those who are now in the hospital either in acute - no, all those who are panelled.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I want to know how many are panelled for placement in personal care homes.

My next question was going to be: How many of those are currently occupying hospital beds?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Are you asking that question now?

MR. D. ORCHARD: Well, we've got to, anyway.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Okay, in the rural, there were 592 in December of '86; and in the Winnipeg Region, 830, for a total of 1,422.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Of those numbers, Mr. Chairman, can the Minister indicate how many currently in both rural and Winnipeg are occupying hospital beds?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Now the figures won't be exactly the same, to give you an idea, now I have the average for the year, if that's acceptable. I gave you the actual waiting list as of December of '86, okay?

MR. D. ORCHARD: At a given time, yes.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Now, those who are in Winnipeg in acute hospitals, there are 237, on average; and the non-acute hospitals, 229; and in the rural regions, there were 252; for a total of 718.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, so better than half of the panelled patients are currently occupying hospital beds?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Right.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, that brings us to - well, maybe I'll ask some of those questions later on.

Now, what I would like to do is just - every year I bring this up. We've got out of the Health Services Commission, you can go through and the assumption

is - I'll give you the assumptions. When you go to the amount of funding, the net MHSC payments to the personal care homes, what I've done is I factor out generally the very high-cost homes and the very low-cost homes because there are special circumstances mitigating their costs in each case.

The low-cost homes often have a lot of hospital beds which aren't indicative, so I generally try to choose a middle band of beds and I make the assumption that (a) the occupancy rate is very high in all these circumstances, like probably 98 percent or 99 percent because that's been the figure that's generally been given; and (b) here's where my analysis will be flawed - I make the assumption that they have generally a close to equivalent mix of Levels 2, 3 and 4, particularly 3 and 4.

Now, I realize that is flawed and I will ask later on, because we don't have time today to discuss it in full, but I will lay the proposition out for you and here's where I've got to cross-match my figures. If you're looking for dollars to be saved and you go through your various homes in Winnipeg - I've excluded rural Manitoba on purpose - but you go for a range of costs of roughly \$17,000 per bed per year, which presumably is per patient because your occupancy rate is very close to 100 on average. You can factor out the 41,000 at Deer Lodge and some of the very low-cost ones, for instance, Metro Kiwanis Courts at 4,400. Factoring those out, you get a range that's anywhere from approximately \$16,000 to \$24,000 average cost per patient.

Now is the comparison there, so that a Level 3 bed in a facility or a Level 4 bed in a facility is roughly cost comparable between facilities, so you can see which would, to me, be a measure of the relative efficiencies of each home? Are those comparisons available?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Why don't I give you - will this help you - the '86-87 average cost of a personal care home per annum? I can give you that, that's \$62.45.

MR. D. ORCHARD: What level of care is that?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, that's an average of all the personal care homes. Every level, and that would be \$22,795 per year.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, I appreciate the difficulty. You have got four levels of care. Do you have those average costs? There are two pieces of information that are relevant. Do you have the average costs in all your homes of a Level 1, Level 2, Level 3, Level 4; and then do you have, on a per-home basis, the average cost would be the numbers from all the personal care homes with patients receiving that level of care, but within, for instance, Level 3, can you then go - and let's just say that the average cost per day is \$70 per day for a Level 3, I'm just picking a number out of the air - would you be able to establish a range of cost of \$50 to \$90 depending on the home? Are those figures available?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: All I have is the average here for the total thing, and the total of Levels 3 and 4 is \$68 per day - 3 and 4 only - and then I gave you \$62.45,

Tuesday, 28 April, 1987

that was for everything, 1, 2, 3 and 4; and Level 2 is \$49.10.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Right, okay. Now you're got that average cost per level . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: But there's less of Levels 1 and 2 with what we're trying to do now.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I realize that.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We're trying to convert them to . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: But where I'm coming to is that, within homes, if you have an average cost of \$68-and-some to the government for Levels 3 and 4, what is the range in cost between homes? Does it range from a low of, say, \$58 in home "X-Y-Z" to a high of \$88 in another home? Do you have those figures available?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We haven't got it now. We can get that information for you.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, well, rather than have it relayed in terms of a memo or something, would it be possible for me to sit down with K. Thomson or someone, and go through those kinds of numbers? Is that confidential material or is that something that we can do?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, we'll give you that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, because you see, where I'm coming from again is you have such a range of costs, apparently, between homes. Now my analysis is flawed in that, for instance, Tache at \$24,000 may have all levels, 3 and 4.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, Tache and Luther Home are the two, yes.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Those may not be comparable. That's why it's important to determine the range for Levels 3 and 4 between all homes, because that may give you some insight as to how different homes are able, within the standard, because they're all presumably operating within the standards that you've set, and it may give you a guideline as to areas in which cost efficiencies can be achieved without compromising patient care. That's where really I'm coming from.

Given the understanding that I can sit down at some future date and discuss that with Ms. Thomson, that would be good. I won't pursue that right now.

The second area is, it seems to me that there are two things that are impacting. Let me go back to my notes . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You're not going to forget what you forgot last year. You know something that controls that a certain amount, a bit of impact, is the capital cost. That's what it is. Remember last year, we forgot that, I remembered this argument. It's the capital costs, some of it. That will bring the difference . . .

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, but that's why I want to sit down and understand this, you see?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Okay, fair enough.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay, we've got now, in rough figures, 730-some-odd panelled patients occupying beds in our hospital system. Now, if I can just find quickly, I don't know what percentage of bed capacity that is, but it could be close to 10 percent of our beds, hospitals beds in Manitoba, give or take a percent or two.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: 10 percent.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Now, Mr. Minister, you're embarking - or let me correct that, so we don't get into an argument on esoterics. You have allowed certain bed complements to be closed in Brandon, and you may well be allowing beds to be closed in some of the Winnipeg hospitals as a method of budget containment. You've got a number of over-cost care patients right now who Home Care is looking after, I think 60-some if the last figures I had are correct, and you're currently wrestling with a policy of what you do with over-cost care patients. Like where do you draw the line, and what should be the maximum, if you will, that you devote in Home Care to over-cost care patients, okay? You've got a number of options.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: . . . little wrestling we might, we're reconsidering now.

MR. D. ORCHARD: But you've got a number of options that you're considering in that regard.

Now, given that your personal care home system is 99 percent occupied - there are no freed-up beds. The only freed-up beds you're going to have are hostel beds, which really aren't able to be freed up without some pretty severe dislocation of those individuals, and may not be possible to be freed up. As you renew those beds, you eliminate the hostel care, the Level 1 for sure, and possibly even Level 2. But that's a process that isn't going to happen tomorrow; it's not instant. So you've got impacting on you a demand by some 1,420 people, who need personal care home placement, 700-and-some of which are currently occupying 10 percent of the hospital beds. You're not going to instantly have new personal care home beds. The attrition rate leads to a 1,400 waiting list, because the attrition rate is not that high in the personal care homes.

If you close hospital beds, would it not be logical to assume that some of the first beds you close would be beds occupied by panelled senior citizens? Then that brings the question of where do they go? I can see right now a real dilemma. Because home care was over budget last year by some \$8 million, part of which, I understand from the Minister's discussion, was because you had a significant attempt to de-emphasize the institution, therefore care cost went up in the Home Care Program.

If you have to take some of these 700-odd panelled patients who are currently occupying hospital beds, put them into the Home Care Program as over-cost care patients, you're not going to save any money. The money

Tuesday, 28 April, 1987

is going to be expended. Your system is really converging into a crisis right now, because personal care home beds that are open are simply not available. If you close hospital beds, they're not going to be available for those panelled patients who really can't be looked after. I presume that a lot of those panelled patients who are in hospitals would be over-cost care patients, if they were in the community, now here not necessarily but a portion of them would be.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I should, first of all, Mr. Chairman, inform the committee that there's been a reduction in the waiting list. For instance, in December '84, there were 1,008; December '85, 1,677; and December '86, 1,422. That's No. 1; it's an indication, that could change.

Now I know, and I would have to certainly look at the problem and at the statement and the scenario that the honourable member just mentioned. But there's one thing we can't forget. I don't want to make the same mistake that we did on acute care beds, and we're paying for it now. There were so many acute care beds filled, and then what could we do? Now they're using it, and you've got to change the system and change on that, and it's difficult.

So I'm saying that, before we start going crazy on personal care beds we'll be sorry we built, we could be sorry we built, and we're building some. It's not the same safeguards, not the same scare that we have with acute care beds. But we must look at all, exhaust all other programs in the home. When we say we want to deinstitutionalize, and keep people out of institutions as much as possible, we also include personal care beds. I think that will keep on reducing as we improve the programs of home care and other programs.

Having said that, we will need more personal care beds. There's no doubt about that. We're building, now we'll have quite a few, when Deer Lodge is opened and other areas. What we're looking at in the rural area where we are converting, and I think we'll certainly go in that direction of converting acute care beds, especially in smaller areas to personal care beds if it's viable.

And another thing, I might be all wet on this. But I want to look - if we're going to close beds, I don't want to close beds on one hand and build some in another area. It might be and I don't know; I've asked the commission to look at that. They're just starting to work, to see if we can, if there is going to be that many, I don't know. But if there are going to be some hospitals - and it's mostly the hospitals in the city where there are going to be a closure of beds - then it might be that we want to look to see if those beds can be used officially for something else, if they could be reorganized.

There's one thing I want to correct. The hospitals are not proposing closing beds occupied by personal care homes; that'd be easy. This is not what we're saying. They have to be able to give the service to some of these people also. Maybe at this time they feel that they should stay there longer. These are not the high-cost beds. We are talking about other beds, as I explained yesterday, and that would be the reason why they would close them.

So I think that what has been said today is valuable, and I think we should look at that, but the added concern that I've stated.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, this is '85-86 statistics, page 37 from Health Services Commission.

You've got 9 percent of the residents are Level 1. So even if you replace all of the Level 1 beds which cost you \$48 - no, less than that - Level 2 is \$48.00.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The average - Level 1 will be about 30-35.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Okay. You close all of those, you add to your cost. That means 740 beds. Presumably, as you move your renovation program . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, but you understand that'll be done gradually, because some of these people have been there so long that you can't kick them out.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Yes, I think I understand, Mr. Chairman.

But even replacing all Level 1 beds eventually with higher care beds, you will pick up 740 beds. That doesn't even accommodate, and presumably all of those panelled patients, even though they may not be over-cost care patients in the hospitals, presumably are not simply Level 1. Because if they were Level 1, probably they would be at home, or in another facility on home care.

So what you have impacting on you is a serious set of problems, and I realize the Minister is saying, we don't want to rush in and build a whole group of personal care home beds. I can't disagree with him, I don't have knowledge to disagree with him on that statement, that you don't want to rush in.

But I can see the system as the Minister is now orderly proceeding to bring it under budgetary control - if I can invent some new terminology. There are going to be hospital bed closures, whether they are surgical beds, acute care beds within the hospitals. But the impact is going to be felt, that there are going to be fewer beds to be occupied by elective surgery, emergency surgery and panelled senior citizens. There are going to be fewer beds.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: For awhile yes, until the people get used to it.

MR. D. ORCHARD: And it's going to be for more than just awhile, because you're not going to eliminate the necessity for personal care home beds at some point in time. No program eventually eliminates this. That is why I want to sit down and be able to talk to your people over at MHSC to see the kind of cost effectiveness that may or may not be present within the current system. Because I think it's important that we base arguments on sound knowledge, not assumptions that you can draw from incomplete statistics.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I have no problem with that.

I want to say also that it has never been the intention that we're going to remove all panelled people out of acute care beds. I think you know that. If not, I want to make sure that we understand that. There'll always be a need for some of them to be in acute care beds.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, one last question, I've seen correspondence where the Minister is

indicating that, in this year's Estimates and in future year's Estimates, there will be a slim likelihood that your budgetary provisions to nonunionized personal care homes, that their budgets will be supplemented enough to remove the inequity that's been built into the system. Is that a correct statement?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We have a concern with that. I can tell you the principle that there should be a difference, fine, but that the difference is getting a little too big and should be corrected as soon as possible. That's right. And there is no doubt, like everything else, with the lack of all the funds that I would have is retarding that, there is no doubt about that.

MR. D. ORCHARD: I simply make the observation that it doesn't bode well for an administration that has passed pay equity legislation to allow this pay inequity to continue for people doing the same service. Most of the facilities, and I think the Minister is fully aware of this, do attempt to supplement their nonunion salaries to a salary equivalent less union dues which would be payable so that they are comparable, the facilities themselves. That's the best they can do and I think that's been the proposition they've made to the Minister, that's all the funding they require.

You know, the inequity is further exacerbated by the fact that you don't in nonunion facilities treat the nursing staff differently. You provide union settlement budget requirements for the nursing staff. It's just the support staff who are so adversely affected in those nonunion facilities.

Mr. Chairman, we're getting close to five o'clock. I will take this time to make some few closing remarks and we could pass the MHSC.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Could you pass those three lines.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hospital Program—pass; Personal Care Home Program—pass; Medical Program—pass.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Before that, should we do the capital? Should we pass that or do you have any questions? Okay, pass that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for River East, did you want to say something?

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Yes.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: When we're ready, we'll pass this and some questions will be asked on the Minister's Salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll pass this resolution.

Resolution No. 88: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,159,235,100 for Health, Manitoba Health Services Commission, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

8.(a) Acquisition/Construction of Physical Assets—pass; (b) Capital Grants—pass.

Resolution No. 89: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$36,390,300 for

Health, Expenditures Related To Capital - Manitoba Health Services Commission, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

We are now down to the Minister's Salary - the Member for River East.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Yes, I just wanted to go back to the Capital Program for a minute and ask a few questions and put a few comments on the record. The Member for Emerson couldn't be here today. He's in Natural Resources Estimates, but he has some grave concerns about the deferral of the hospital in Vita.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It's the same answer as I gave for Benito and all the others.

MRS. B. MITCHELSON: Would you just repeat that for the record?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I'm saying that when we're looking at the overall classification, the regional hospitals, the district hospitals, that we're reviewing this. We're not cancelling this, we're reviewing the policy on that, and then we'll get back with them and we'll continue with the functional program.

It is just that sometimes you have to stop when you're going in a redirection, you want to make everything all right, and what is needed and so on. This is what we're doing at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Page 86, 1.(a) Minister's Salary.

MR. D. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I think, again, we've had reasonable discussion in the Minister of Health's Estimates. Unfortunately and as usual, we spent a bit too much time on the department and not enough time on the commission in terms of thoroughly examining the commission and its activities.

Mr. Chairman, I guess if there's one thing that again I can indicate to the Minister, it's that I hope that he has the support of some of his Cabinet colleagues in some of the endeavours he's discussed. He's been very frank in some of his statements this year in Estimates. I have been equally frank with some of my statements.

I want to bring the Minister down again, as I did last year, and I'll probably do it next year again. But there are a number of challenges that the Minister is facing and he's alluded to them. He's made reference to them today again. That is, of course, to determine in our Hospital line, because our Hospital line is taking \$700 million this year to determine, as has been identified some three years ago, or two and a-half years ago, in Manitoba and Medicare, why we have a differential per diem cost in terms of what it costs us per patient day in Manitoba versus the national average. That represents a major amount of money. My last calculation on the number of patient days, it could amount to \$45 million. That's why I want to pursue with the Minister's staff over at the MHSC a similar hopeful examination or at least to make inquiries in terms of the Personal Care Home line to see if similar comparisons are available there.

I broached the topic with him this time, and I hope to have more information on it at a later date to discuss either in this Session or for sure between Sessions with

the Minister, the proposition that a number of rural hospital facilities could well undertake a wider range of procedures that are currently being done in Winnipeg and better utilize our rural hospitals, the staff and physicians there and give opportunities in rural Manitoba that may not presently exist. That also may well represent an area of fairly significant cost saving to the Minister, because the cost per day in the Health Sciences Centre is substantially higher than it is in the Carmans, the Winklers, the Dauphins, as we discussed yesterday.

Now the Minister is approaching the budget of the Department of Health and particularly the budgets in the hospitals from what I consider to be not necessarily an informed position, i.e., he's willing to accept as he did in Brandon General Hospital the closure of beds - 9 percent roughly in Brandon and possibly a further closure. That may be an option to be decided by government with their approval, with government's and Cabinet's approval, for budget control or deficit control in Winnipeg hospitals. I'm not arguing whether that's right or wrong today, because I quite frankly don't know.

I have concerns. I've always said, I think I said last year that I believe we have enough hospital beds if we use them properly, but the Minister's position, since last year, appears to be that we have too many beds and that we can do without some of them. That may well be but, within the system, I think there are some pretty sizeable amounts of money available through the additional cost per patient day as identified in here, and through the transfer of services from Winnipeg hospitals to rural hospitals, which would benefit rural Manitoba. I think that's something that all of us would be interested in doing.

In addition, Mr. Minister, we went through your department and I guess I'm as alarmed as you must have been when you found your internal audits to describe some of your programs, namely Home Care, as financially out of control. I don't think that is a very gratifying revelation that any Minister would want to see within your department. That financially out-of-control Home Care Program is very important to the Minister in his move to de-emphasize institutional care, and he has to know that the service is being delivered efficiently and effectively. If he doesn't, then I suggest he's not responsible in his ministry.

But last year we had Maternal and Child Health, Other Expenditures, decreased by 10 percent because the department could not be overbudgeted because of home care: Health Promotion, Other Expenditures, down 51 percent; Hearing Conservation, down 18 percent; Gerontology, down 39 percent in Other Expenditures.

Then we moved into Mental Health and we found - and I don't have a percentage on it - but it's in the neighbourhood of a 33 percent reduction in Other Expenditures in the Mental Health Directorate, in order that the department come in closer to budget. In Mental Health, that meant the curtailment of a number of community-based support programs. That's why it's incumbent that you find out within your department that you have staff who are capable of management. Until you can make that assurance to the House, then any consideration - and I broaden the brush - that if that's happening within your department, you have to assure yourself that your internal audit capabilities are

assuring you and your senior staff at MHSC that the various funded facilities, between personal care homes and hospitals which consume \$850 million, \$860 million of the budget, are likewise efficiently managed. Manitoba Medicare certainly make some pointed questions; the same thing may well be present in the personal care homes.

So I'm saying to you, Mr. Minister, before you embark on cost-cutting measures which would include the closure of hospitals and hospital beds - because you're reviewing in the Capital Program the function of a number of hospitals. One of them is in my area, and it isn't one that I want to see you review. Manitou is under that review and there are a number of others. It would seem to me that you have to be able to answer whether the department is adequately managed and run, and delivering programs cost-effectively, and the same assurance being given within MHSC and the funded institutions.

Within the Winnipeg Region, I simply say to you, as I did a week ago Thursday, that you have to make sure that you're not creating a new "old boys' club" there. It's pretty easy to write off criticisms to the "old boys' club" that was there before. You are entering a process of reorganization, and again I draw the analogy to the Minister who sits across from me, in Community Services, with the Children's Aid Society. We were promised great things with the breakup of that into six regions and that has not happened; that is in chaos. You have problems in your Regional Services right now, and they're problems that you have to resolve because you can't continue with low staff morale. You can't continue with some of the problems identified for you on Thursday. Satisfy yourself that those problems don't exist.

I'd be pleased to come here next year and get your assurance that they no longer exist, and indeed I'd even be pleased if you were able to come here and definitively say that they didn't exist, that what I was drawing to your attention was wrong. That would not hurt my feelings one little bit, but I don't think you will be able to do that, Mr. Minister, when you move into that.

So I say to you that you've got a challenge. You are in a position, as the questioning in question period, and we will continue on that line of questioning. You can't tolerate no-layoff contracts in the Manitoba Government Employees' Association new contract because, if you close hospital beds, you're going to be having those hospitals lay off staff. That's what we discussed yesterday.

You are on tenterhooks between a government that may not have the will to do that, that may not see the necessity to do that, and that puts you in an extremely difficult position. You are going to be battered on all sides by people who say we need more services, etc., etc. That's an expectation of the people of Manitoba that will continue. We've encouraged it, and when I say "we," I mean all political parties have encouraged it.

Now you're in a process of contraction, as you indicate, but I say to you, make sure that the efficiency is there before you embark on your contraction.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I ask, if it's understood, if Health is finished, the understanding was that under Minister's Salary we would discuss Sport. Is that all right?

Tuesday, 28 April, 1987

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. We are now discussing Sport, Item No. 5(a), Executive: "Provides for the Director of Sport, communications services and operations."

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Look, there's no - we go all over the place under Minister's Salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Do you have some questions lined up?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I've provided the member . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Norbert.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, just for the record, I think we better place on the record an explanation of what has happened because, if you look at page 92 of the Estimates of Expenditures for this year, whereas there were some \$540,000 - pardon me - a total of \$661,000 shown last year, there is nothing shown for Sport this year.

The Minister has kindly given to me a copy of a memo dated April 1, 1987, for the Sports Directorate, which shows Expenditures for the Sports Directorate for this fiscal year. Perhaps you could explain for the record, how is this happening? I assume what's happening is that the staff of the department are paid out of the Lotteries funds somehow. Is that out of the trust account? Are they civil servants? Do they have civil servant status or are they employees of someone else?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to explain that. The situation was last year that we had \$540,000 that we requested, and that was for salaries of the staff, and part of it was grants also to different agencies. This year the Cabinet decided that the whole thing should come from Lotteries. There was an increase in lottery revenue to the province, of course, and it was felt that it should come from there, as they did other areas in Health that they transferred, for instance, Medical Research, which was \$700-and-something thousand. The memo or the page that I gave would give an idea of the programs that we have, which we didn't have before. Next year, we'll try to prepare something better than that to give you an idea about the program so we can look at programs. Now at least, I'll have to jump from one to the other. It is all under the Lotteries; it'll be all the same, as we're dealing with other areas here.

Yes, my understanding is, there's no change as far as the staff is concerned. They are still civil servants.

MR. G. MERCIER: Is the money then that's being spent on the Sports Directorate coming from the - is it 12.25 percent share of lottery funds that comes to Sport?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The Sport is 12 percent.

MR. G. MERCIER: Twelve percent, and that has been going into a trust account?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes. Well, we're spending it. That was the money that was earmarked for Sports, and of course we have to go to Treasury Board with

a proposal every year. Now we'll have an idea before the year how much it will be and, at Estimates time, we'll come like, this is what we're doing for the first year, that column. The grand total, I think, is at \$3.133 million. I'm not saying we're asking for it, but that's what we're suggesting that we're going to spend on the Lotteries. That's what we have approval, let's say from Cabinet, but we still have to go, as we normally do, to Treasury Board.

MR. G. MERCIER: As of the end of, say the last fiscal year, '86-87, how much money was in the trust account for Sport?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I think you would do better when you discuss that with the Minister of Lotteries. I know that last year was a bit confusing and this year, because there have been some changes, they would have that idea. We'll provide that for sure, but you won't have it today unfortunately.

What was the question again?

MR. G. MERCIER: How much money is in the trust account for Sport?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: As of March 31, 1986, we had \$4,793,781 less the commitment of \$2,217,500.00. There are other commitments after that. As of April 1, 1987, there was \$2.998 uncommitted. I think that's the best I can give you for Sports, but there have been some changes out of that, as I mentioned, Medical Research and so on and there would be a certain amount of money that would be added from there. Remember the \$7 million that they said would be added to Health. Well, that came from part of that, so that's why I think that, if you want the full figure, whoever who is in charge of Lotteries, you should ask those questions because it involves our department, of course, because at the time if you remember, everything, all the share of the province was earmarked for either Fitness, Sports and Recreation.

MR. G. MERCIER: Just one further question and I'll follow it up with the Minister responsible for Lotteries, but there was \$2.988 million as of April 1, 1987. Is that after deducting the amount for this year's budget of \$3.1 million?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, it's got commitment to programs in '87-88. It's not the same amount of money. I must admit that I'm a bit confused with this because it's not the same figure, but in general I would think that most of the commitment that we're asking for, then they would be uncommitted as of April 1. I would say all the commitment would be \$2.988 million, except that there are other programs. This was transferred, the program in Sports and construction and so on, that will come out, a program under the Minister of Culture . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Has that been announced?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, it's been announced, the Community - that's part of it.

MR. G. MERCIER: If I recall those figures correctly, that's a \$10 million program over four years?

Tuesday, 28 April, 1987

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Ten million a year, isn't it?

MR. G. MERCIER: Maybe it's \$10 million a year.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Something like that.

MR. G. MERCIER: Just so I understand . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Part of that is going to go for Sports also, so part of that is this money that wasn't committed.

MR. G. MERCIER: I have to admit this is very confusing - 12 percent comes to the government for Sport. That's divided between this area of Sport and Recreation under the Minister of Culture and Recreation.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There was a formula at one time when that was started. I remember, because I recall I was the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs, so all that money went to that department. Then when there was a division of Culture, there was so much for Culture, so much for Sports, so much for Fitness and so much for Recreation.

Again in 1981, I was the Minister of Health and also the Minister of the first Fitness and Sport. They did away with that department and the Recreation went to the then Minister of Cultural Affairs. Of course he had certain responsibilities and he took that share with him to his department. Then what was left in our Department of Health, we had taken over Fitness, and that's working now in the region in a more reasonable way, a better way, with dieticians and other groups. So there was a small amount there and the rest was for Sport, and that has increased quite rapidly.

We're spending more money than we have, although the government pretty well put a cap on it and then said, all right, this money will go in the - it was suggested during the Estimates of Health that we should have a special program instead of just putting it in Consolidated Fund. That's a possibility that in Health we might say, here, there's \$7 million of so much; this is earmarked for those programs.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask the Minister if he could have his staff prepare for me and him an outline, say, for 1986-87. How much was the 12 percent that came to the government for Sport. How was it allocated. How much was uncommitted at the end of '86-87? How much is estimated to be coming in 1987-88, and how is it to be allocated for Sport and Recreation? What is the estimated unallocated balance at the end of the year?

I ask that because I don't know how one can plan a sport program or a construction program without knowing those figures.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, I'll try to provide this information. I'd like to have it also, because it has been a bit confusing.

MR. G. MERCIER: Thank you.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: But we must remember that now it's not quite the same as the Estimates. There

could be, for instance, a program that would be started during the year. There won't be that many, but there could be construction, for instance, that could come back during the year from some of these uncommitted funds, that Cabinet would agree because it's lottery funds, it's not in the Consolidated Fund at this time, not all of it anyway.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, although this area that I'm going to deal with is not in the budget, I think it's an area that the Minister would be concerned about, and I think it relates to the fact that with \$7 million of lottery money this year going into the Health Department - I suppose it's difficult to disagree with that in these financial times - but that means that money that would have gone to Sport is not going to be going to Sport, and that the government will be taking a higher and higher percentage of the lottery monies in future years.

There's no question that certainly the Sports Federation is going to get a significant amount of money and it's an increase over this year, but how does the Minister visualize this concept developing over future years?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, the share that goes to the sports umbrella, the Manitoba Sports Federation, has nothing to do with that share, that 12 percent of the government, of course, of the department as such. They had a share themselves. All the umbrella groups had a share themselves.

Now it was increasing much more rapidly than anybody thought and, of course, with the difficulty, we were talking about closing beds and so on, and the government said whoa, just a minute. That would be better asked - I'll give you an idea, but in details to make sure, that would be better asked of the Minister responsible for that.

The situation was that they will say, all right, we will allow for what they had last year plus a percentage, then we will freeze the top. The act would permit to put everything in Consolidated Fund, and we've never wanted to go in that direction and there would have to be some protection. It didn't necessarily mean that forever and a day the same umbrella group would have the same, you know, just keep that pot forever and multiply and multiply. I think that they wanted to be fair and said, okay, there's going to be so much money, and I think that was advocated by the members of the Opposition in previous years also. And they're saying, okay, with a certain percentage and that's it, that's the maximum. So that would be better, you know, if you are going to get exactly the right information.

The Sports Federation, as well as all the other groups, would not continue to keep the percentage of all the profit. It might be capped, it might be a maximum, but they would get the same percentage unless there are some adjustments made somewhere, and they would pretty well be assured of not getting less than they received. There wouldn't be any cut anyway. But it wouldn't keep on multiplying and doubling or whatever every year like it's been the case for the last few years.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I'm not really arguing with what has happened this year, but it's fair enough to say that, if that hadn't happened, Sport would have

got probably another \$1.2 million out of the \$7 million. They've also lost the \$600,000 if you look at it in one way, because the government budgeted this money previously out of ordinary revenue of the government.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Oh, you mean here?

MR. G. MERCIER: Yes, in the department.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, the Sports Federation wouldn't lose that. Let's not mix the two. That's what I said, that the Sports Federation or all the umbrella groups are independent. They receive a certain percentage. There was a cap on it and actually what they're doing, they're doing the same thing here with our share of 12 percent, they're saying, hey, you don't need all that money, we're going to use it. That's a fact, but nobody is receiving less. It's not money from the Sports Federation to pay for this. This comes from our own. In other words, we're also capped in a way.

MR. G. MERCIER: The Sports Federation or Sport could have received more money?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Sport, in general, yes.

MR. G. MERCIER: Yes, could have more received more money . . .

Can the Minister say what is the formula? Was the \$7 million just an arbitrary figure or is there some formula that will be used in the future?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The Minister of Finance will be in a better position - to be quite honest with you, I was a bit confused because I did not attend Cabinet meetings during these two weeks or three weeks when that was decided and I was confused, I must admit.

My understanding is - and the Minister of Finance is here and I hope he listens and interrupts me fast if I give you the wrong information. The decision was made that \$7 million of that, from capping these revenues to the umbrella group and to our department as well and Cultural Affairs, that \$7 million from the Lotteries revenue would be placed in the general revenues, and that would enable them to give me \$7 million more in my Estimates. I already have it in the Estimates. It would be part of the \$120 million more than I got for Health this year.

The suggestion has been made from the critic for Health who said, all right, that's fair enough, but it would be better if you earmarked that; if you said, all right, \$7 million because that'll be used \$2 million for Home Care, this for that, and you know, and the changes that we're doing, and we certainly will look at that for the next year. Now that \$7 million has been transferred from the unallocated funds, let's say, to the consolidated revenue and then transferred to the department.

MR. G. MERCIER: I think this funding is important, Mr. Chairman, because it's important to know what amount of money could be available for the construction of an improvement of sports facilities in the city and in the province.

I wonder if the Minister would like to comment on the article that was in the Winnipeg Free Press this

week on the progress of the meetings that the three levels of government are apparently having to possibly proceed with a \$7 million amateur sports training centre in Winnipeg at the Sargent Park site. I wonder if the Minister can indicate . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, I can tell you what had been approved by the Cabinet, which you know already, last year in their discussions. Well, first of all, we invited the city to sit down with us and to look at the question of a construction program, building for, let's call it, major sports facilities. The city has agreed with that, that's before they started talking about baseball. They agreed; they sent a member, they gave us a name of a member to this committee. We did the same thing with the Sports Federation and that was done so the directorate of sports in our department, the Sports Federation, and the city met together to push this thing. And, of course, that's when, during that time, the question of the Triple A baseball came in, and the stadium. So that was referred to that committee and we were pushing for the city not to just go with a professional stadium that would be used mostly for professionals. Our main condition, our main reason for going in was if it was going to profit amateur sports and, of course, we had the cooperation of the Sports Federation on that.

Now at the last minute, this didn't materialize. Now, we had at the time a commitment. That was all subject to Triple A ball coming here. I think it was \$7.5 million from here in five or six years, and that was from each - from the city, from the Sports Federation and from ourselves - for construction, with the understanding that we'd try to get the Federal Government involved in that.

So, of course, that was a proven principle that showed the direction that we wanted to go. We discussed that at times, during the campaign and other times, about the need for that. We're on record as saying that was needed, but that agreement now is gone. We'd have to be back, in other words, I'd have to go back to Cabinet and try to convince them that this is needed and this will help. That commitment is no longer there because that condition wasn't filled.

So, then we made a commitment to have the Western Canada Games in 1990. We had at one time provided some funds to keep the Jets here, and that wasn't needed either, so that was one of the concerns. That agreement, of course, was gone, but the principle was there that we were ready to work with sports for these facilities.

Now, I've asked the city - and I wish the Member for Brandon was here. Then he'd get his answer this morning. We had always felt, there was never any thought of inviting people to compete and to put in an application to host the games. It was never felt because, in the past, the Western Canada Games wasn't exactly the same thing as the Canada Games was. There was quite a legacy left by the Federal Government, also. The Federal Government has never participated or just the first year on transportation for the Western Canada Games. So it was felt that was the only thing that Winnipeg could get; Brandon had the Western Canada Games. So we've talked, not officially enough, we should have started a long time ago with the city and, of course,

with that construction that they were talking about, that the Triple A ball was the main thing.

Now, Brandon then came in to see me and they wanted to know if they could compete and I told them straight what it was, that it was earmarked for these games. The Canada Games will not allow, unless they've changed this, games in the larger centres like Winnipeg and Calgary and Montreal. In some of the small places like St. Johns, I don't say, it's still a capital; no it's not the capital but it's a city in New Brunswick and so on. So that was permissible but not the Western Games.

So then you tried, because there wasn't the same amount of money available, to get an area where most of the facilities were already there and you might leave some legacy, some repair which would help, but it wasn't the same thing as the Canada Games. In other words, the senior partner was not a partner in this. So I told Brandon that. I said that if Winnipeg, for some reason, I'm sure you could do a good job because they did a hell of a job as far as the Winter Games were concerned, and it's easier to get interested in things in a little bit of a smaller place. So it's not that we feel that Brandon couldn't do a job.

I've asked the city to put in their bid, the City of Winnipeg. They had said, yes, in principle they would, and it took a long time. I wrote a couple of letters and I finally got the thing and that's why I remember the date, the day before I left for summer holidays and the Canada Games in Sydney, and also for participation in the Canadian Hospital Association meeting. So I was away for close to three weeks, and I got the letter just on that day I got here, on a Wednesday. The next day we started the Session, so there wasn't much time unfortunately.

Now, I have to go back to Cabinet. I am suggesting the possibility that we say, all right, we will roll in our obligation and our commitment for the games, and other commitments we've made, and with the five-year capital program. We are interested in the city participating in a five-year capital program for amateur sports. Now, this hasn't received the approval of Cabinet, and I want to make sure of that, but that is what we're suggesting. If they do that then we would go along and propose a plan to the Cabinet that would look at a capital construction plan, whatever we can do, and that would include our commitment for facilities for the Western Canada Games and, of course, we would have to have a budget for the hosting of the Games.

In other words, we still think it's one of the most important things, is the construction of a capital program, but we're not going to start all kinds of other obligations. So it might be that we'll suggest to the city - the city, if you remember, as soon as the Triple A ball was out, we had an agreement and then, all of a sudden, they had agreed to all that, and then that was thrown out the window and they, on their own, without even talking to us at all, announced that they were going to build a baseball field and also a soccer field. I reminded them of that and I was ready to talk to them on that, but they announced it. So I feel that it is their commitment.

It could be that I could go to Cabinet and say, fine, and if Cabinet is ready to approve, if we have a five- or six-year capital program, we could recommend - and again it has to go through Cabinet - that will be

considered as part of their share, the soccer and the baseball because it would be the priorities. And if not, if they say no, and providing they would go back on the five-year program if all the parties agreed, if that was the case, well, then that's the first question. It took me a long time to get to that, but that field house you were talking about is the first priority.

The first priority would be Phase I, if we went to the program, would be the construction needed to operate the games, to host the games in 1990, that would be Phase I. Phase II, the recommendation is the field house and the park, including the oval and so on. So that could be it. If they refuse to go along with that, the program, well then they're not going to be left off the hook for sure. We won't recommend the baseball and football. We'll just provide the minimum amount for capital and another amount, because that's an obligation, that's a commitment for hosting the games.

So this might be something, if I can convince our people in Cabinet, that will put this thing back on track about the capital program, which I think is sorely needed here for amateur sports. Besides, we're way behind other cities, especially with the Olympics, the facilities in Calgary for the Olympics, what they've done in Edmonton with the different sets of games. They have the Commonwealth Games and the University Games, what they had in B.C., and even in a small area like St. John's, and even Sydney and so on, the money that they spent.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, just a couple of quick questions if the Minister will answer them directly. As I understand it then, in 1990, the Western Canada Games will be in Winnipeg, will not be in Brandon.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: They've applied. As soon as this is over, I intend to meet with them. I haven't been able to meet with them, as I said, and then we will discuss what I have just finished discussing with them. Then I would have to get the approval of Cabinet, and then we would authorize it and they would set up. There's not that much time, I'm behind.

MR. G. MERCIER: I was just going to say that. When is the decision . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We're behind time, and they would have to get their host committee. We will have to do that in the next few days.

MR. G. MERCIER: Assuming the decision is made that the Western Canada Games will be in Winnipeg, what is the commitment of the province to provide, in the way of facilities, for that event, like that which we don't have?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, I couldn't tell you at this time. We can talk around it, but it's the host society. If it is finally approved and the city then would name an executive director, which is practically a full-time job for the next two to three years, and they would set up their hosting committee.

If there was a fast count looked at, they even said, this sport will take place at the university. We're not even discussing it with the university, for instance, and

the university doesn't like the idea too well. It was prepared in haste. Our presentation was done at the last minute in haste so we want to bring that seriously. As I say, the only thing that we have, if we can play ball, if we're not going to fall flat on our face and if they're serious about delivering it, it would be in Winnipeg. If not, we'd have no hesitation in saying to Brandon, all right, do you still want it. That is exactly what I told the people of Brandon when they came over to see me.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it's on the assumption that Winnipeg will host the Western Canada Games in 1990, despite the opposition of the Member for Ellice that . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: The Member for Ellice, is he against that?

MR. G. MERCIER: I'm just kidding him, Mr. Chairman, because all of these facilities are going to be built in his constituency. But it will be a real opportunity for . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You're talking about the park in his constituency?

MR. G. MERCIER: Yes. It'll be a real opportunity for Winnipeg to improve sports facilities.

The Minister has mentioned a five-year capital program which seems another opportunity for the City of Winnipeg to get provincial participation in an area where facilities badly need upgrading. I'm wondering what the Minister's concept is of what would be included in a five-year capital program.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I agree with the member, Mr. Chairman, that it would be a good chance for Winnipeg and even when baseball wasn't included, the Triple A ball, had they continued, we were very disappointed. We would have honoured the agreement, because we would have had the same park and, in fact, more participation of amateur sports which is our main concern here as a provincial government.

Now the facilities with Phase I, I would say, what would be done, it might be just an improvement to the existing facilities, providing of course that there is a part for amateur sports in that. That would be No. 1, the facilities that are needed to host the games; that would be Phase I. And as I say, that committee, we're going with the recommendation and I have to go back to Cabinet. This wasn't done at all. We're not that advanced yet, so I can't tell you what we would go with, or the city. But if we followed the recommendation of this special committee - and I hope we certainly take that into consideration, it would be that field house that was suggested by that committee - but they've already talked to the City of Winnipeg. At first, they were talking about something in McPhillips and so on. I would imagine that the City of Winnipeg agrees because it is their property. So that was looked at.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could indicate what sort of financial contributions are being suggested here. The Sports

Federation is involved, the city, the province. Obviously, from the city's point of view, the continued operating expenses are always much more than a simple capital contribution, although I shouldn't say simple, but it's a significant capital contribution. But at least, from the provincial point of view, the commitment then is over.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That's correct. But I mean we're building that for the city. So, again, I'm not going to go into details because that's not approved. I'd have to go back to Cabinet and I want to emphasize that. But if we went on with the first recommendation, it would have been 22.5 in that. In other words, we would have gone with one-third, but then the city had a partner of the Federal Government who was involved, who participated in this committee, and the Sports Federation also.

Now I'm sure that they have certain responsibilities for some of the facilities providing - in other words, if we can do something that the stadium could be used by amateur sports, we would allow that. I'll give an example, I'm not saying a priority. Let's say in that capital they'd say, okay, they agree with the Bombers and so on to put artificial turf and let the high school football there or any football, that could be considered. So you know that's helping the city as it is. It's not something new that they have to build. That would be taken into consideration, it's not necessarily all new facilities.

MR. G. MERCIER: Just on that one subject though, artificial turf . . .

HON. L. DESJARDINS: I gave that as an example, I'm not suggesting it.

MR. G. MERCIER: Yes, it's an example, but I wouldn't recommend artificial turf, and I don't think any doctor involved in the sport would recommend artificial turf anymore. The number of injuries that occur on artificial turf are extremely high.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, there's no doubt that there is danger and the professional player, my understanding is they would sooner not play on artificial turf, but I think we're one of the only places that hasn't got it. I'm looking at artificial turf as a possibility. That's about the only possibility that we would have. Ask your friend to the left, he might help me on that. But the situation might be that the only way that we could use that stadium for amateur sports would be with the turf, but that was just an example. I'm not advocating it.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, last Friday in question period, I'd asked the Minister a few questions about a report that I had received done by the Toronto Western Hospital, University of Toronto, on spinal cord injuries due to hockey. They pointed out there are some 88 injuries over a 10-year period, and that was up to May 15 of 1985. Since then, of course, we're all aware of the injury to the young Hornung hockey player in Regina and, as I've indicated to the Minister, I've had a 17-year-old hockey player who lives in my constituency suffer a broken neck within the last month in a hockey game, as a result of being checked from behind into the boards.

The Minister in his response indicated that he may consider withdrawing funding from the Amateur Hockey Association if something isn't done to curtail the violence. But in the news article in the Free Press, it indicated that he said that officials in his directorate have been monitoring hockey violence in Manitoba, and he'll review their findings with an eye to funding next season. I wonder if the Minister could indicate what sort of monitoring has been going on.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, I didn't use those words. What I did say is that there had been discussions that I'd discussed with the hockey group. It started a few years ago and, in fact, I think that year you asked pretty well the same question, talking about the violence in hockey. This is the second or third year we've talked about that.

We've put a certain amount of money into developing officials at one time. I remember working with the then president, Buck Matiowski. The point that I wanted to make, there's no doubt that the question and the publicity that your question and my answer got, they're quite concerned.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mostly your answer.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well with my answer, okay. In fact, they asked to meet with me before this weekend, they're having their annual meeting. Before the question was even posed, the president had circulated for the annual meeting a note, and on the agenda for the annual meeting is violence in hockey. Should the MAHA adopt a stronger approach? There was discipline for members who are in violation of the playing rules or regulations. Should the MHA discipline officials who do not call the appropriate stick and checking from behind penalties? The Quebec Ice Hockey Federation initiated a pilot project in the fall of '86 in the matter of no body contact from Pee Wee down. Should facial protectors be compulsory for all MAHA registered members? There are some other documents.

They met since then with staff, with Mr. Crook here, and there is no doubt that they have been trying. The statement that was in the paper also that we're much better off in Manitoba than other provinces, it's true, but it's still not good enough. I'm not blaming them, and I definitely want to talk to them. It might be that, instead of just giving a grant to them, we might have a special grant for special programs or special training. I don't blame them.

I think that watching TV - and I think the NHL has gone completely nuts. I listened to a game pretty well the same day or day after and, if you want to see it, I'll guarantee that if you - at 6:30, in an hour from now, watch the Quebec and Montreal game. You'll see what I mean. They're letting everything go in the playoffs, and the kids are watching that and many of them want to make the NHL, and that's the concern.

Is it an impossible task for the people who are trying so hard here? So we'll discuss that with them, but we certainly want to see some changes. And the crowd also. There was an article pretty well on the same day and some sportswriter in the Free Press - I don't remember if it was Taylor or not, Sigurdson - they compared it to the old days with the Roman gladiators

and the lions and so on, and it's practically the same thing at times. It's scary.

We didn't want to make a big thing out of that, as if the politicians are sticking their nose in. We did it quietly over the last few years and now that came up and it's not bad, because they know that we're serious. I intend to meet with them before the weekend, if at all possible.

MR. G. MERCIER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister made a comment at the end that I've always been very sensitive to, having followed sports most of my life, that I would not want to be seen - and I'm sure he does not want to be seen - as a politician sticking his nose into something that's not within his jurisdiction. But there comes a time when, if the situation deteriorates badly enough, we are at the same time representative of our constituents. I certainly believe that I am representing my constituents when I raise a subject such as this, because violence in hockey has been talked about for a long, long time. You go back into the early 1970's, in Ontario, in the mid-Seventies when they had the McMurtry thing going on, and they were talking about charges on professional athletes.

I'm not so concerned about what the professional athletes want to do to each other. That's almost their responsibility. They have strong unions, they have strong player representatives, they can play the style of hockey they want, I guess. It's up to them, they're old enough to change it. But I think we've seen a situation in amateur hockey deteriorate for a considerable number of years and violence increase, and I would like to see the statistics on registrations in hockey and, even considering the fact that there are also a lower number of children available to play hockey, the declining numbers.

I think there are significant numbers, particularly teenaged boys, dropping out of hockey in their mid-teens because of the violence that occurs, and they don't want to be part of it. Frankly, I don't blame them. But that's not right. Hockey should be the greatest game in the world, really, and I believe that. My comments are not being said, because I dislike hockey. I like hockey and I'd like to see the situation improve.

I think the time is coming when the talk has to stop and there has to be some action by those responsible, and I wouldn't blame any of the people who volunteer thousands of hours every year to help run this sport. But perhaps we have to look at - when the Minister talked about funding, perhaps rather than talking about reducing funding, we should be talking about increasing funding, for example, in the area of officials.

I'm not blaming present officials, but obviously hockey is a very difficult game to referee with some of the coaches that you have, and with some of the fans and parents that you have. Should we not consider, or should the Sports Directorate consider, doing something to help improve, as best as possible, the level of officiating, perhaps in introducing more financial incentives for people to get into refereeing, for qualified people to get into it. Because I often wonder, as I go to minor hockey games all year, why does anybody want to be a hockey referee. When you see the parents and the fans and the players running down somebody who's trying to do an honest job, and when it really comes

down to it, they're the ones, if they call the acts of violence early on in a game, take charge of a game, they can control the game. So that's an area where I think the Minister might want to, rather than reduce funding, take a look at increasing funding and offering greater incentives and financial rewards and training to the officials who are refereeing minor hockey.

There are also some areas that the penalties would have to be looked at, because you see from a report like this that I have, these spinal injuries, from which there is no recourse - you suffer a spinal injury, you're paralyzed, you're in a wheelchair. You're there for the rest of your life, and that's too big a price for any young boy to have to pay just for going out and playing a hockey game.

So, in that particular area and I know in minor hockey, in Winnipeg, a couple of years ago, they introduced the penalty for checking from behind. I think regrettably, it's probably called inconsistently, and it's probably not a serious enough penalty. There has been a suggestion in Ontario, I noticed in a little article on what the Ontario Government is doing, in looking at minor hockey, that they're saying anybody who checks from behind should be immediately suspended. I wouldn't disagree with that - immediately suspended, and perhaps suspended for two or three or four or five games - because nobody can take the risk of somebody doing that to another player.

Rather than reducing funding, I'd like to see, and I'd be very supportive of the Minister of increasing funding where some of the penalties for some of these acts of violence are increased substantially, and to improve officiating.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I agree with everything that was said and the concern. I agree that we can't control the NHL, certainly not the Minister of Sports. Even with the amateur sports, I think if they want to tell me where to go, there's not much I can do. If we're going to bring regulation and punishment ourselves, it would have to be through the Attorney-General. But what I'm saying, it's quite important, they're getting through the Sports Federation about \$94,000-\$95,000, and they're getting from us another \$25,000.00.

So the point that I'm saying, if we say, all right we can't control your game, it's none of our business as politicians maybe except, if somebody's going to be hurt, you have to protect them. But we certainly have the right to say, we're not going to make any grants to encourage that kind of game, that's public funds. We've started - we've had some special grants for a number of years, and they've improved - to work with the referees.

But, for instance, some of the information that I have - they had 20,000-plus games in a year; those were registered hockey games played. They've got so many referees, I think they've got too many games. They can't keep up, and some of the referees lose complete control. So if we would work with them and insist, that's where we can help in the penalties, making the penalties tough to say, fine, do you want to prove that? If you want to prove it only in certain leagues, if it's a Tier I, for instance, they don't want any part of that, these guys all want to make NHL. We'll say well ask the NHL

teams to sponsor you, let them develop their players, we're not into this.

So I think that we can discuss it. They're well-intentioned and they've tried. The only reason why I mention the pros, there is no doubt that has an impact in the last few weeks with the hockey fever we had in Winnipeg, the Jets being the favourite and so on, the kids are watching that. When this Don Cherry is saying, oh the team that knocks the hell out of the other on the boards is going to win and so on. If they feel that the only way they're going to make it is by being aggressive and all that, it certainly has an influence on them. It is the Canadian game, and nearly every Canadian boy wants to make the NHL, if they can. I think we're on the same wavelength, and I'll keep him posted of any progress that we're making on this.

MR. G. MERCIER: Yes, I appreciate everything the Minister has said and done. As the Minister indicated, it's not the first year I've raised this issue. I've raised it with him for certainly the last two or three years. I just hope something is done and, hopefully, it'll be done by the Amateur Hockey Association people themselves. Because I can say one thing, that parents, reasonable parents and reasonable young people do not want to play the game the way it's being played now, once you get into the teenage years.

There's absolutely no doubt in my mind on that question. I run into more and more people, not only in my constituency but wherever I go, for example, young boys, they don't even want to start them off playing hockey, because they're afraid of what's going to happen when they're in their mid-teens. That's a very regrettable situation because, as I said earlier, hockey is a fun game, and particularly for a young boy when they start at 5 and 6, and up to 12. Really, with no body contact they enjoy the sport very much. It's the kind of thing that is a great opportunity for a young person. But when you have people saying, I'm not even going to allow my young boy to start playing hockey because I'm worried about what's going to happen in the future, then the game has got a real problem, and they better recognize it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Riel.

MR. G. DUCHARME: To the Minister, just one quick question.

I wasn't going to join in the discussions, I just wanted to hear them. But, my other hat, in years gone by when the original Jet purchase was coming about, the Minister - I don't know whether it's through these funds or through the urban funds - did give some monies up front for that purchase. Whatever happened to the money that you gave up front at that time?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: It wasn't for the purchase of the Jets; it was for building of seats in the Arena, it wasn't for the purchase. But that's not the same thing.

MR. G. DUCHARME: Okay, well it was all in the same negotiations at the time.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, it's with different groups. The Enterprise, to make it possible to get a rink that they can have a NHL team.

Tuesday, 28 April, 1987

MR. G. DUCHARME: That's correct. So it was all under the same, to keep the Jets here is what I should have said. Whatever happened to the money?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: They built seats. The money was spent.

MR. G. DUCHARME: After that. No, no, there were some monies after that.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You're talking about two years ago.

MR. G. DUCHARME: That's correct.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Well, that we were told, no thank you, we don't need the money, the money belongs to the province. I don't know if it's still collecting interest somewhere. I was hoping at one time when we talked about the capital construction, that part of that could be used for that, but that fell through also.

MR. G. DUCHARME: So that was in the discussions that you were having recently.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Yes, there's no commitment; it doesn't belong to the city at all.

MR. G. DUCHARME: But the monies, is that still an obligation on the province's part?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No, not that obligation when the Jets didn't need it, or said they didn't want to use it, then also when the Triple A ball didn't come here - those two.

MR. G. DUCHARME: All I'm trying to do is find out where that money is, or was it ever put in the hands of the city?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: That money was given to the city at one time. It was sent to the city, and they had to keep it, in trust, and it was collecting interest. I don't know if the Minister -(Interjection)- It's through Urban Affairs, and I don't know if it's still there. If it is still there, it's collecting interest while we're negotiating this construction and so on. I don't know where it is. The Minister of Urban Affairs would know. It's either there or it came back to the city, and was put in Consolidated Fund or somewhere - not the city, I mean the province.

MR. G. MERCIER: On the budget, I wonder if the Minister could explain the provincial team, Manitoba First, Item No. 5., in Grants.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: This is to assist the Provincial Sport Association in the identification and training of Manitoba athletes within the province. This program assists provincial sports associations in the pursuit of excellence and, in many instances, forms the basis for the Canada and Western Canada Games. It helps set up the team for the games most of the time.

MR. G. MERCIER: Just another smaller item under Services (3), Sports Awards, goes from \$10,000 to

\$30,000.00. Is there something significant being done to replace it?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: We've changed that a couple of years ago. We added very little and we've instituted the Order of Sports Excellence. There are the medals, and then there are the Golden Boy Awards and pins and so on. This is all in there for these awards.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Niakwa.

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

Just a couple of questions, it shouldn't take us longer than half an hour.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: You'll be talking to yourself after six.

MR. A. KOVNATS: I know I'll be talking to myself after six o'clock.

What have we done to honour people who have contributed to sports in the past, in the last 20-30 years, who really did contribute to sports, some of the great names who were involved in amateur sports? Have we done anything to honour them, to bring them forward at this point so that we can see where having contributed to sports is something that would be remembered, or do we forget very, very quickly?

HON. L. DESJARDINS: No. The Sports Federation has been very active in that with the Annual Hall of Fame Banquet, the Hall of Fame itself, also. In different Halls of Fame, different sports also are recognizing some of their people. You're talking about the old timers now, that would be pretty well the event. Occasionally, something could be done because sports is an important part of the community. I'm not saying that is only for sports people but, in certain circumstances, the Provincial Government has conferred the Order of the Buffalo and so on. Like, there's a banquet for Paul Robson on Friday, and I'm representing the province and making a small presentation at that time.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Did I hear the Minister correct in saying that a small presentation was made to Paul Robson, who is very, very deserving? I would accept that.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Will be made on Friday, honouring and bringing greetings from the province. Of course, the year they won the Grey Cup and other teams - I remember the Selkirk team and the Portage team one time were made presentations of different Order of the Buffalo Hunt, also. I remember the Grey Cup, and we honoured them. Well, that's not the old-timers as much; that's professional sports. There's been recognition of the Jets in the past.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Money will almost do anything. It can win recognition throughout Canada, the United States, the world. It can almost buy championships, and I would like to see -(Interjection)-

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Don't prove that with the Boston Red Sox, they've tried for years.

MR. A. KOVNATS: Now we're talking about professional. I think I'm really more interested in amateur which is providing facilities for young kids where they can participate and gain a lot of knowledge in the sport which they decide, like we saw some championships in gymnastics just the other day of which my friend, on my right, has some great involvement.

By contributing some finances there, it doesn't have to be big finances, I don't think that we should be considering the Jets, the Winnipeg Enterprises and all these places. We're talking about, the only way that amateur sports could use the Winnipeg Stadium is if they had artificial turf, because god help them if they ruin the grass for the professional team. Let's start considering the amateurs a little bit more, Mr. Minister. I think it's very, very nice to have professionals, and I've had some involvement with the professionals, but let's not forget about the amateurs which is, you know, the kids of our province, which is the future of our province.

I think that we should be throwing more money into promoting amateur sports, and the officiating, as my friend also suggested, in hockey and in football and in every other sport because that's where really it comes from. It teaches them good manners, it teaches them sportsmanship. I don't want to teach them to be good losers, but I want to teach them how to play the game. I think that it's just a matter of a few dollars. I certainly wouldn't criticize the Minister for throwing a few extra dollars into a situation like that.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, I agree, our role and my role as Minister of Sports is with amateur sports.

Now, it is very important, and I think we're working better and better every day with the Sports Federation because we don't want to compete. They have certain responsibilities that we feel are more theirs than ours. The provincial fund, and it's still provincial funds with the Sports Federation up to a certain point through the Lotteries, but those are their programs. We don't interfere with them, except that we want to coordinate the program and not duplicate.

We have a responsibility. Our responsibility might be less with the elite athlete, although we feel that's important. Elite, I'm talking about kids who are making the Canada Games and those things which promotes sports also. But our first priority would be for mass participation, for instance. We aren't doing that, you'd be surprised. If you look at the budget, there's quite a bit of money that's going there, but more and more we want to look at our priorities, re-evaluate our programs also, and use sports for fitness. By fitness, I'm talking about complete fitness as far as our share is concerned, and that's why we're concerned about violence in hockey and so on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Pass?

SOME MEMBERS: Pass.

HON. L. DESJARDINS: There's nothing to pass here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution No. 83: Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,539,400 for Health, Administration and Finance, for

the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1988—pass.

Committee rise.

SUPPLY - NATURAL RESOURCES

MR. CHAIRMAN, C. Santos: The Committee of Supply will be dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Natural Resources. We shall begin with a statement from the Honourable Minister responsible for the department.

The Minister of Natural Resources.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to make a brief opening statement, after which time we can proceed to the questions that I'm sure the members opposite will want to direct for my consideration.

I would like to begin, Mr. Chairman, by expressing my appreciation to the departmental staff. It's through their work, and they continue to demonstrate their professionalism and dedication, serving the general public and the Province of Manitoba with continued budgetary restraints that this department has to work with, and with indeed the government. Many of them have been called upon to shoulder increasing workloads while continuing to provide a high quality of service expected by the people of Manitoba.

I would also like to pay tribute to Mr. Nick Carter, our former Deputy Minister. He recently left our department to take on another challenge as the chairperson of the Hazardous Waste Management Board. Mr. Carter's integrity, dedication and hard work within our department were an example to all. In addition, I would like to pay recognition to Mr. Nes Mudray, who recently retired as chief of Water Management within the Water Resources Branch of this department. Mr. Mudray, since the late 1940's, made a substantial contribution to the province and the branch within the area of water management.

Manitoba Natural Resources has a mandate to protect, conserve, manage and develop the province's forests, waters, fisheries, wildlife, Crown land and parkland resources. In carrying out this mandate, the department acts as the steward of these resources on behalf of the resource owners, the people of the province.

In this stewardship capacity, the department strives to allocate and manage the province's resource heritage for the use and enjoyment of current and future generations. Accordingly, Manitoba Natural Resources is challenged to make sound and fair decisions to serve the long-term interests of the province. In this regard, we will continue to manage and enhance the province's resources for current and future considerations.

Decisions involving the allocation of our scarce resources must be based on fairness, moderation and balance. We, in Manitoba Natural Resources, seek to strike a reasonable balance in allocating the consumptive and non-consumptive use of our province's resources. Further, we make every effort to strike a fair and reasonable balance between the competing claimants for the same resource base.

We endeavour to maintain and enhance a cooperative and consultative relationship with the general public. Whenever feasible, we will make resource

management's decisions only after consulting with those who may be affected by those decisions.

Without the general public's cooperation and assistance, the department by itself does not have sufficient financial and human resources to manage the province's natural resources. The department recognizes that it is ultimately responsible and accountable for this management role. Nevertheless, we could not adequately carry out this role without securing the general public's opinion, support, cooperation and, indeed, in many cases, its assistance.

We, in Manitoba Natural Resources, will increasingly emphasize service as our foremost priority in our relationship with our clients, the people of Manitoba. Nevertheless, we will do so while carrying out our enforcement responsibility.

Speaking of enforcement, I would like to recognize and thank the overwhelming majority of Manitobans who continue to comply with our department's regulatory measures. These measures are specifically designed for the overall benefit of all Manitobans and the owners of the province's natural resources. It should be noted, Mr. Chairman, that the compliance rate with the province's regulations is far in excess of the 90 percent level.

I would now like to highlight some of the department's recent accomplishments and upcoming initiatives. During the past year, the Turn In Poacher's Program, also known as TIP, progressed from the experimental stage to the fully operational stage. Under this program, Manitoba Natural Resources received over 500 calls resulting in approximately 150 poacher-related prosecutions. I should point out, Mr. Chairman, that this program is supported by several groups throughout the province and it is the participation of the general public of Manitoba that does make it a success.

After several years of research, discussion and negotiation, the Beverly and Kaminuriak Caribou Management Board developed a preliminary management plan. The preliminary plan was reviewed in a special forum involving caribou hunters, elders from various communities within the caribou range. Comments from Inuit, Chippeway and Metis users will be taken into consideration in drafting the final management plan. Upon finalization, this document will serve as a guide for caribou managers and users for the next decade.

I would like to briefly comment on the Manitoba Habitat Enhancement Land Use Program which is also known as HELP. This pilot project has been designed to preserve prairie pothole habitat and to conserve soil and water on privately owned lands in Western Manitoba. This pilot project will be specifically carried out within the Rural Municipality of Shoal Lake. HELP was designed with the assistance of local landowners and municipal officials.

This program offers a wide range of conservation options for farmers, such as leasing pothole upland complexes, establishing nesting cover, as well as providing control measures for soil erosion.

HELP is innovative, holistic and flexible in its approach to land use management of our prairie potholes. The Manitoba Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Habitat Canada and Ducks Unlimited are HELP's sponsoring agencies.

The new Water Rights Act has now been proclaimed and regulations are now in place. The act addresses

the problem of water being a scarce resource which, like most other natural resources, is being subjected to increasing user demands. In the interest of conservation and the rational use of water, moderate and fair charges for this increasingly scarce resource were recently introduced. This measure establishes the principle that withdrawals of surface and ground water should be priced on the volume basis. There will be no quantity charged for water used for agricultural and irrigation as well as for domestic consumption.

It should be noted, Mr. Chairman, that this kind of approach has been established in other jurisdictions, particularly Saskatchewan and British Columbia.

The department will be designating new categories of parks as set out within our park system plan. We are currently examining several geographic areas for possible wilderness, heritage and other parks. In doing so, Manitoba Natural Resources wishes to preserve sites representative of Manitoba's natural landscapes and to protect unique, rare or endangered species of plants and animals. Through the creation of new parks, we will be setting aside certain areas for the enjoyment of not only our current generation, but also for future generations as well.

The department significantly improved its aerial photography service. More than 200,000 aerial photographs were obtained from the Canadian Department of Energy, Mines and Resources in Ottawa. These photographs are being stored at our Century Street vault which is environmentally controlled. With this change, our department will be able to respond more quickly to aerial photograph service requests from within the department and from the general public. In addition, revenues generated from this service will remain in Manitoba.

I hope, as we are going through the Estimates, we will be able to draw further attention to the progress that has been made in this particular branch in adaptation of the new technology through reproduction of maps and serving the interests of Manitobans.

Manitoba Natural Resources continues to monitor developments relating to the Garrison Diversion in North Dakota. The Government of the United States passed legislation meeting our basic concerns. Nevertheless, Manitoba Natural Resources continues to scrutinize and to monitor certain possible developments regarding the revised Garrison Diversion project. For example, we continue to be concerned with the possibility of a biota transfer into the Cheyenne River. The Sikeston Canal, approved by the American Government as a replacement for the Lonetree Reservoir, has yet to be approved by the North Dakota Government. We will continue with our vigilance until this matter is resolved.

Consultation between American, Canadian, North Dakota and Manitoba governments will be necessary on the Sikeston Canal. Similarly, consultation will be required on other subjects, including the proper treatment of Missouri Basin water which might be transferred into the Hudson Bay Basin.

The 1987-88 Estimates of the Department of Natural Resources reflect the government's continued concern for budgetary constraint. Once again our department was challenged to provide quality service with an environment of responsible fiscal management and human resource allocation. Wherever possible, we continued in our efforts to introduce more efficiency,

Tuesday, 28 April, 1987

effectiveness and economy in our operations. Accordingly, we will continue to maintain our thrust in streamlining operations, in consolidating functions wherever possible, and in introducing new technology.

The 1987-88 department Estimates reflect a net reduction of 38.23 staff years. Nevertheless, our total salary expenditures increased by \$2,837,900.00. This increase primarily results from the upward adjustments for employees' salaries. The 1987-88 operating budget requested from the Manitoba Natural Resources is approximately \$75.8 million. This amount represents a \$522,800 increase; that is, an increase of less than 1 percent over our '86-87 Estimates. This is quite an achievement, given that inflation and nearly a \$3 million increase mostly brought on because of the salary adjustments. To achieve this minimal expenditure, increased cost-cutting measures were introduced widely throughout the department. Many branches were called upon to maintain their operations with fewer financial, fiscal and human resources.

The department's 1987-88 requested capital budget has been set at \$10,206,000.00. This figure represents a slight increase of approximately \$200,000 over the previous year. I'm pleased to indicate that several new initiatives are included in the proposed capital expenditure. For example, \$200,000 was budgeted for a flood control diversion in the Gimli area and \$500,000 for facility enhancement in provincial parks. Further details on these and other capital projects will be provided as we go through the Estimates review.

Mr. Chairman, in summarizing my opening remarks, I want to indicate the high priority Manitoba Natural Resources places on its stewardship role. We in our department are aware that the resources we manage belong to the people of Manitoba. Accordingly, we are committed to improving the process of making resource management decisions in consultation with those Manitobans who may be affected by those decisions.

We are proud of the department's accomplishments, especially when they have been made within an environment of budgetary constraint. We look forward to future challenges facing our department and we look forward to improving the quality of service to our clients, the people of Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I conclude my remarks and look forward to answering questions from the members opposite.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As is customary, the chief Opposition Critic may now give his reply if he wishes.

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

I want to thank the Minister for his opening remarks. This is the second time that the Minister and myself will be debating the Estimates of the Department of Natural Resources. When we did this last year, the Minister was a relatively new Minister, and I indicated, at that time, I had a certain feeling of compassion for him while he was getting used to the responsibilities within the Department of Natural Resources, and now that he's had a year under his belt, Mr. Chairman, I think we can get down to some issues and get some action going here for a change. We will try and do it in a manner that is going to be hopefully constructive and hopefully the Minister will take some of the

comments and advice that we give to heart and move along those lines.

I want to indicate to the Minister that when we talk about the Department of Natural Resources, one of my colleagues and myself, as well as a few other friends, had the privilege of joining in the turkey shoot and having good results. So many people do enjoy the Department of Natural Resources. I think all people, and this is my perception, have an affinity and feel closely related to things within the Department of Natural Resources, whether it's forests, whether it's wildlife, whether it's water, fish, all these things. Everybody relates to it.

Even those people that don't necessarily hunt or fish, when they get out into the outdoors, for many of our urbanites, I think they find it very exciting, with very few exceptions, when they can see wildlife in their habitat, see the lakes properly cleaned up, useage of it for camping, etc.; and I personally feel that within the Department of Natural Resources, there is so much potential for useage, proper useage, and I actually felt a little disappointed when the Minister announced his new initiatives, as he put it, and the items that he covered basically were really not new initiatives.

He raised issues like the TIP Program which actually I don't think the government was that receptive to it. I don't know whether the Member for St. James was the one that was initially the Minister because we had so many changes there it was hard to keep track of who was doing what. I don't know which Minister actually finally consented to going along with the TIP Program, which I think has been a good program and has not really been developed yet to its potential by any means of the imagination.

The Minister also mentioned, under new initiatives, the caribou herds, the Beverly and Kaminuriak herds and I'm sorry that he didn't mention the fact that there's been a dramatic increase in caribou and part of it has been because of the establishment of agreements that were made by the then-Member for Turtle Mountain, Mr. Ransom, who had a very key part in that. He had a very key part in that. He initiated that whole arrangement and I think credit has to be given to him for that kind of initiative.

The Minister mentions that you're looking around for establishment of new wilderness parks, for whatever reason, and these are things that we'd like to pursue a little further, depending on what he has in mind. We can deal with that when we get into the Parks section.

He also mentions Garrison as a new initiative. Basically, that initiative has been there for a long time. I think the battle finally has been more or less won, and I certainly support the view of the Minister in terms that we should keep watching what develops out there. But many Ministers before him, from both governments, have been very actively involved in that project. So as far as a new initiative is concerned, it's not really - well I was trying to pick up the drift of the Minister's new initiatives and I couldn't find too many there.

I must say I'm actually disappointed that there are not more new initiatives being announced, because there's so much potential in terms of what can be done within the Department of Natural Resources. I have to express some very great concern when I look at the Estimates in the Department of Natural Resources since

1980-81, where we've had a 103 percent increase in revenues, and we've had a 16 percent increase in expenditures. The thing is getting out of whack. We're looking at the point where, when we look at all the fees that have been increased, we're losing the perspective.

The Minister talks pretty words about all the things that are happening within the department, and in my opinion, I think there's far, far too little that is happening. There's seemingly no new ideas; I think there's a lack of leadership. In the Department of Natural Resources there's been a lack of leadership for years, even when the Member for St. James was there, and we had some differences of opinion then. I think that's when it started because we have to look at the expenditures. We have to look at what has happened.

In 1980-81, the total expenditures for the department were \$62 million; the next year it went up to \$73 million; it went to \$78 million and then, all of a sudden, that's when the government decided, hey, this is the place where we can take and put the squeeze on - this department, let's try and generate as much revenue as we can, but let's spend less money. Between the Department of Natural Resources and the Highways Department, I think these are the two departments that had the hell kicked out of them by this government because they've been cutting them back. Was that unparliamentary? Anyway, I feel very strongly about that.

These are two departments that they've just put the squeeze on and these are things that affect all people of Manitoba, all people of Manitoba - Natural Resources and Highways - and that's where they've been putting the squeeze on and cutting back. We'll get into the staff part of it a little later on, but I think I understood the Minister to indicate that he had a reduction of staff to the tune of 33 staff man years. That shows where their priority is, and at a time when I would think there could be an enhancement, that we could be developing new programs to generate additional revenue as well, we have a reduction. That indicates to me, at least, and to most people of Manitoba, it must indicate that this is not a priority department for the government.

I'm a little disappointed when we look through here, because in 1983-84, the total expenditures within the department were \$84 million - I'm using round figures - and 1984-85, \$84 million; and 1985-86, \$85 million; and 1986-87, \$84 million again. In this year's Estimates, we're at the 84 again, so we've levelled off. For five years, there has been no additional expenditures when you consider the automatic increases in wages should bring the rates higher. So what we're doing, we're cutting services, charging more for it and I think we're working at it the wrong way around. I feel that things are not going in the right direction.

I think the Minister has to take a lot of responsibility for that. He is sitting in the Treasury Committee, I understand, which is a very influential position to have, I would think, and still he can't come up with more money for his department.

I know that in the total budget of the government, I think they're not running the government well. We see that by the difficulty that they have and, Mr. Chairman, I realize that there are problems within the Department of Natural Resources. They have been developing over a period of time. How I can I tell, Mr. Chairman? It is because of the correspondence and

the phone calls I get from people all across Manitoba who are unhappy with some of the things.

I want to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that I am not criticizing staff or the department as such. I'm criticizing the Minister and some of his key people who make the decisions or don't make the decisions. Those are the ones I want to criticize. And if I use examples of things that have happened in the field somewhere along the line, it is not because I pick on those people. I want to pick on the Minister because he has the ultimate responsibility and very often has made decisions or has lacked in making decisions that I find reprehensible at times. It is lack of planning.

It seems as if this Minister, Mr. Chairman, is there to just sort of try and keep things without getting any action going, no imagination, nothing new. He's just trying to bide his time in there; maybe, if nothing happens, he can serve his time in there, whatever time that is, until the next election when changes will be made.

There are many areas where we're going to get into more specifics dealing with The Water Rights Act, and the Minister made mention of that. We want to pursue that a little further in terms of getting a good clarification. I actually would have liked to see, when these regulations came down, that the Minister would have sent out a proper release informing the public exactly what was happening - the municipalities and the farmers. He didn't do that. He almost sneaked the regulations through - he didn't sneak them through; they were gazetted - but nobody found out what it was all about.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: How do you sneak regulations?

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Well, okay, I said almost.

Why wouldn't the Minister put out a press release and itemize the things so that there was no concern? The farmers in the municipalities were really not aware of it until we started raising it in the House.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: We had a press release, Albert; and you know it.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Well, I'll tell you something, if you did, you should have contacted the municipalities. You should have made the public aware of it in a different way than you did, because they still don't really know what is going on. There are so many things that have happened this way that make this Minister unpopular.

The conservation districts, and we'll be going into that to quite a degree, because in my view I think the government is trying to absolve themselves of responsibility in funding as well as other responsibilities. That's a nice way to do it. It's a nice way to do it because then you form a district, you give them so and so much money; whatever they want to do, that's their responsibility. The Minister washes his hands of it in that respect on some of the changes that have taken place, and we'll go through that in terms of the engineering, the drainage works that are not being done, etc., a lot of things.

I want to raise with the Minister - we'll go through this in-depth to some degree - the elk ranching story, a fiasco created by this government and further

worsened by this Minister the way he handled the whole issue. We're going to go through this extensively so the people of Manitoba have a right to know what happened and what is going on. So we intend to spend time with that.

As I say, there are so many areas here that we could cover and we'll do that on a piece-by-piece basis as we move along.

The fishing issue, I would have hoped that the Minister could have come forward with some new ideas, initiatives, in terms of stocking programs, you know, the use of raw fish, rough fish, all kinds of things that this Minister could have done.

I don't know what he spends his time on, whether he's just writing letters and signing letters, because he certainly isn't getting out in the field, and interestingly enough, he makes comments about he will do nothing without consulting. I find that kind of a comment most interesting. Mind you, this is standard for this government. They say they consult; they study everything to death and do nothing.

I would have liked to see some incentives come forward in terms of wildlife habitat. There is so much that could be done in that direction and we could make use of things like the wildlife associations in the province. We had not very much. We started off at one stage of the game, when we were government from 1977-81, in the St. Malo area where we took and designated a block. The wildlife association bought it; the government paid the rent for it. It was a good program, just the one program. Nothing has happened since. You know there's a lot of areas.

At a time -(Interjection)- the Member for St. James is yelling something; I can't understand him.

HON. A. MACKLING: We acquired the land.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Who initiated the program?

A MEMBER: We did.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: The program? Well, the Member for St. James, I think he's losing his . . . -(Interjection)- I'm talking about the St. Malo project. Well, if the Member for St. James has trouble listening to what I'm saying, then that's fine, because it was St. Malo I was making reference to, the one that we initiated there.

But there's so much opportunity for involvement of the public in these things. The wildlife associations would be begging to be involved in all kinds of projects, and conservation, it's a big thing. At a time when the agricultural community is in trouble, we should maybe be paying grants in lieu of taxes to farmers so they would not work some of their land, more marginal land. There's so many ideas we can come forward with.

I don't know why the Minister hasn't mentioned one project that he's worked out together, jointly, with the Federal Government in terms of the forestry arrangement, yes, and we want to get into that. There's some interesting stuff, I think, that we have to look at in there.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, with those general comments, I'd like to conclude with that at the present time, and maybe, as we go through the Estimates here, we can cover all the other things that possibly myself and my colleagues want to pursue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

At this point in time, we wish to invite the member's departmental staff to come over and take their respective places.

Deferring item No. 1.(a), relating to the Minister's Salary, we shall begin with consideration of item No. 1.(b)(1) Administration and Finance, Executive Support: Salaries; 1.(b)(2) Other Expenditures.

The Honourable Minister may want to introduce the members of his staff.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, the two staff members that are with me now, I have at my left, Dale Stewart, who is the Acting Deputy Minister of the department; and on my right is Bill Podolsky, who is the Executive Director of Administration.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: First of all, I'd like to welcome the staff here as well. I'm looking forward to maybe exchanging ideas, through the Minister, with them as well.

I would just like to ask at this time of the Minister: When is it expected that the position of Deputy Minister will be claimed as a full-time position?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I've not made a final determination in that regard, but I think it would only be reasonable that it would be sometime after the Session. I don't think it would be appropriate that we would be dealing with the matters of changing the acting status.

I should point out that we not only have an Acting Minister, we have other people within the branch in acting capacities, and I think at some point, after we are through the Session, those items will be reviewed.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I want to indicate, Mr. Chairman, that I had a conversation with the Minister briefly yesterday, and we came to some kind of an understanding that as we go through each section, that we'll sort of cover it on a broad base like we did last year maybe, if that's acceptable, and then just pass it as we go through these things. That way possibly, the colleagues that want to make some comments on it can get involved at that time and we'll try and do it along those lines if that's acceptable.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I think that's quite acceptable to us, if we can try to follow the sequence that is outlined here; and I say that only so that we can, in turn, try to have the appropriate staff on hand to deal with the sections, each of the branches of the department as we go through them; but we're quite prepared to have a fairly broad-ranging discussion within each of the branches.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I think that would be an acceptable format to work with, and I'll try to adhere to that.

Under this section here, can the Minister indicate - this is basically the planning arm of the department, this is the policy making group, if I understand it correctly - and I wonder if the Minister could indicate.

Are there any new developments, any new programs, specifically, that the department is undertaking, or are we just sort of sliding along? I wonder if the Minister could maybe indicate what the new initiatives are.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I guess I want to make clear for the record, Mr. Chairman, that each of the branches is involved in planning. Not all planning occurs at this point. This is more the administrative branch and it does deal with planning as it relates to the administrative functions of the department, but within each of the branches there is a planning function. Within this branch, as one example of a planning function which would impact all branches, would be the matter of the adaptation of the new technology. We are involved in that particular process. So the planning that would take place here would impact other branches.

But I want to point out that within specific branches, using mapping and surveying that I referred to earlier, there would be projects involving the adaptation of the new technology which would be developing within that branch. The same is true within the Forestry Branch, for example, where they are adapting the new technology. So there is an overall planning function. Within each branch, there is a high degree of responsibility for planning. We will undoubtedly be getting into the activities of each of the branches as we go through the Estimates.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: I understand what the Minister is saying, that each department sort of does their own planning, but this is the area where it all comes to a head. This is where the decisions get made and that's what I'd like to find out, like what decisions have been made at this level in terms of programs, new initiatives.

I'd like to talk "new initiatives" because this provides policy and program development/administration for the department, including research and planning, communications, financial, personnel, computer, audit support services. I would think that under this area here is where we should be looking at new initiatives, and I'm wondering if the Minister can bring us up-to-date.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Clearly, Mr. Chairman, there are new initiatives that do flow from this particular function and, as I said, the adaptation of the new technology would be one of those. Another example would be the question of the review of our administrative structure, our communications process, our personnel function. All of those would be tied in.

We are looking, for example, at the matter of communications. This ties back to my opening statements, wherein we said that we wanted to ensure that there was good, clear communication not only with the general public, perhaps primarily with the general public; but in order to be effective in that role, I think there has to be effective communication between departments of government within the department because our department is a large department, having 1,500 employees, and on a seasonal basis, going up in excess of 2,000.

So communications is a critical function. In fact, communication with other organizations - the Manitoba Wildlife Federation and other groups that we have communication with - we want to improve our communications capacity, so that is being reviewed.

On the matter of personnel, we are looking at reviewing our process there for the manner in which we develop staff personnel, for example. We utilize staff

personnel to their fullest potential - what kinds of things are there that we could perhaps be adding to our staff training programs to improve the effectiveness of our personnel?

Those are activities that would emanate from this department, but if the member was looking for the specific planning that might take place with respect to projects that would reach the people in the field, whether they be in Parks or in Wildlife or in Forestry, that kind of planning would take place more at the branch level.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I always get a little nervous when this government talks about Communications because that has been . . . You know, when you consider the increase in staff, it was mentioned today during question period of approximately 6,000 people in the last few years as a matter of major concern, and I'd like to pursue that. When we talk of Communications, that's one area where this government has been - I suppose we'd call them apple polishers. They've been very busy getting people in place to try and do that kind of work for them.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that there are 6,000 more civil servants - I use that as a round figure - now than there were a few years ago and the Minister's indicated that there's a cut of 33 staff in his department, I'd like to first of all have him justify that, and I'd like to know in which area those staff were cut.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I will ask the staff to collate the figures for me here so that they can show me where those staff changes are. It should be pointed out that in the detailed Estimate material each of those is illustrated. It is not as though those figures have not been revealed. But if in fact the critic wanted us to give that information, it would require that we would go through each of these and identify them. But that information is displayed branch-by-branch where those reductions take place. It is not something that we've intended to conceal in any way.

I guess, just in terms of Communications, Mr. Chairman, I want to indicate to the member opposite that our view of Communications is not that it would be using the critic's term "apple polishing." I think, given the interest that the critic himself recognizes of the general population of Manitoba in the issues related to the Department of Natural Resources, there is the opportunity for each and every Manitoban to be in contact with the resources that are under the stewardship of the department almost on a daily basis. For that reason, it is important to be able to communicate openly to people and communicate well to them the kinds of things that we are doing.

I think an example that was pointed out recently, and I take some advice from the member opposite, in terms of communicating what we were doing with the water resources of this province, when we chose to deal with that issue it did in fact touch most of the people of the province. It excluded the City of Winnipeg for reasons I'm sure that we will get into later. Almost everyone was impacted by that. We do then have the competing users for the resources as well. The competition between consumptive and non-consumptive interest, and whenever we deal with a particular resource under the direction of this

Tuesday, 28 April, 1987

department, it is essential that we try to have those with different views, at least if they cannot accept the other view, come to understand it.

I think a good example of that would be the current situation that we're facing near The Pas in providing the sewage disposal facilities at Campers Cove. The facility is being provided in order to deal with the effluent from those who would use the area, so there's a particular use there. On the other hand, there is a very genuine concern and a legitimate concern in dealing with the disposition of that effluent, we not have an impact on what many people see as a pristine area in the province. So it is in that sense that we want to improve our communication capacity, Mr. Chairman, to have the people of the province generally better informed by our department as to why we undertake certain activities and what the impact of those activities will be, not only for the day-to-day users, but what will be the impact on future generations. So it is a communications improvement in that respect that we are trying to develop.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to indicate to the Minister, if he's concerned about the communication aspect of it, I want to endorse communication in a proper way with the proper people, because one thing that has not happened; for example, awhile ago, I met with the Whiteshell Mobile Home Association group and also met with one of the Minister's staff at that time. There was a prime example of where there was not proper communication, because they had a group, an organization there, the department totally disregarded the concerns or meeting with them. We finally got the meeting arranged, but those kind of things are the ones that I think are very important, that the public who is affected, consultation and communication is a thing, those words roll off very easy off this government's tongue, but it doesn't always work out that way. In fact, I feel very critical about the way they do some of those things.

Another good example of lack of good communication with the public is the elk ranching aspect of it. If they had had proper communication on that right from the start so that the public could become aware what is going on all the way down the line, the Minister would not have had that dilemma. It seemed almost a secret. I understand the Government House Leader came up just before Estimates started and indicated that the Order for Return I'd asked for on elk ranching will be tabled tomorrow. He has it and I said that was fine, because we'll deal with the elk ranching under the Wildlife section there.

There was another prime example of communication. The Minister wants to take this to heart. It's a matter of communicating with the people who have an interest in these things, and I criticize him because these kind of problems would not have developed with the Whiteshell Mobile Home Association or with the Wildlife Association who turned out so hostile on the elk ranching if there had been proper information brought forward all the time, right from scratch really, because it was an experimental game farm, elk farm that was set up and because there's always been some information not coming forward, that is why we had the dilemma. That's why we have had that problem.

So if the Minister talks of communication, I think if he wants to pursue it on that basis, I certainly endorse that kind of thing.

I think it is very important that the people who are affected have an input into it, not have the heavy hand of your bureaucracy push this thing through and then afterwards everybody is confused and doesn't know what it's all about.

I'd like to now ask the Minister under this section here, I'm sure the Minister must have been contacted by the Manitoba Conservation Council. The members on that I believe are Manitoba Forestry Association, Manitoba Wildlife Federation, Fort Whyte Centre, Wood Bison Foundation, Delta Waterfowl and Wetlands Research Station and Zoological Society of Manitoba. It's a group that's been formed, and I think the Minister must be aware of it, and I understand that there's a desire to request funding from government on that.

I'd like to know what the Minister's position is on that because he certainly should give me an indication, being on Treasury Board as well as being the Minister of this area, what his position is on that.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Yes, indeed, Mr. Chairman, we did have a representation from one of the member groups of that organization indicating their interest in having funding from government, but I want to point out that request for funding is not directed to this particular branch of government. They were hoping to access funds which come under another Minister's jurisdiction, so I don't think it would be appropriate for me, in the course of dealing with the Estimates of my department, to commit funds or make commentary about a commitment of funds in another department. The organizations that are represented within that group are very responsible and well-meaning people. Their projects are good. So certainly, in terms of the goals which they are pursuing, I have no difficulty with that at all.

There are, I should point out though, some of the members of the Fort Whyte Centre, for example, is an organization that we support directly; I think in the range of \$20,000 to \$30,000 a year. There are other organizations to which we make funds, but the specific group, the coalition, if you like, that the member opposite refers to is a new organization that was lobbying members for funding which falls under other departments.

Perhaps while I'm speaking, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the summary of staff changes is within the detailed Estimates on pages 8 to 11. So at a quick glance we could scan that and see where the staff changes come - Schedule 5. So if there are specific questions there, we could deal with those. I just point that out for the member.

I want to point out as well that there are some errors that were discovered subsequent to printing and we have a correction to distribute, but while we are distributing the correction, we'll make a correction to the spelling of "errata" on the sheets here.

And perhaps one other point just on the matter of Communications, Mr. Chairman, and I agree with the member opposite in terms of the need for good communication and I would not for a moment suggest that there are not examples that we could cite. In fact,

Tuesday, 28 April, 1987

I have cited some in this Chamber where our communications could have been more effective. I give, as an example, the question of Campers Cove Lagoon in The Pas as one. We can point to others. Perhaps, as I cited, we could have had a different approach with The Water Rights Act and the member makes reference to the question of elk ranching.

But in each of those, I don't think we can attribute it only to communication. I think it is a question of making an assessment. Could our communication be more effective recognizing that we have different user groups, different interest groups, to try and accommodate within any one of the resources that we are dealing with? We have a commitment to subsistence users. We have a commitment to those who would use the resources for economic activity. We have a commitment to those who would utilize the resources for recreational purposes and there are those who would utilize or perhaps not utilize the resources, those who have an interest, strictly a non-consumptive interest in our resources. So clearly there is a need to balance those interests and I think we should always be making an assessment as to whether or not our communication is sufficiently fine-tuned to convey the interests of all people.

But the one point that I would take exception to is any suggestion that anything is being withheld. I get no sense that we are withholding anything from any of the different interest groups. It is a matter just if we can be more effective. I think the very fact that we are undertaking some of these assessments indicates our own desire and our own interest in being more effective as communicators.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I want to come back to the Minister on the Manitoba Conservation Council. The Minister indicated that the request for funding has not come to his department, I fully appreciate that. But my understanding is that there is a request to government to the tune of \$500,000 for these worthwhile organizations here. But I'm asking the Minister, is he supportive of it? Is he supportive of the request? Because most certainly, even if he doesn't make the decision, but I would think that he'd be very concerned about lobbying for that kind of funding for this kind of an organization. I want to know how he stands on the matter.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, let me indicate again, as I did earlier and in my conversation with the individual who made the presentation to us, I have no difficulty with the goals of this particular organization. If it were just a matter of taking the money which had no other demands on it, I would say, yes, I could support it. But clearly what we are faced with is the allocation of scarce resource, if you like. There are competing users for that resource; the limited supply of money. I cannot address the question of support for this particular group without having full knowledge of what other demands there are on those funds. When all of these groups that are requesting funding are before me for the purposes of making a decision, then I could make an informed decision. But to make a comment, to commit myself to a position without knowing fully what other groups were competing for that funding, I think would be irresponsible of me.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I'm a little disappointed in the Minister's position. I thought that I would be able to get a commitment from him that he would be supporting this, and I see he's lobbying or being lobbied by the Minister responsible for some of the funding under this category here, and he's getting some advice.

What I'm asking the Minister, whether he is prepared to take and support it in principle and lobby for the \$500,000 request that is made? Certainly when you consider the organizations that are involved in this thing, what are the basic objectives of the conservation council? To receive and fairly disburse funds to eligible organizations and worthy projects; to share information on conservation matters; to work together on worthy projects. I would think that those kind of objectives are something that would fit right into the Minister's category when he talks of communication. Here he can work hand-in-hand by supporting it wholeheartedly and lobbying his colleagues as well to support this request.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I think what this points out is the need for me to be interested in not only in the issues of my department; there are clearly those issues that I have responsibility for and that I will move forward, and issues that I can speak to.

But to suggest, as the Member for Emerson perhaps is suggesting, that I can consider those requests which relate to natural resources in isolation of the other request, I think again I would point out is not responsible. I repeat, as I said earlier, that the objectives of the organization are laudable. I have no problem in supporting them in their objectives, but to say that I can support that in isolation of the other requests, I cannot do so. If the member opposite could outline for me at this time, perhaps if he is aware, what some of the other considerations are, and I expect that they're quite detailed, then I would be in a position. But in the absence of that information, I cannot make the kind of commitment that he is seeking.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I will hope to pursue that matter a little further and will probably be pursuing it in some other department as well. Maybe the Minister could be more specific and indicate the application, how will it be dealt with? Is this dealt through a specific department, or is that request going to be dealt with by Treasury Board, by Cabinet? I would just like to establish who is going to be making the decision? Obviously, the Minister says he can't make that decision in isolation. I want to know who is going to be responsible for ultimately making that decision?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I think that question would be more appropriately directed to the Minister who is responsible for the program which is being developed. I'm not in a position to make comments on the process.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't asking for the process. What I wanted to establish with the Minister is, who is going to make, which department, or who is ultimately going to make the decision as to whether there will be funding coming forward for this organization or not? Somebody has to. I'm not

Tuesday, 28 April, 1987

accepting this for one minute, that we're just going to pass the buck and say, well, somebody's going to make the decision. With the Minister being in Treasury Board, he can indicate to me who is going to make the decision on that funding.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, as I understood the presentation that was made to me in my office, the particular group was wanting to access some of the funding which comes from Lotteries, which is presently given to the umbrella organizations. They want to be part of that funding. So effectively what it means is they are asking to have allocated to them some of the resources that would otherwise be allocated to one of the existing groups. If there is some suggestion from the member opposite that I should be now committing myself to support this particular application and to take money from one of the other existing groups, and I'm sure that he would agree that there are many worthwhile groups there that are being funded through that source, I cannot make that commitment.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I had already in my mind established the fact that the Minister is not going to lobby extensively for this kind of a program. What I'm trying to establish is, which department, he mentions Lotteries money. Does that mean that the member sitting in the House here, is that where the application will be made, and will it be dealt with there or not? The Minister for Lotteries is in the House right now and she's been feeding him some advice. I wonder if we could maybe have that put on the record.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I think what would be appropriate is that the group should - I think they have already talked to the Minister responsible, the Minister responsible for Lotteries. I think they understand the process that is required. They are asking for a special allocation. They can apply under one of the existing umbrella organizations. I think if there is need for further clarification on that, rather than use the Minister of Natural Resources trying to provide it, I think the member opposite, or if there is concern on the part of that organization, we know the responsibility for that area rests with the Minister responsible for Lotteries.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: See, Mr. Minister, it isn't that hard. All we have to establish is who is responsible? That's what I asked because now I know that both yourself and myself can jointly lobby the Minister responsible for Lotteries on behalf of this group along with other people and we'll take it from there. I was just trying to establish who is actually going to be controlling the purse strings and where the money was supposed to come from. We've done that and I thank you for the information.

Moving on to a little different area here, I'd like to pursue some of these things on a general scale here because I think probably we can do that better here. I wonder if the Minister could indicate what his plan is in terms of the future of our Natural Resources, in terms of Wildlife and Fisheries.

What has happened is we've seen dramatic increases and licence fees for fishing, for hunting, for forestry.

There have been increases all over the place and there's been a reduction of services and programs; and I wonder if the Minister could maybe indicate to us what is his view, how does he view it, or is this Minister looking with keen interest in terms of having a plan in place, or are we just going to continue on this road toward increased costs and less services?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Let me say from the outset, Mr. Chairman, that I am looking forward, indeed with some anticipation and excitement, about the kinds of things that we plan to do within the department. Indeed, I'm pleased with some of the things that we have done within the past year.

Some very difficult decisions were made and I want to - before going on to the issues that we see as presenting really exciting opportunities - I want to touch briefly on the question of elk ranching because it seemed to be the suggestion on the part of the member opposite that it was an issue that was mishandled. I think it was as much of a problem for me, as the Minister, as it was for my critic, because clearly what we had were very good arguments on both sides of that issue.

There were people who saw an opportunity, were given a permit to ranch elk and they raised elk. They demonstrated that the elk could be raised in captivity; on the other hand, there was a group of people who had very legitimate concerns as well, as to whether this was an appropriate use of wildlife, to allocate a scarce resource to another kind of activity and, in fact, there were some who opposed it simply because they had non-consumptive interest. They did not see that it was appropriate to confine wildlife and have them raised in captivity.

So it is not, Mr. Chairman, as though we were avoiding a decision. It was a very difficult decision; solid arguments, sincere people on both sides of this issue, and it came to the point where I felt that it was important to have a decision and we moved forward with the decision, and the decision was made to terminate the experimental program in elk ranching. I would not like to think that this was seen by many people, as portrayed by the Member for Emerson, as a mishandling of the issue. I think what we did, we grappled with the issue in a very public way, I should say.

Several public meetings were held, meetings to which there were public notices given. We indicated, by way of the media, that these were taking place. We had meetings in Ashern; we had meetings in Neepawa; we had meetings in Swan River. The Member for Ste. Rose was present at the meeting in Swan River.

I must say that I am disappointed that the Member for Emerson couldn't find time in his busy schedule to attend one of the meetings, because it was very interesting and informative to be able to be part of that process in a very public way, to see people grappling with a very difficult issue; and that is: what is an appropriate allocation of this rich heritage of ours? And the decision was in this particular case to not proceed in that direction, but to make that resource available for more traditional uses for recreational purposes and the non-consumptive interest.

Just following from that, we have undertaken in the Duck Mountain, an area where I know the Member for Emerson has had the opportunity to enjoy sport hunting,

we have undertaken habitat enhancement programs. We have the Jumper Plains area, which I think is an area nearby the area that the Member for Emerson may have frequented; and then further back into the mountains we are undertaking habitat enhancement programs. We have a crew of people working during the winter months and there will be a controlled burn undertaken in the spring of the year - I don't know, we can check with the departmental staff later, it may already in fact have taken place, in an attempt to restore some of that habitat which is not as favourable at this point to the elk as it was on an earlier occasion.

We have undertaken as well, in terms of wildlife management, programs for moose management. I'm very pleased. I should say that we've been able to enter into moose management agreements in Game Area 8 where the population was down to a very low number. There's an agreement involving the different communities in the area of The Pas. I think four bands have signed, the Manitoba Wildlife Federation has signed, where the groups have agreed that there will not be any harvest of the game for a period of three years. Combined with that is again a program of habitat enhancement where there will be an improvement by way of controlled burn of some of the traditional areas east of The Pas where some of the highest concentrations of moose in Manitoba existed at one time.

We are in the process of dealing with a group to re-establish the musk ox herd in Manitoba as well. We are looking to acquire some musk oxen from the Territories and have these re-established in the area of Churchill where they were native to Manitoba at one time and the intent would be that if these could be established successfully that they would be part of the attraction to the area, where we already have a very significant tourist trade to the area for the viewing of polar bears and waterfowl; and to reintroduce the muskox into the area would add another dimension to that.

We are very pleased with what is happening in terms of water and soil conservation, despite the criticism that has been put forward, and some very legitimate questions from the members opposite with respect to water. I think by way of the new Water Rights Act we have demonstrated that we are wanting to manage this water supply, to ensure that it is available, not only in good quality but good quantity for future generations, because I would venture to say to you, as I've said to others, that it would be a greater impediment to development if there were not a supply of water available. Only last Friday I had the opportunity to talk to the mayor of Brandon and he had a concern about the pricing policy, but I think when it was indicated that if we did not move that there were some very grave risks, that he was more understanding of the issue.

If the members opposite think that this is an issue that is confined to Manitoba, it is not so. If you had the opportunity to read the Globe and Mail yesterday, I think, on the centre pages, on pages 9 and 10, a detailed report on some of the issues facing the world, in terms of the Bruntland (phonetic) Report that is being tabled in Ottawa today or tomorrow, some of the details were put out. Concerns about water quality, water shortages were one of the foremost items in that, again along with matters of soil conservation.

The conservation districts, I know the member opposite has indicated that he will be asking some further questions, and I'm sure the Member for Gladstone will be as well, the conservation districts have served as a very useful vehicle.

I met only yesterday with the Conservation Districts' Commission, in which we were talking about the long-term direction that the conservation districts should be moving. We think that the conservation districts are an excellent vehicle. We should have, I think, some change in focus. I believe that there has been too much a focus on using the conservation districts as vehicles for delivering capital works, rather than looking at these as vehicles for delivering programs, wherein those who are on the land adapt their activity to the land.

I must point out, in my view, that one of the shining examples of an operative conservative district is the Turtle Mountain Conservation District, where there is a diversity of programs within that conservation district which demonstrates the kind of leadership that I think is needed throughout the province.

Further, I want to point out that the Habitat Heritage Corporation, which was established last year, is an excellent example of working with groups to ensure that the habitat for different forms of wildlife is well preserved. We contribute approximately one-quarter of a million dollars a year to the Habitat Heritage Corporation and there's an independent board which then administers those funds and is free to acquire other funds through contributions from individuals; an indication, I think, of our willingness and our desire to work with individuals and organization and demonstrates our view that all of the responsibility or all that has to be undertaken, in terms of habitat preservation, need not come through government, but it can involve people at the community level. These projects, under the Habitat Heritage Corporation, have involved projects for big game animals as well as projects for fisheries.

We referenced the HELP program earlier in my opening remarks. Clearly, I think that is a very desirable initiative, wherein we have a joint effort between organizations at the provincial level and at the federal level, and this activity will be centered in the Shoal Lake area, where we will try to have people involved in the use of the natural habitat of the area, dedicated to its natural uses rather than having it converted to farm land.

So clearly, Mr. Chairman, I think that there are plenty of indicators that we, as a department, are forward looking, that we are moving forward. Parks is another example where we have dedicated parks. Only in the past year we had declared the Akudlik Marsh in the Churchill area.

We are looking at other areas throughout the province to preserve these for future generations, and I think, as well, just again to reference the use of the new technology in the area of mapping and surveying and adapting the new technology to forestry are clear indicators that we are not just dealing with today, but we are dealing with the concerns of future generations.

Perhaps the most graphic example of that, as I'm closing on the Forestry Branch, is the very considerable effort that we've put into reforestation which demonstrates that we are not concerned only with today; we are concerned with generations of the future.

Those trees will be harvested 40 and 80 years from now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Brandon West.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister how much money the government expects to raise in this fiscal year with its new water levy?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: It is probably going to be in the range of \$100,000, because it is projected to reach \$300,000 three years from now. So I would guess that \$100,000 would be a fairly accurate assessment of what we would gain in the first year from the levy for the licensing and for the charge on water.

MR. J. McCRAE: Will that money go into a fund that will grow over the years to be used for certain purposes, or where will that money be deposited once it's collected?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: The Member for Brandon West suggests that it's confiscated. It's not confiscated. It will flow into general revenue as other fees do. Whether it be fees for licences or the fees for harvesting trees, it goes into general revenue.

But just to make the member rest comfortably, I hope that what we have here is not a money grab. It should be pointed out, and we will be looking at this in more detail when we get into the Water Resources Branch, that we spend in excess of \$8 million a year on water-related issues. I believe our revenues - you know, when you look at the \$100,000, it is very small. Now there is an existing revenue base, I believe, of some \$400,000.00. So our revenue is very small relative to our expenditures. Again, let me point out as just one example, in the past two years where we spent approximately .75 million pumping water from the Assiniboine into the La Salle to meet water shortages. We take no delight in charging for the use of the resources, but is it unreasonable to ask that those who are using the resource make some contribution to the management of that resource as we do in the area of wildlife? We do it in forest. We charge people for the visit to the parks, most of them, not all of them. Some are exempt, but there is a charge there.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I really don't mind taxing luxuries like air conditioners for cars. I wouldn't even mind seeing certain films taxed pretty heavily in this province, Mr. Chairman, but water is something that people can't really do without for very long before they become dehydrated and die. I wonder if it is government policy to begin looking at other areas of essentials to begin taxing.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, the member for Brandon West makes my point, that water is a precious commodity, one which we cannot do without. If we do not have an adequate supply of water, we cannot have thriving communities, you cannot have growth and expansion. In fact, the natural vegetation cannot be there without an adequate supply of water.

Clearly, what we are doing by way of this approach is asking people to recognize that water is a scarce

commodity, water is a precious commodity, water is a commodity which we cannot do without. When the member raises the question of charges, let us understand clearly the magnitude of that charge, Mr. Chairman. The charge will vary from community to community because the charge escalates with an increasing volume in water. So if there is a large industrial base, and most of them would tend to be heavy users of water, the total charge on that system could be greater, and it would depend on how that cost was distributed.

But I asked for the figures for the community of Swan River, which really doesn't have an industrial base, and I was told that if the charge, as it is stipulated in the regulations was passed on to the users on a per capita basis, it would be 10 cents per person per year. So the charges are not onerous. In fact, I find it somewhat difficult to understand, some of my critics, the people who have criticized me for bringing this in, said the charge isn't high enough. If you were really serious about asking people to consider the management question of water, the consumption, you would be charging them more. I clearly am not interested in charging them more and I don't hear that the members opposite are saying that. But some people have said that that should be the case. But I think that too makes the point that this very small charge, and I'm not aware of a single community in which the charge, if it were passed on on a per capita basis, would exceed \$1 per person per year.

But given the attention that that has brought, I think it is clear that people up to this point maybe haven't considered it in the context that we want it considered. So given this kind of discussion I think it will raise people's awareness and I do not think that a charge of - using the example of Swan River again of 10 cents per person per year - is an onerous charge. And even aside from the magnitude of the charge, I do not think that it is as the member may be implying, unacceptable to charge for water, because clearly within his community of Brandon there is already a charge for water.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has said that some of his critics are suggesting that he charge more for this. And as I understand it, under the Water Rights Act, the government, by Order-in-Council puts this levy on, and in view of the advice the Minister has had, and in view of my concerns, is it the intention to increase that levy next year, the year after? Let's say within the next 20 years. Is it the Minister's intention not to increase that levy? Will he give us that commitment now?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I thank the Member for Brandon West for having the confidence that I will be here for 20 years to make that decision, Mr. Chairman.

But clearly, I think if you look at the record of what has happened with charges for other resource uses, using the charges for forestry for an example, the fee that is charged to those who would harvest the forest, has not grown astronomically. I think, if you look at the other charges, there have been increases in the charges, for example, the cottage rental, for park use, for hunting licences, for trappers' licences. But I don't

think that any one of those areas people would suggest that the government, the Department of Natural Resources, has acted irresponsibly and charged people an excessive amount.

Let me say to the Member for Brandon West, in concluding, that I was indicating that it was the advice that I was receiving from some of my critics that it should be higher. I do take some advice from my critics but it is not that piece of advice that I intend to take.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, before we talk about future reasonable increases or small increases or no increases or whatever, we should first decide whether the levy is right in the first place.

For all these years, for all the first 100-and-some years of our existence in this province, this province has not levied this charge for water. So I think we should decide here and now, before we talk about increases in the future, which the Minister hasn't seemed to . . . He certainly hasn't satisfied me about that; we should decide whether this is the right thing to do in the first place.

When we look at the record of his government when it comes to Autopac, somewhere between 9 percent and 30 percent this year; when it comes to hydro, I think we're somewhere around 10 percent this year, increase, when we add up the so-called one-time charge; I think virtually every single licence, every single fee imaginable under the jurisdiction of this government was increased to more or less significant degrees this year, and probably will every year, knowing the spending habits of this government.

So I don't have any particular confidence that in the future this will not be used as another tool, considering the fact that everyone has to use water - a tool to raise more revenue for a hungry and greedy government, whose spending policies are questionable at the very best, and disgraceful at the worst. We certainly know the disgraceful of the last few days. Mr. Chairman.

I'll speak now more specifically about the situation in Brandon, by asking first of the Minister how this levy will bring about conservation of water in the City of Winnipeg?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, the Member for Brandon West brings to the floor one of the dimensions of this discussion that I have found rather disturbing in this sense, that there seems to be some indication that this is unfair only because it doesn't apply in Winnipeg.

I want to indicate to the member I don't know if he is suggesting that I, as the Minister, should be recommending to my Cabinet colleagues that we should try to apply ourselves in an area where we have no jurisdiction. The body of water from which Winnipeg draws its supply is an international body of water. We have no jurisdiction over that body of water.

Is it because there is a difference between Brandon and other communities and Winnipeg? Does that make it wrong? I have a concern that there be good management of our water supply.

I've indicated in other forums, and I will indicate here, that if I am to be criticized, I would rather be criticized for having tried to ensure that there will be an adequate supply of water for future generations than to have a

generation from now people saying that it was that Minister responsible 10 years ago who didn't take appropriate action. We do not have sufficient supplies of water in Brandon or in Carman or Portage la Prairie, or wherever the community may be.

I am aware that there will be come criticism with this, but I am prepared to live with that criticism, given the kinds of projections there are. I am prepared to share in this House when we come to the section dealing with Water Resources. I have material which demonstrates the level of use of our existing water supplies, both the surface water supplies and the ground water supplies. We know full well that some of the water supplies from some of the streams are already fully allocated, given the level of use that there is today.

When we make projections to the year 2000, there are very clear concerns. I want to point out, as I have before as well, that we are not the only jurisdiction that has that charge. If it is wrong for us to implement the charge, that charge is in place in Saskatchewan right now at a level, I believe, which is twice the level that it is in Manitoba. There is also a charge in British Columbia, and again I draw the attention of the member to the Bruntland (phonetic) Report as some reading when he has some time, where there are grave concerns not only in Third World countries but indeed in many parts of Manitoba and in the United States, that we are facing crises with respect to water supply.

I frankly think that this is a reasonable, sensible approach to take to try to ensure that there is a supply of water for future generations. So the fact that it does not apply in Winnipeg is not a matter of discriminating against rural Manitoba. In fact, if we've done anything, we've indicated our concern for what is happening in the agricultural community, because we already exempt agricultural users. So we have discriminated in a way, if you like. There is no charge to agricultural users. There is no charge to domestic users, that is, anybody who draws less than 25,000 litres per day, which is 5,000 gallons per day, a considerable quantity of water. So we have made some of those exemptions already.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is not convincing me and he's certainly not convincing anyone else in this province about where he stands on water conservation.

The Minister of Labour from his seat suggests that the user should pay. This is a very comfortable kind of conversation for the Minister of Labour, whose constituents reside in the City of Winnipeg and won't have to pay this charge. Well, the citizens of Brandon pay for their water to the City of Brandon, and it's based on the amount of water they consume. Every gallon of water taken out of the system is charged to the people, and on that is placed a sewerage charge as well.- (Interjection)- The Minister of Labour, Mr. Chairman, is doing his best to obfuscate the issue by suggesting that the users in Winnipeg also pay for their water; of course they do.

We're talking about a new levy, which is levied on people outside Winnipeg. Mr. Chairman, the people in my area of the province perceive on a daily basis that this government, represented as it is mostly by members from the City of Winnipeg, has little time for their concerns. What we see today with this water levy is

another piece of evidence for the voters out there in rural Manitoba that this government is a city government and, coming from this Minister, coming as he does from where he does, it should be surprising. It's a letdown to the people of rural Manitoba that this Minister didn't stand up for rural Manitobans when it came to this issue. Obviously the idea isn't the Minister's, because I don't think he can make the idea stick that this levy is to bring about water conservation.

When he tells me that the money goes to general revenues, what assurance do we have that any of that money is used for research to bring about water conservation in the future? There is absolutely no way for the people of this province to be assured that this money will be used wisely. In view of the record of this government, there is every reason to believe otherwise, Mr. Chairman.

If you look at it from the point of view of a resident of Brandon - I remind the Minister that recently the Clean Environment Commission imposed upon the City of Brandon a \$20 million sewage upgrading responsibility. We don't know what part the province is going to pay in helping to pay for that \$20 million upgrade. This is a matter of serious concern. Perhaps, the Minister can respond to that part of my question.-(Interjection)- The Honourable Member for Inkster suggests it's about time the taxpayers of Brandon had to pay more for sewage upgrading. Well, all I ask the Member for Inkster, who sits so comfortably in a Winnipeg riding, is: Why doesn't the Clean Environment Commission impose the same kinds of standards on emissions from the City of Winnipeg? This is the point that really irks people in my area.

There's that aspect, but there is also the aspect that the cost of purification of water in Brandon is much higher than the cost of purification in Winnipeg. Did the Minister not know that when he imposed this on our community?

These matters all lead to the inevitable conclusion that rural Manitoba is left outside of the system once again. As a member of this Legislature, Mr. Chairman, it's a constant battle for me to remind this city government - I should call it a city government, because most of the members come from this part of the province. That's not to say that they shouldn't be representing their constituents in a responsible way, but why is it that, if the government wants to raise money like this, why doesn't it do it in some other way rather than picking only on residents outside the City of Winnipeg?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I guess up until this point, I have not found it necessary to respond to what the Member for Brandon West was saying, other than to react to the issue. But I must say that I find it objectionable to hear him saying that what this is is an issue of rural Manitoba versus urban Manitoba. If we are being polarized, we are being polarized by the cynical comments of the Member for Brandon West. That's where the polarization takes place. There is no need to have this issue portrayed as an issue between rural Manitoba and urban Manitoba. If indeed that is the case, I have not heard the other members from southwestern Manitoba who are rural members, wherein there is a very serious concern about future water

supply, say you should not be doing these kinds of things.

We have spent considerable sums of money, \$8.8 million - and when I refer to the \$8.8 million, not one cent of that has been spent within the city limits. Those are dollars from the general revenue of the Province of Manitoba that are spent for rural Manitoba. I don't apologize for that. In fact, I would like to be able to say that it is higher. But when we are making those expenditures in rural Manitoba, we don't suggest that what we are doing is neglecting the people of Winnipeg.

The member himself points out to the cost of purification of water in Brandon. Why do we have to purify water? Because we don't have adequate supplies of good clean drinking water. The supplies have been affected by the presence of man, by the activities of man, agriculture included in that, so those costs do have to be borne.

He talks about the cost of the sewage system. The province contributes to that. He, on the one hand, is saying that there is need for increased sewage capacity in Brandon, and is asking the province to fund that to some degree. Where will that funding come from, only from rural Manitoba? I would venture to say not. That will come from the general revenues of the province, wherein all of the people of the province contribute to that.

So I think it's shameful, Mr. Chairman, for the Member for Brandon West to suggest that what we have here is a polarization between rural Manitoba and urban Manitoba. That, I think, is despicable. What we are dealing with here is the need to ensure that there is a good clean supply of water for future generations.

To suggest on his part that the fee, which may be somewhere in the range of 50 cents to 80 cents per year in the City of Brandon, is somehow onerous, I think it would be far more a concern on his part that water that he already suggests needs purification will not be there in adequate supply or adequate quantity.

He suggests that you cannot manage water supply. Let me point out to the Member for Brandon West, that in Calgary where there is a charge for water but no metering, compare that to Edmonton where there's a charge for water but the water is metered, the consumption in Edmonton is one-half of what it is in Calgary.

So let him not say that the users of water will not respond to particular management approaches to water. They will respond. And let him keep in mind also that it is not just a question of water being drawn, because for the most part we use water, we pass it through, so excessive use of water also puts demands on that very sewage disposal system that he says is inadequate; further to which I want to add, that he is ignoring one dimension of this project.

Where we are talking on the one hand about charges for water, we are also talking about the manner in which people deal with water on the land, and the related issues of soil conservation and the costs of maintaining waterways in rural Manitoba.

So for the member to suggest that the \$8.8 million that we spend in rural Manitoba should somehow be considered in total isolation of the other considerations, the fact that that money comes from the general revenue of the province, shared by the people from the City of Winnipeg, the businesses of the City of Winnipeg, and

the people of rural Manitoba, Northern Manitoba and the businesses therein, I think is irresponsible.

MR. J. McCRAE: For a moment there, Mr. Chairman, I thought it was the Minister of Labour giving me my daily lecture.

I remind the Minister again, in case he wasn't listening, that Brandon users' homes and businesses are metered and they very well understand the cost of water and they don't need this extra levy.

I remind the Minister, as the mayor of Brandon I'm sure has done, that Winnipeg is exempt because its water comes from outside the province; it's international water.

Our mayor will remind this Minister that our water flows in from Saskatchewan, so the same point can be made for the City of Brandon; and the Minister talks about it being despicable of me to talk about polarization. Well, I'm talking about it. His government is the government that caused it, so who is more despicable? I'm talking about polarization, and it's as a result of the actions of this government that we have so much polarization in this province and it won't stop until we would see an end of this government in this province.

I just want to put on the record, Mr. Chairman, that I object on behalf of the citizens of the City of Brandon to this discriminatory tax, and this government will have to pay the price for that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I regret the fact that members are constrained sometime to enter into debate where they otherwise would be happy to sit back.

But when the Honourable Member for Brandon West puts on the record the kind of scurrilous comment about government programming in water supply, it is absolutely appalling.

Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Interruption can be done on a point of order. State the point of order, please?

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I am offended by the words used by the Minister of Labour, the word "scurrilous" is a word that offends me and I ask that he be asked to withdraw that word.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, when I complete my remarks, if there's any part in them the honourable member objects to, he'll have an opportunity to comment.

MR. J. McCRAE: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the same point of order.

MR. J. McCRAE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister was not speaking to the point of order, but getting on with his statements, and I would ask Your Honour to rule on my point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a practice and a tradition in this House that the word "scurrilous" is unparliamentary.

HON. A. MACKLING: Mr. Chairperson, I accept your ruling and I withdraw the use of that word and say that the remarks of the honourable member appall me. They are both ignorant and stupid, and I hope that he likes that description much better.

Mr. Chairperson, under the Schreyer Government, we initiated a water services program that's the envy of many in North America. Through the department, and the Estimates dealt with just prior to the Estimates of this department, the Minister of Agriculture supervised a program where the taxpayers of Manitoba provide a water services program to communities in rural Manitoba and individual farm sites.

All of the taxpayers in Winnipeg are happy and have been happy to contribute to that kind of funding, because we felt, as taxpayers of Manitoba, that rural residents should have the kind of standards and opportunities for clean water that we had in Winnipeg. So for the Honourable Member for Brandon to try and polarize water programs on the basis in which he did is scandalous.

Under the ministry for which I was responsible, we entered into agreements with the Federal Government; it wasn't all provincial money and municipal money. The Honourable Member for Emerson will tell you about pipelines to provide water for Altona and the Pembina triangle. The honourable member will tell the Honourable Member for Brandon that not only our government, NDP Governments, the previous Conservative Government did that sort of thing; and all the taxpayers of Manitoba, including the half of Manitobans that live in Winnipeg, didn't question the negotiating of that kind of agreement with Ottawa to provide a reasonable sharing of potable water for all Manitobans.

For the honourable member to try and politicize and suggest that there is partisan politics being played in respect to water conservation is just appalling to me, and I hope every member in this House, including the Member for Emerson, the critic, who should tell him something about water policy in Manitoba.

MR. J. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, the remarks of this foolish and incompetent and tired old Minister are reminiscent of the debate at the time of the MTX matter in this House. The words of the Minister of Labour will be given the same attention as they have been in the past.

I repeat my charge that this is a discriminatory tax upon rural Manitobans.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I want to point out to members of this Chamber, and particularly for the benefit of the Member for Brandon West, that the concerns for water shortages have not been an exclusive concern of the province.

We have been signatories to an agreement with the Federal Government. There has been a federal-provincial agreement for drought proofing in the Province of Manitoba; so there's a very legitimate and serious concern on different levels of government to ensure that there is a good supply of water for future generations. Those funds that are provided by the Federal Government and the Provincial Government come from general revenue. All taxpayers contribute to that.

So I think it is unfortunate that the Member for Brandon West would try to portray this as an issue of rural Manitoba pitted against the City of Winnipeg. We don't need that kind of an issue in Manitoba. The Member for Brandon West would thrive on that kind of an issue, but we don't need it, not only on matters of water resources, but in terms of management of all of the other resources that come under the jurisdiction of this department.

In most branches, in fact in all branches, the revenue is less than the expenditure for those branches, and that shortfall is made up by the taxpayers of the province.

I suppose that would then raise the question from the Member for Brandon West: Why would the taxpayers in the City of Winnipeg, through general revenue, make a contribution to the reforestation program in rural Manitoba and in Northern Manitoba? Do we raise that question?

Why would they make a contribution to habitat enhancement for fisheries in various parts of the province? That doesn't happen at this point to any great extent in the City of Winnipeg.

We could point to various issues of that sort. Suppose he should ask the Member for Minnedosa: How will the expenditure of money on the elk enhancement program in the Duck Mountain be of benefit to the people of Winnipeg? That is supported through general revenue by the taxpayers in Winnipeg.

But I think very few people in this province would be as narrow as the Member for Brandon West who would suggest that what we should be doing is pitting one group of people in the province against another. This is not that kind of an issue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MRS. C. OLESON: A few minutes ago the Minister, when he was being asked about the revenue that was being collected to do with The Water Rights Act, said that there would be \$100,000 this year, and I think he projected \$300,000 in four years or something.

Could the Minister tell us how much it's going to cost to administer and print the forms and all the things necessary to collect that tax?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Let me say at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that it is not a tax. If members are prepared to call this a tax, then I suppose the fee that is charged for those who would harvest trees would be a tax on trees. I suppose then the fee that we charged - and I know only in the last few days the Member for Emerson and the Member for Minnedosa bought licences to hunt a turkey and they were both successful. Should we then call that a turkey tax? I think not. Do we have a tax on wildlife? This is not a tax on water.

In terms of the total cost, there is undoubtedly a cost associated with it. In terms of staffing, we do not see, at this point, that we would have to take on additional staff. We can deal with these issues with the existing staff complement. I've got a projected figure here that it may cost some \$5,000 to have the forms printed. Now we have to remember that this would be the fees for the licensing, for the diversion of water,

and then the fees in those cases where it is applicable for the usage charge, approximately \$5,000.00.

MRS. C. OLESON: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry if I offended the Minister by calling it a tax. There are licences and there are fees, and they all amount to paying money which some people might consider a tax. So I'm really not too concerned about what you call it; you still have to pay it and it's in dollars.

The \$5,000 may very well be for forms, but I would suspect that when you're finished tallying up and attributing every cost to this, there would be a considerable amount much more than \$5,000.00.

Just on another subject while I'm on my feet, in this section there's a section on Communications. Does that section include all the pamphlets and brochures that are printed in connection with Parks and Recreation to do with the Natural Resources Department, and how much does that cost per year?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, just on the question of the cost of administering the program, we recognize that there is going to be a cost. There is a cost for administering the water program at this point, but I think we should recognize our concern was not to increase the revenues for the province.

So if the member is suggesting because there would be some additional administrative costs that somehow the program would have failed, the intent of the program was not, as some members opposite are suggesting, to grab money. The intent of the program was to draw to people's attention that we are dealing with a scarce resource - it's a resource that has to be managed - and we are confident that they will respond.

Let me point out that when we were entering into the program with the municipalities for the diversion of water from the Assiniboine to the LaSalle, there was no objection from the municipalities. The municipal people are aware that there are serious shortages of water.

In terms of Communications, the Member for Brandon West was apparently not present when we spoke of communications. He chooses to refer to apple polishers, that flies in the face of the comments the Member for Emerson made, which indicated that there was a very real purpose for communication; not to cast a particular image but to have people understand what it is that this particular department of government was doing. So I think that there should be some better line of communication between those individuals.

Now, in terms of Communications here, there is a component of communications that applies to all departments that is encompassed in this section; and I must say to the Member for Gladstone that when you spoke of the section that we were dealing with, we had been in the administrative and somehow we slipped very quickly over into Water Resources and now we're coming back to Administration.

Okay, so we're back into the Administration section. There will be a component of the cost that will apply to all departments, but then within each branch there is a communication cost as well, and we will deal with those branch-by-branch branches as well if you like, okay?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, we've just had a good example of a Minister who shoots off his mouth too much and gets himself into trouble. I thought we'd sort of agreed to some degree.

Mr. Chairman, I asked a little while ago, indicating what the policies and directions of the Minister were in terms of various, you know, what we're looking at; and he's the one that went and ran off at the mouth and had to bring up The Water Rights Act and the mayor of Brandon, and that just gave a beautiful opening for the Member for Brandon West that they can sock it to you, you know. So, invariably, sometimes by speaking too much, you get yourself into all kinds of trouble because the debate on The Water Rights Act, as far as I'm concerned, hasn't even started yet. The Member for Brandon West got his shot in there because the Minister opened the door for him.

What my question basically was before, and the Minister went on into a tirade about outbranching - we could cover that twice over, you see, and I don't want to do that either because I alluded to the odd question initially and never asked any further questions on it - and the Minister has to go off and do a 10-minute jaunt on outbranching. So I just caution the Minister; you know we could cover an awful lot of ground at the rate you're going then.

What I basically wanted to do, I raised the question and I want to raise it again -(Interjection)- I'll tell you something. I just want to caution the Minister; if he's getting advice from the person sitting beside him, he's in deep trouble. And now he's in trouble with both. If he gets advice from both those people, you know, this is going to be a long, long Session.

The question that I basically raised with the Minister before, under page 9 of his report, I should have alluded to it more specifically.

You have your Department of Natural Resources Annual Report, page 9, where it says, "Economics and Program Review." On the right hand side - "development of options for enhancing revenue and reducing costs within the department, including proposals for changes in fees." - that is the area that it basically was making reference to.

What is the Minister looking at? All the fees are increasing on a regular basis and I have information coming to that effect. I think I have an Order for Return in with the Minister in terms of all the fees that have been increased.

I found that kind of a comment very interesting; and that is why I asked what direction is the Minister taking this department? I mean if we're looking at enhancing revenue, I can just anticipate that we'll keep on jacking up the prices and giving less service for that. That's why I asked the Minister could he maybe just give us a bit of an idea as to what he sees under this section generally in terms of where are we going with the department.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Clearly, in terms of assessing the fees that we charge, and basically that is where our revenue comes from, within Natural Resources - the fees for harvesting the forests, the lease fees for Crown land, cottage-lot lease fees and so on - those fees are reviewed. They are compared to what happens in other jurisdictions. That is clearly what happens in the case

of licence fees. We're not an island unto ourselves in Manitoba. We have to be aware of what other jurisdictions are charging and I think most users of our resources are very reasonable people.

In fact, they are users of their own resource. The resource belongs to the people of the province. It is not the resource that belongs to the department. We are charged with the management of that resource, and given the funding that we anticipate that we can get, and given the programs that we want to deliver, we have to make some assessment of what kinds of fees are the users of the resource willing to pay to support their resource and their use of the resource.

So there is no magic formula in that, I have to say, to the Member for Emerson. There are judgments that are involved when you are making a comparison from other jurisdictions. You have to take into account what is happening with the cost of delivering services. If there is no increase in the fee charged to those who use it, then in fact proportionately they could be paying less.

I think it's clear that we are under constraints within the Department of Natural Resources and then I guess there are some options to be explored. Would people have us deliver fewer opportunities, for example, in recreation? That is an option; but we don't get a sense that is what people want, that we would have fewer options. We get a sense that there is a willingness on the part of the users of the resource to make a fair contribution, and I think if the member was to look at our fee structure, that it is indeed a fair fee structure for the use of that resource.

When the member suggests that there is a grab, that to me is somewhat unreasonable in that the revenues that we receive for the different fees from Natural Resources fall short. We will get an overall figure for you shortly as to how our revenues compare to a percentage of our total expenditure. So clearly there is not a revenue grab on the part of the department.

Furthermore, for whatever fees we charge, much, much more is contributed to those resources through the general revenues of the province. So a blanket statement would be that there is no specific formula for that.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, hunting licences have gone up and the service has gone down. There are less animals; the Minister is aware of that. Fishing licences have gone up, and we have articles all over the place that indicate our fishing industry is going down. There are less people fishing because of lack of product. And this is the area that I'm trying to raise with the Minister, that if he keeps on doing exactly what he's doing now where he jacks up the prices and less is available in terms of hunting and fishing, less people will buy again. So he'll jack it up again.

The argument that he uses that, you know, the department is not revenue bearing at this stage of the game, that it costs more to run the department than you get money in, that argument doesn't hold with me at all because, granted, you know, that could well be the case; but as I indicated in my opening remarks, when we have a 103 percent increase in revenues in this department and a 16 percent increase in expenditures, that is what the problem is. That's where it's all at.

And I am asking the Minister; if you want to raise the fees, I, for one, who enjoy hunting and fishing, and I know many others that do, am prepared to pay more for our licence. I'm prepared to do that, but I don't want that money to go into general revenue then. If there was a portion of that licence was set aside and said specifically for wildlife habitat or for fish stocking, people wouldn't mind, but the way it's going right now, it's going all backwards.

That's why I think it is a money grab, because you're raising the licence and you're giving less service for it. The same thing happens with cottage owners. Every year the fees have gone up - the fee goes up and the service goes down - and the Minister says, well, you know it's costing more money. Well, if you considered the other departments, this has never been a revenue-bearing department. It has never been. But I think we could enhance that by providing better services.

So I just want to indicate to the Minister; I think that is an area I don't know whether you've looked at. If you want to increase the fees, and I've talked to many people, all over the province. They're prepared to pay more for fishing licences, but they'd like to have a certain portion of it indicate, and indicate to the people of Manitoba and to the fishermen that a portion of that money, of the fee that they pay, will be used for stocking. We'll get into that as we get into the fish program and into wildlife.

But these are the kinds of things that the Minister could do. You know, he has no imagination.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I just want to indicate, Mr. Chairman, that it's interesting to hear the Member for Emerson say - and I believe it is true that most users of the resource are prepared to make a greater contribution to supporting the resource - but he says "providing." Providing what?

At this point, if we look at Natural Resources generally, 60 percent of the cost of operating the Department of Natural Resources is a subsidy from general revenue. So clearly, I'm not sure what the Member for Emerson is indicating when he has at other times accused the government of spending too much money and has been critical of government expenditure - and I'm not saying that there shouldn't be any questions raised; that is his role in Opposition - but at this point, I gather what he is saying is that we should be spending more. He is saying we should be spending more government - there should be a greater level of expenditure from general revenue in Natural Resources.

Now let me point out, 60 percent at this time is borne by the taxpayers of the province, not from the users of the resource. So when he speaks of the burden on the cottagers, the cottagers have an element of support from the general taxpayers. For those who enjoy wildlife, there is an element of support from the general taxpayers.

So, clearly, the users of the resource are still getting a good deal, and I am a user of the resource because I enjoy some of the same recreational opportunities that the Member for Emerson and the Member for Minnedosa enjoy, and I think that the fees that we charge are not excessive when we look at the opportunities that we have when we go out into the outdoors.

For example, is a \$6 licence fee for fishing unreasonable for a year's recreation? It will cost most users more to drive to the lake on the weekend or to go fishing than it will for their year's licence. So let the member not suggest that by way of the licence fees, there are excessive contributions toward the management of the resource. There is a shortfall which is borne by general revenue.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, when I listen to the Minister, first of all he takes things out of context and gets it all screwed around; and then the other thing is the impression I got, Mr. Chairman, from the Minister is he said that 60 percent of the cost in the Department of Natural Resources comes out of the general coffers; and obviously, the direction he is going he wants to make it a revenue-bearing department ultimately because he is certainly moving in that direction.

I never indicated that a \$6 fishing licence was too much. I indicated that the licences have all gone up and I said people are prepared to pay that. Providing that they would have some indication, they'd even be prepared to pay more; this is what I said. That's why I say the Minister is taking it out of context.

People will be prepared to pay more for certain licences provided they know what it's going for; that it's going to go for stocking. A fisherman that is a fisherman will be prepared to pay more money if he knows that it's going for stocking of fish. The same thing with the hunters; if they realize that a certain portion of that, you know, a wildlife certificate, for example, that this is going to go back into wildlife habitat, restoration of wildlife, then people don't mind that, enjoy that kind of thing. But this is the area that the Minister should be moving in as far as I am concerned.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Mr. Chairman, I think when the Member for Emerson indicated that I didn't have any imagination, I think that he should look at what he is saying.

He is of the view that it is only through the licensing that we can make a contribution to the management of the resource. I indicated only a short while ago that we have established a Habitat Heritage Corporation wherein the province, with general revenue - taxpayers contribute about a quarter of a million dollars a year - but that organization clearly will take contributions from individuals who want to contribute to the enhancement of a resource, and there are other organizations that are active.

I can point out that, as an example, on Friday night of this week there is a gathering, I think which is unique in Canada, of the Swan Valley Sport Fishermen's Association. What they are doing is they formed an association where they want to work cooperatively with the government in terms of enhancing the resource that is in their area, that they want to utilize. They have worked with the Habitat Heritage Corporation. They are holding a banquet on Friday night, the proceeds of which will go toward habitat enhancement.

So, clearly, there are vehicles available for members who want to make a contribution and, as the member has indicated, if there are those who would feel more comfortable, that they could contribute more directly

to the resource that they are concerned about, they need not go by way of the licence. There are many vehicles out there.

I'm sure the Member for Minnedosa is a supporter. He often wears the lapel in his button, which indicates that he's a support of Ducks Unlimited. There are agencies of that sort who would support habitat enhancement programs, programs which we work cooperatively with. There are joint efforts between the agencies, such as Ducks Unlimited and the province, where we want to do it.

So we would never suggest that it is only through the department, through the vehicle of licences, that the users of the resource can make a contribution. There are many, many opportunities. In fact, if some members had an interest in sport fisheries and they were interested in sending some kind of a contribution up to Swan River, I would be glad to deliver it for Friday night.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, the organizations that the Minister is making reference to, I agree, we have many good organizations of that nature. I was making reference to some of those when I was talking about that umbrella group here, at one stage of the game. These kinds of organizations are doing a lot of, actually the Minister's work, to some degree.

I would think that he should probably take the initiative in these things, instead of having them drag the government along in some of their programs; he should be working hand-in-hand with them and taking the initiative in these things. Instead, you create an unhealthy atmosphere in many cases because of what's happening. The attitude is not right, that's what bothers me.

The attitude of this Minister is not right. There should be a positive attitude in terms of working with these kinds of groups. He's so cautious, Mr. Chairman, this Minister is so cautious that he doesn't dare make a move, and he can't give you a straight answer very often in some of these things. He talks all around the mulberry bush and never gets to the point properly. Let's have some positive action from this Minister, in terms of the direction that you want to go.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Clearly, Mr. Chairman, I take it that the Habitat Heritage Corporation is only one example of our desire to work with these organizations, and the Member for Emerson suggests that we are being dragged along. I don't accept that, but I would never suggest for a moment that other groups would always be having to follow us as government. Clearly, we in government can take some leadership from outside organizations.

If what the Member for Emerson is suggesting that all of the responsibility is with us, as government, and only good ideas will flow from government, I would disagree. I would disagree. We rely very much, and I indicated in my opening statement, that we rely very much on consultation, cooperation with the general public and then with specific interest groups in the general public to manage the resource.

Clearly, we cannot do it on our own; and, in fact, I would suggest that it would be undesirable on the part of the government to suggest that we must do it on

our own. There is a very real and responsible role for people who are close to the resource, people who are near the landscape, to work with government in terms of managing those resources.

I think we have an excellent working relationship with the different groups, not only in sport associations, but if you look, for example, at the Manitoba Registered Trappers Association as another example of where we work cooperatively with the resource users. The Manitoba Forestry Association is an example where we work with people with an industry in that particular sector, so I think we have an excellent record of cooperating with, working with other groups who have an interest in the resources.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Minnedosa.

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

I think it's worthwhile putting on the record to indicate to the Minister that there are many in Minnedosa, in my particular area, that are concerned and very actively involved in the retention of our habitat and conservation of our wildlife for future generations.

I would like to mention to the Minister that my next-door neighbour and well-known sportsman in Minnedosa, the late Harry C. Stevenson, who was my across-the-street neighbour who I hunted with for many, many years, a few months back, on his second safari to Africa, he passed away very suddenly in Kenya. On the obituary and on the cards, bequests could be left to the Heritage Trust Foundation.

I don't know what funds were turned in there, but I know many, many of the citizens knew of his keen interest in sportsmanship, in hunting and in conservation of our wildlife. I'm sure there were substantial donations turned into that fund. Knowing Stevie so well, I know that he just wouldn't want to leave a donation to the government because he's observed it over the last number of years that the NDP have been in power, and I'm sure he wouldn't have trusted any donations to their use, but to leave it to the Heritage Trust Foundation, I'm sure he felt at that time and the family felt that those funds would be put to excellent use in the maintenance of our habitat and in wildfowl and animal conservation.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. If there was a question at the end, I missed it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, it was just a comment.

The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, the Minister seems to be a little sensitive when I'm critical about his lack of taking some initiative, but I feel very justified in making that criticism because, as we continue on in this particular area here, the issue I want to raise with the Minister, just as an example of his lack of taking the initiative, was last year when I raised the issue about the regional director. I had to go through great pains, dragging the Minister, kicking and screaming to the point where finally we had an investigation, and there was justification in those statements.

This Minister was being cute and sassy from time to time. I raised the question, and he was just trying

to brush it off and make light of it. If he had been forthright and honest at that stage of the game, he would have had a lot less problems, but he was trying to hide issues. This is what I say to this Minister, and I'm being very frank with him and that's why I'm suggesting that, in order for us to have a good working relationship here, he not try to be too cute about some of these things, that he gives us the answers that we want and then there won't be any problem.

I use that as an example, and I want to pursue that a little further now because, under this first section that we're under, we have the internal audit. Last year, when we raised the issue of the regional director, the Minister indicated that he was reviewing what had happened, and that he was going to establish some new working guidelines for some of the people. I know there have been a lot of changes. You know, I want to deal with the changes within the organization but I'd like to, first of all, have him comment on what happened with the internal audit and the changes that he has been hopefully making.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Before I go to that item specifically, just in reference to habitat projects again, particularly for the Member for Minnedosa, I want to reference the HELP program or the Habitat Enhancement Land Use Project that we are undertaking again as a cooperative effort in the Shoal Lake area. I think that is just an excellent program which will involve not only different organizations, but will involve landowners in terms of preservation of the habitat of the area and seeing some of the land returned to a use which is probably more suitable. I think there isn't any doubt -(Interjection)- Well, if the Member for Minnedosa is donating some land, we would be glad to take it off his hands, whether as Crown land or make it available to one of the many agencies that I'm sure would be delighted to have it, the Manitoba Wildlife Federation or others.

But I reference that only to point out that there are several approaches to dealing with habitat enhancement, habitat improvement: again, the HELP program is one, the Habitat Heritage Corporation is another, working with the Manitoba Wildlife Federation, working with Ducks Unlimited; some activities dealt with specifically by the department, the improvement on elk habitat. There are various approaches to this, so it's not as though there is just a single approach that need be used, and I would venture to say that I don't think that we've explored all possibilities yet.

Maybe the one point that I should mention is the role of the conservation districts in this. I think it's important to note that there have been some very fine efforts within some of the conservation districts to address the question of habitat as well. I think too often, within the conservation districts concept, it is thought that only the interests of agriculture are being served. But within those conservation districts, I think there is a trend developing and one that I would encourage and I would want our department to give some leadership to that we would look for further developments in that way. Within the conservation districts, there would be a view to the utilization of the resource, not only for agriculture but that there would be a concern for the wildlife habitat of the area, not only the wildlife on the land but the fisheries, the

waterfowl, the big game. All of those should be taken into account.

So through that, the conservation districts are a vehicle, and I would encourage the members here to look again at Turtle Mountain as a model because, within that model, there is a clear indication that the management activities that are taken on do address the concerns of habitat.

Now on the question raised by the Member for Emerson with respect to the internal audit, we did have the external audit, as the member has indicated. He did table documents in the Chamber which then led to the request to the Minister of Finance, who asked the Provincial Auditor's Department to review certain documents. Subsequent to that, we asked for an internal audit within the department to review the expense claims for the previous three years.

I should point out that the review dealt with the question of personal use of the vehicle, because initially there were some allegations about attendance, the expense claims, and then the personal use of vehicles. The audit report showed that, in terms of the attendance record, there were not any problems with the attendance record. The changes that were made, explanations were given and quite acceptable to the Provincial Auditor.

There was one minor adjustment on an expense claim where a person was in attendance at a function and claimed that expense, and that was not an appropriate claim in the eyes of the Auditor, and that was reimbursed. But then, in terms of the personal use of the vehicle, there were some questions raised and the Auditor recommended that a sum of money of \$900 be repaid. We then did an internal review and, on the basis of that internal review, requested that a sum of \$2,000, perhaps slightly more - I don't recall the exact figure - but a sum of \$2,000 was owing by that same individual for the personal use of vehicles. Now the problem arose out of some problems with the interpretation of the use of personal mileage and what constitutes personal mileage, given a certain relationship between a person's place of work, the person's residence and then other duties that individual has to take on. The review having taken place, the \$900 was earlier repaid by the individual, and an agreement has been made for the repayment of the \$2,000.00. I think it's in that range; I'm not sure of the exact figure, but in that range. So we feel that the matter has been addressed.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, in view of what happened - and I think the Minister indicated that there should possibly be changes made or a review of policy on that - can the Minister indicate whether there has been any change in policy, or has nothing changed since what happened there, if there are no stricter guidelines that people have to follow, that they know what the rules of the game are so that these kinds of things don't happen?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Just to explain the process, the guidelines for this are provided in the General Manual of Administration, and that applies to all departments of government. It is not generated by the Department of Natural Resources. There is a component of the item

that deals with personal use of vehicles which ties in with the collective agreement, and that is handled by the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission.

But we did undertake within the department, given the regulations that exist, we initiated correspondence to the Minister responsible for Government Services, initiated correspondence to the Minister responsible for the Civil Service Commission, indicating our concerns. Then internally, we sent out directives clarifying as best we could within the department, also drawing to people's attention the concern that we had for problems that could arise out of any misinterpretation.

So yes, we have undertaken initiatives within the department to see that this kind of a problem does not arise or to try to minimize it, because I don't think you can ensure that it will never arise. That is the role of the internal audit people, to monitor this kind of situation.

As well, we did initiate correspondence with the other two Ministers responsible to review that and see what could be done to perhaps remove or to word the policy in a way which would leave it less likely to misinterpretation.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Minister for that information. That was basically what I was trying to establish, whether there had been some tightening up - tightening up maybe is the wrong word - but to establish the proper guidelines so that there is no misunderstanding, because the Minister well knows that anybody driving a government vehicle is subject to a lot more criticism and is being watched a lot closer by the general public, because they figure they're playing around with taxpayers' money. So very often, it probably makes it a little tougher on civil servants who drive government vehicles, trucks, cars, etc., because if they do anything wrong, there is more attention paid to that.

So I think if the Minister has indicated that he has established proper guidelines and made everybody aware of it, then it's going to be a lot easier for staff involved, as well as everybody else. So they know what the guidelines are. That doesn't mean that somebody won't still break them from time to time maybe. I mean there is no assurance of that. I mean that would depend on the individual, but at least that there's a proper understanding because I think that was part of the problem that we had here. There was no proper outline as to what the responsibilities were.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I want to point out that part of the problem does arise out of perhaps the wording of the guidelines, but it arises primarily out of the wide range of circumstances that the government employees are faced with in the use of vehicles. For example, somebody may be living in one location, driving to work, and clearly the travelling to and from work, they do have to declare a certain amount as personal mileage. I don't know if that's generally understood that each person who is assigned a government vehicle does have to declare a portion of it for personal use.

But then if there is an assignment which is not a personal use and you are going by the grocery store

and you stop for a litre of milk, is that considered personal use or is it not? I think generally people would accept that that is not personal use because it did not entail any additional use of the vehicle.

But there are a lot of people, particularly the Department of Natural Resources, where we are dealing with people who are working in a variety of circumstances, working in a variety of locations, different demands on their time, different times of day, being called to different locations and some problems will arise.

It is not our feeling so much that people would intentionally misrepresent their claim, but I think, given the complexity of circumstances, that a judgment has to be made. Perhaps in some cases it is a misunderstanding or an error in judgment, but I don't feel that we do have any significant amount of intentional misrepresentation of the claims.

There is a continual review, there is a process for approval that we've drawn to people's attention that has to be followed, and there is an internal audit function wherein people monitor a certain number of these to ensure to the best of our ability to judge they are within the guidelines.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, within the last year, there have been quite a few changes, staff changes; and the director of Parks, I don't know which else, there have been major changes there.

Can the Minister indicate what those changes are and why these changes were necessary?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: I think I can recall most of the major changes just as I stand here, Mr. Chairman. Of course, the process started with the retirement of the Deputy Minister, Nick Carter. I referenced to his retirement in my opening comments. With his retirement, one of the Deputies, Dale Stewart, who is here with us, was moved into the position of Deputy Minister on an acting basis. That in turn created a vacancy at the Deputy Minister's level.

Rich Goulden, who had earlier been the director of Wildlife and during the past year had moved to the director of Parks, was asked to assume responsibility on an acting basis for the Assistant Deputy's position.

When Rich Goulden moved to that Acting Deputy's position, Claudia Engel was moved into the position of director of Parks on an acting basis.

I think basically that covers the major changes in that period of time with that sequence. Oh, yes, then Jim Potton, who was previously the director of Parks, was moved to the resource allocation where Gene Bossenmaier had retired.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Can the Minister indicate when some of these - I raise the question of the Deputy Minister - when that position would become a permanent position? At that time when there's a decision made on that basis, is that when the acting director of Parks is going to be established, as well as the other acting positions at the present time?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Yes, firstly, I would want to deal with them in that sequence that we would resolve the question of the acting status or the deputy, and, of

course, then the responsibility would rest with the deputy at that point to deal with the other positions. But it would be my hope that very shortly after we complete the Session, we would make a determination of whether those would continue in an acting capacity or whether we would undertake the competition and put them into a permanent status.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: Mr. Chairman, how would the position of director of Parks, for example, would there be competition for that or what is the process of establishing that?

HON. L. HARAPIAK: There will be a competition for that process.

MR. A. DRIEDGER: If there's a competition for that kind of position, I'm wondering why the Minister would not try and move on that basis sooner rather than later, especially with the Parks, because we're going into the summer where there is a lot of activity within the provincial parks, etc., and people sometimes maybe don't have the confidence in an acting director, as much as if we had a position filled. I'm wondering if there's any problem in that?

The Minister made reference that once the Acting Deputy Minister's position has been filled, then he would be working on filling the others, but if there's a competition for this thing, then it could proceed sooner.

HON. L. HARAPIAK: Clearly, Mr. Chairman, there are certain points in the year's cycle of the department and different branches of the department where you need a degree of continuity, and it is this particular point in the year when we were coming into developing the Budget and coming into the Estimates process and the programs having to be in place for the summer, that I think it was appropriate to have that continuity at this point; because in order to fill the position, there would have been a period of time required to advertise and to make the assessment and we would not have had the benefit of the input of that individual.

So I think, very frankly, that it was a responsible approach to take. We had a person in whom we had a great deal of confidence, a person that we felt could fulfill this in a very responsible way on an acting basis; and had that not been the case, if we had not had the confidence, it would not have been filled.

So it is a reflection of the confidence that we had in the individual that led us to post it in that way, and given the time of the year, we felt that it would be better to proceed and then, in what might be considered the off-season or certainly a point in the year where we were less concerned about developing and putting programs into place, we could deal with the competition.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOWNEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise to again point out to the public of Manitoba, and to the Assembly, again the incompetent handling by the Minister of Natural Resources and his department. The record speaks for itself.

We now see, and I'll speak for a minute as critic for Municipal Affairs, we've now seen the imposition of a

tax on municipalities, municipal corporations, industrial use of water, we're seeing taxation on wells drilled, or the licensing of wells, because the Minister said that we're going to be in a situation of shortage of water.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't see where the imposition of a tax or a licence or that type of thing will do anything to make more or less water. The water well, or the well, or the product that I think he hopes to produce, is revenue for the province and control over the lives of people by his department. That appears to be more what he hopes to bear.

I would ask the Minister as to whether or not he checked with the Union of Municipalities and the municipal corporations before the imposition of such a tax, or a user fee?

Mr. Chairman, goodness knows, the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba have enough burdens on their back without having now the Minister of Natural Resources climbing on as well. The Minister of Finance is heavy enough for the people of Manitoba without adding the Minister of Natural Resources, as well the Minister of Highways and his user fees, as well as all the other departments, whether it be Agriculture or what else.- (Interjection)- Yes, the Minister of Highways says somebody has to pay for it. But what are they paying for? They're paying for the incompetent mishandling of taxpayers' money through their Premier and Cabinet, Mr. Chairman, that's what they're paying for.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister's record - and I hope we get a chance to spend a little bit more time during the wildlife part of it - I have never in my life seen anyone with as much conviction as he has. On Thursday he was bound and bent he was going to introduce elk ranching in this country. By Monday he had taken a complete reversal of his position and it was no longer an important matter. In fact, he was going to a press conference to justify the complete reversal of his decision. Now is it any wonder how his little brother from The Pas says that I'm sucking air? Well, you know, I guess in the Cabinet in which he sits you have to have a little bit of brotherly protection because I'm sure there isn't any other kind.

But, Mr. Chairman, the record is quite clear. On this hand, I'm supportive of it; by another three or four days, I am completely opposed to it. Can you tell me what kind of direction his department is getting? What kind of signals? I mean there are those people within the bureaucracy, and good people, who said, ah ha, we've got the Minister sold on this program and he's going to Cabinet with it; and he goes to Cabinet and he gets it approved and everybody sits back and says, well, the decision's been made, we've got this accomplishment and can now proceed on a path. My goodness sakes, three or four days later those who were opposed to it are now cheering because the Minister has taken another position and he's reversed, where are we at? Where are we at? You know, without even dealing the pros and cons of the issue.

A MEMBER: Scott got to him.

MR. J. DOWNEY: The issue on this whole matter is the incompetence of the government and the Cabinet and the Minister. I mean, goodness sakes alive, what

have we got? What have we got? The people of Swan River certainly would, I'm sure, have expected more, even those people who thought that he might be able to represent them in a way in which they would want. I can assure you that the Minister previous was far more determined in the direction and could carry out a policy and would deliver it in the best interests in his perceived best interests, but he didn't. He didn't operate as if he was on some kind of a U-turn system that if somebody spooks you from one corner, you turn around and he spooks you from the other corner, you turn again. It's incredible, Mr. Chairman, it's incredible.

(Mr. Deputy Chairman, S. Ashton, in the Chair.)

And I say, I hope we have the opportunity when we get into the other parts of the department that apply, we want to know how many other areas the Minister is going to turn around. Is he going to change his mind on the imposition of the water taxes? That's a fair question I would think.

A MEMBER: You never know. Think he should?

MR. J. DOWNEY: Yes, I think he should. I think he shouldn't tax water in this province. I don't believe it's proper and right. I believe - and the next question is - is he going to tax the air over the land? Is he going to tax the air? Is that the next move? You know, I mean, where does it stop?

The biggest disappointment though is, and I'll conclude my remarks with this, the Minister does not know where it is at, Mr. Chairman, the Minister does not know . . . Oh, don't get anxious, I've got a couple of minutes yet. I've got a couple of minutes yet.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister has to be able to justify what he does. He has not been able to justify the policies which he's tried to carry out. He certainly does not act

with any consistency, and his brother is trying to defend him from the back bench here, and having the difficulty, Mr. Chairman, in trying to - (Interjection)-

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to debating with the Minister, and I'm sure that the people who are supposed to have some understanding of the direction the Minister is going will have a hard time in doing so.- (Interjection)- The Minister of Industry, Trade and Technology would be far better off if he was out working to help the sugar beet growers rather than sitting in here trying to make funny comments. But anyway, it's another one of the failures - he gave us a \$2 billion deficit in the province, now he's knocking our sugar beet industry out; now he's making some cheap side remarks in here when there's a good speech trying to be developed here.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hour is six o'clock, our time of adjournment.

Committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

The Committee of Supply adopted certain resolutions, reported same and asked leave to sit again.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER, C. Santos: The Member for Thompson.

MR. S. ASHTON: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Inkster, that the Report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hour being 6:00 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until tomorrow at 1:30 p.m. (Wednesday)