

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Monday, February 5, 1990.

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

### PRAYERS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

#### Racist Propaganda All-Party Task Force

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is to the Premier (Mr. Filmon). Mr. Speaker, racist propaganda which is being distributed in this province is a concern and of concern to all Members of this House. Unless some action is taken, this type of racist activity will in all likelihood regrettably continue.

Will the First Minister today establish an all-Party task force to hear from Manitobans about the proliferation of racist propaganda, a task force which will make recommendations as to how we can reverse this trend in the Province of Manitoba?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the Leader of the Opposition for that question. I can assure her of one thing. We will not end the spread of racist literature and representations by attempting to politicize the issue as she did last Friday.

Mr. Speaker, I can say to the Leader of the Opposition that I was offended by the manner in which she attempted to make political hay of the issue. I suggest that she ought to speak perhaps to her colleague, the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema), who took a far more responsible approach, and it was quoted in Sunday's newspaper as saying the Government can help only to an extent, setting certain moral standards. It should not be an issue of just one political Party, but of all Parties.

The message has to come from the 1.2 million Manitobans, not the way in which she attempted to do it, Mr. Speaker, or her friend and former vice-president of her Party, Wade Williams. The fact of the matter is—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. Order, please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** I very clearly stated in the House on Friday that I believed all Honourable Members of this House were concerned about racist propaganda. Why will the First Minister not, in the light of what I believe to be genuine concern from 57 Members, establish an all-Party task force so that we can come up with new programs and new initiatives to attack this head on?

**Mr. Filmon:** We have a very large job to do obviously, not only in this province, because in fact most of the materials and literature and representations that we have been seeing have been coming from outside this province, from places like Alberta, from places like British Columbia, Ontario and so on.

This is not a problem unique to Manitoba, contrary to what is being said this weekend again by - (interjection)- Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards), who is free to give his opinion and try and shout down Members on this side, will be given an opportunity by his Leader to speak at some point in time.

I suggest to you that this is an issue not merely of the Province of Manitoba, as has been suggested by various people over the weekend, it is an issue right across this country. It is an issue that all of us have a part in which to play to try and overcome.

Mr. Speaker, a good deal of it has to be in the field of education, where people have to learn more tolerance, more understanding, more opportunity of recognizing the strengths and the abilities of people whom we have to work together with in this great province and country of ours, putting together the various elements of our multicultural community, regardless of their background, regardless of their race, and trying to work co-operatively together. Education has a major role to play in that.

\* (1335)

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Manitoba is one of the most multicultural, if not the most multicultural, provinces in this great country of ours. Surely we can as a result of that mosaic take a leading role, be on the edge of attacking racism. Can the Premier provide the House with any reason why he would not be prepared to establish an all-Party task force on racism?

**Mr. Filmon:** Mr. Speaker, Manitoba is indeed a multicultural community. When I have spoken across this country, I have told people about the fact that projections say that in this nation of ours by the year 2000 that half of the people in this country will be of neither English nor French background, neither of the two founding nations. Manitoba is already there and has been there since early in the '80s. More than half of our people come from neither of those two so-called founding nation backgrounds. We know and understand the ways in which our country, our community can be enriched by people of all backgrounds.

I am prepared to consider any number of avenues of looking at how we might be a positive part of the solution to the problem of racism, the problem of discrimination that exists throughout this country of ours in communities everywhere across this country, not just in Manitoba.

I am prepared to listen to solutions being suggested by people, but I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition (Mrs. Carstairs) that the City of Winnipeg had a task force on racism some time ago and as a result of that established a Standing Committee on Race Relations that the mayor chaired. That standing committee has been in place for some time and has been examining

various avenues. They established a co-ordinator of race relations for the City of Winnipeg, but that has not been enough. There is more obviously that is yet to be done. Task forces alone are not the sole solution—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Mr. Speaker, the Premier is quite right when he says that task forces alone are not the final solution, but let me remind the Premier that not only are we a multicultural group where French and English will not be the original languages, but we are increasingly becoming a province of brown, black, white and yellow as well, and that is the issue that we have to address in racism.

### Human Rights Education Curriculum Development

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) tell the House at what stage the piloting program on human rights is within the school curriculum, and will it be ready for full implementation in all schools by September of 1990?

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education):** Mr. Speaker, not only is it a matter of implementing one program in the school on the topic that the Member speaks about, but indeed it is important that throughout our curriculum, starting right at the Kindergarten level right through Grade 12, that our curriculum reflects the nature of our province and the kinds of peoples that we have in our province. I have to indicate some of our curriculum material has been such that has been written long ago and, therefore, it did not reflect the kind of province that we have today in terms of the multicultural mix of the people we have in this province.

So it is not just a matter of putting in one program. It is a matter of taking a look at the curriculum that we have and ensuring that we address the issue at each and every step of the curriculum.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Well, Mr. Speaker, that Minister simply begs the question, and the question is, when will the curriculum that has been designed and is now being piloted be available in every single school in this province?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Speaker, I have to tell the Leader of the Opposition that the reason a course is piloted is so we can indeed evaluate every aspect of it to ensure that if there are changes required those changes are made prior to that course being taken off pilot and into the regular stream. That is presently the case with the program and, as soon as we have made those amendments to it, as soon as we have made the necessary changes to it, then that curriculum will be ready for full implementation in this province in each and every school.

\* (1340)

### Pilot Program Amendments

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Education tell me and tell this House what areas are subject to amendment under this pilot program?

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training):** Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition should know that I am not doing the piloting and the observations of that course on a personal basis. That is being done by staff. Staff will make those recommendations to me when they are ready. I have not seen those specific recommendations and in fact that course may be so good that it may require few amendments to it, but it is important that we go through the pilot phase in order to ascertain whether in fact that program is meeting the needs of Manitobans as it should. As soon as that program has been evaluated, we will be ready to implement it on a full-scale basis in this province.

### Villa Royale Project Minister's Meeting

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** Mr. Speaker, I have an important question in terms of our health care system, and I will address it to the Premier (Mr. Filmon) in view of the importance of it. It relates to the increasing desire on behalf of the disabled, or I should say really the physically challenged in our society, for greater independence and self-reliance, and it relates specifically to the Villa Royale project in Portage.

For the last month, the residents of that housing project have been attempting to ensure that they have the self-management that was promised to them by the Department of Health and the Department of Community Services. They have tried to get a meeting with the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). A month ago they sent a telegram to the Minister. They went down to the Minister of Health's office more than a week and a half ago. They are here today.

What I would like to ask the Premier is this: will the Premier undertake to have his Minister of Health or, even better, will the Premier himself agree to meet with those residents and deal with some very serious concerns they have raised about not only the future of the Villa Royale project but in terms of projects and programs for the physically challenged in Manitoba?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Member for Thompson would want to have the full information and response on that matter from the Minister of Health, so I will take that matter as notice on behalf of the Minister of Health and have it responded to as soon as he returns.

**Mr. Ashton:** I have taken the time to go to Portage to look at the facility. It is an important facility; it is a major project. They are having difficulties related to admitting of residents. There is an individual here today who has been denied admittance from the department although the residents have accepted him for admission.

I will ask the First Minister once again. In addition to taking the question as notice, will he either have his

Monday, February 5, 1990

Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) meet with those residents, something the Minister has not agreed to do even though he has been contacted for months now, or will perhaps the First Minister, if he does have the time, meet with those residents to discuss their very serious and legitimate concerns?

**Mr. Filmon:** Mr. Speaker, again the Member knows that prior to meeting with the group, individuals would want to be briefed on the matter, would want to know some of the background to the matter. In order to make it productive, in order to make it worthwhile for those residents, I would have to take the question as notice and ask the Minister of Health to look into the matter and then set up whatever meetings he believes are appropriate under the circumstances.

### **Villa Royale Project Welcome Home Program**

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** I have a further question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister responsible for Family Services (Mrs. Oleson). One of the very real concerns that the residents are asking is the commitment to the process of having individuals go back into the community and have an independent lifestyle, the Welcome Home Program. I would like to ask the Minister of Family Services what action she will take to ensure that their concerns are dealt with and that we do not see the Welcome Home Program, in this particular case a pilot project, a major project, set back because of bureaucratic roadblocks that are being put in front of their very important initiative.

**Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services):** My department too and our Government are interested in people being able to live as fully as possible in the community. I will have to take the question as notice as to that particular facility and find out from staff just what stage it is at.

### **Minister's Meeting**

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** I am a bit concerned that neither the Minister or the First Minister are aware of what is happening. Very real concerns have been asked about what is happening, whether there is a real commitment to independent, self-reliant living.

I will ask the Minister of Family Services once again, will she perhaps meet with the residents, because there are involvements from her department in this? If the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) will not meet, will she at least meet to discuss their concerns, ensure that there is no turning back the clock in terms of giving the physically challenged an independent and self-reliant lifestyle in the Province of Manitoba?

**Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services):** I do not recall that I have had a request from them prior to the Member's request for a meeting, but I would be happy to look into it and set up a meeting and also discuss the matter with the Minister of Health.

\* (1345)

### **North Portage Development Corp. Place Promenade Takeover**

**Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge):** My question is to the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme). The shareholders of the North Portage Development Corporation met on Friday night and made the decision to take over the operations of Place Promenade. Can the Minister tell us today whether or not he assumes responsibility for that decision?

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, first of all, I am glad the Member has asked that particular question. It is not a surprise. Not only did we meet on Friday, we met also all day yesterday. The developers, VAP, have agreed that the trust monies have been delivered to MHRC, thereby applied against the outstanding mortgage and reducing the principle by \$2 million, and the public exposure from \$18 million down to 16.5 million.

In addition, North of Portage has remedied the arrears of \$1.3 million, thereby preventing the option sale from taking place. Those are the actions over the weekend. That is what happened in court this morning and those are the results of the meeting on Friday and Sunday.

### **Property Appraisal**

**Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge):** Mr. Speaker, I presume that to mean that the Minister was there and does take responsibility for the decision. Before the decision was made and the shareholders were determining the costs and the benefits of each route available to them, was the Minister shown an appraisal of the value of the property that he has just taken over?

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** Mr. Speaker, in a meeting in the afternoon on the other side with CMHC and MHRC, CMHC assured us they did everything that was supposed to be done in regard to progress payments along the way, no different from any other project in Canada in 1986. We met with the lenders previous to that meeting, so I was quite aware of whatever went on and what process was taking place to assure that the project was completed and was completed at the authority of CMHC.

**Mr. Carr:** What the Minister has just told us is that he has authorized the assumption of \$20 million of debt without knowing how much the building is worth.

### **Monthly Shortfall**

**Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge):** I have a new question to the Minister, Mr. Speaker. Now that the North Portage Development Corporation has taken over the operations, it is critical to know how much of a shortfall there will be from one month to the next. Some estimates are from \$30,000.00. They are as high as \$50,000.00. Now that the Minister has taken part in that decision and is therefore responsible for it, could he inform the House exactly what the shortfall will be from month to month?

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** To suggest that CMHC, who are dealing in the market

situation across Canada, do not realize what that building is worth is irresponsible. We have a Member across the way who wants to look at building permits to establish the value. To heed a question to CMHC and MHRC to that fact is completely irresponsible. Let us get on the record that the CMHC authorized those expenditures and have credited this Minister that they took all the precautions like any other project across Canada. It would be different if you had an uncompleted project. The project is complete, it is there. CMHC has assured us that they took complete control of authorizing those expenditures to complete that building.

**Mr. Carr:** Mr. Speaker, we are fully aware that the CMHC, and therefore federal Ministers, are partially responsible for this debacle. The question to the Minister though is, how much has he committed himself to through this decision over the weekend? How much is the shortfall? What I am asking is to know what is the vacancy rate in the block now. What do the experts say it will be next year and the year after that, so the taxpayers of Manitoba will have some idea of just how much risk this Minister has taken on their behalf?

**Mr. Ducharme:** Mr. Speaker, we inherited this particular project from the previous Government. When we became part of this particular program, we had the responsibilities. First of all was to protect the \$18.5 million of MHRC money. Secondly, we had the responsibility of making sure no additional levels of Government would be put in this particular project. Both of those were accomplished by this particular Government, and that was the picture we were put in when we inherited this particular program.

### Profit Forecast

**Mr. James Carr (Fort Rouge):** When does the Minister anticipate that this failed project will turn the corner and make a profit?

\* (1350)

**Hon. Gerald Ducharme (Minister of Housing):** Well, Mr. Speaker, we were advised over the weekend from the North Portage board that it would probably take approximately three years to completely proceed with that. That would rely on what type of work-out arrangement will be made with MHRC and CMHC to make sure and offer the same type of work-out arrangements that maybe were considered by other particular parties.

You have to remember that North of Portage has a \$7.2 million investment in this particular property. Is that Member across the way suggesting that property should have been left on the market for \$16.5 million, thereby, putting at risk the \$29 million project?

### Racist Propaganda Manitoba Intercultural Council

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, since the start of this Session, January

8, all Parties have been raising the issue of distribution of material that most Manitobans would find offensive, at minimum, and racist. We all agree there must be something done, but the question is what should we as legislators do about it.

My question to the Premier is, has he initiated an urgent meeting with the Manitoba Intercultural Council to receive their advice of how best we can proceed with, what we all agree to be, a challenge to our moral leadership on this very, very important issue in the province?

**Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation):** I have been in contact with the Manitoba Intercultural Council on exactly these specific issues. I do know there is certain action they would like to see us take. We have legal advice that has indicated the direction we should be going. That information has been communicated to MIC.

I have been in correspondence and in contact with them just in the last couple of days with advice that they are giving us. Mr. Speaker, they know the decision that the Government has made. We are continuing to communicate on what future direction we should take.

### Racist Propaganda Legal Advice

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** My question then is to the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae). We know the advice of his department's prosecutors, the Crown Department, in terms of their opinion of the Criminal Code. Can the Minister advise us: (1) what is the legal advice of the Manitoba Intercultural Council in terms of action the Government should take; (2) is there any action that the Government is looking at in terms of the Manitoba Human Rights Code, a question we asked on January 8; and (3) has the Minister looked at The Defamation Act of Manitoba, Article 19—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please, order, please. The question has been put. The Honourable Minister of Justice.

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** All of the references the Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) has made to certain statutes have been made. Those references have been made, examinations have been made at the Human Rights Act, The Defamation Act and the Criminal Code of Canada. In fact, the Human Rights Code of Manitoba was amended substantially, rewritten by the previous Government of this province so that all of those statutes have been looked at by legal advisers in the Crown office.

### Defamation Act

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** The advice we are receiving informally—we do not have the resources of the Minister of Justice—says of course there should be some action under the Human Rights Act, and also the advice we are receiving is Article 19

of The Defamation Act, which deals with the publication of libelous material against race and religious creeds, is subject to potential libel under the Court of Queen's Bench.

I would ask the Minister of Justice, has his department looked at the option of joining with the Manitoba Intercultural Council in taking a defamation action to the Court of Queen's Bench so we can start penalizing potentially these distributors, so we will hit them in the pocketbook, so they will think twice before moving from other provinces into Manitoba?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** I think if the Honourable Member looks a little further into The Defamation Act, he will see that there is reference there also to actions or materials which might incite certain actions. That is where I believe The Defamation Act—or my advice is that The Defamation Act falls short in regard to this matter.

\* (1355)

I also ask the Honourable Member and all Honourable Members to consider what they have been pressing for. In the light of the advice that I have received, should the Government wish to proceed anyway, what kind of message would a judge finding against such a case, what message would it be should the Crown lose that case for those who might be interested in distributing the kind of garbage that we have been talking about? I just ask Honourable Members—(interjection)—now the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) is always quick with his response—

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

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

### Older Workers Labour Adjustment

**Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks):** Mr. Speaker, older workers have been and are continuing to experience great difficulties after being laid off from overtime lifelong jobs. With many years of productive work potential still ahead of them, they and their families often find themselves in great difficulty.

My question is to the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson). Will the Minister outline what new programs she has put in place to assist older workers in receiving training assistance to enable them to find adequate work?

**Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, the Department of Labour has been negotiating and has signed an agreement with the federal Government dealing with older workers. We are now in the process of negotiating the terms.

### Older Workers Labour Adjustment

**Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) evidently is

not quite sure that particular section is in her department.

I would like to then ask the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson) what submissions she has made with respect to this important issue, because what the Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond) has talked about is larger job closings. What submissions has the Minister of Family Services made with respect to older worker retraining to the joint Business Labour Task Force, which is headed by d'Aquino and Bob White? What submissions has her department made to them?

**Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services):** The Member has maybe not been informed but the program for older workers, the POWA agreement, has been transferred to the Department of Labour.

My department, as you will know, is the department that includes day care and youth programs. So we are mainly involved in Careerstart and those types of programs for young people and also programs for people on social assistance.

### Older Workers Program Co-ordination

**Mr. Mark Minenko (Seven Oaks):** I have a final supplementary question to the same Minister, Mr. Speaker. Two days ago I asked the Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Derkach) as to what programs does he have in place for older workers and he referred me and said that there is a program within the Department of Family Services.

I would like to ask her then, what system does she have in place to co-ordinate training for older workers, because the program that she was referring to only refers to major layoffs and not of any individual workers who find themselves without work?

**Hon. Gerrie Hammond (Minister of Labour):** Mr. Speaker, when workers are laid off, we deal with all adjustment committees. The Department of Labour has the POWA agreement which is for older workers, but we also do work with any worker, no matter what age, to see that they can get retraining and be put into jobs.

\* (1400)

### Free Trade Agreement Impact Rail Line Abandonment

**Mr. John Plozman (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, over the last two years at least this Government, this Party in Government, has blindly supported the free trade deal and marched blindly forward with the federal Conservative Government in the trade deal that was negotiated and now supported as well by the federal Liberal Party. Ron Lawless, the President of CN, now says that as a result of this trade deal CN will have to abandon 38 percent of its rail system in Canada, and CP says thousands more rail line miles will have to be abandoned as a result of that trade deal. I ask the Minister of Transportation if he now will admit that the trade deal will have a drastic negative impact on the

provision of rail transportation services to the regions of Manitoba, and will he now recommend that his Government reject its support for the trade deal as a result of that?

**Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation):** No, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Plozman:** So he keeps his head in the sand, Mr. Speaker, and rejects reality. He does not even admit that there are 38 percent losses as a result of the trade deal—

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

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

**Mr. Plozman:** I ask the Minister, if he will not reject the trade deal, will he at least determine and quantify and ask his officials to do that, determine the number of those miles of track that will be lost in Manitoba as a result of this trade deal and the cost that will be incurred by the Government of Manitoba to offset and provide transportation services in place of those lost by the trade deal in the rail transportation system?

**Mr. Albert Driedger:** Mr. Speaker, we are monitoring the impact of decisions by CN and CP on an ongoing basis. I have to indicate that when Mr. Lawless indicated that CN will be run as a business, not as a railway, that we have concerns and we are monitoring those. We are watching what is happening and we will raise the concerns on behalf of Manitobans as we feel that the concerns come forward that will impact Manitobans.

### Compensation

**Mr. John Plozman (Dauphin):** Mr. Speaker, this Minister knows very well there is going to be a drastic impact on the rail system in Manitoba. Will he now demand full compensation from the federal Government for those lost rail lines and rail service as a result of this trade deal that the Mulroney Government supported, that was signed by the Mulroney Government and supported by this Conservative Government and the federal Liberal Party?

**Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation):** Mr. Speaker, we have continually put forward the position of Manitoba in terms of the impact that any activity and decrease in employment and economic impact would have on Manitoba, and we are working on that ongoing basis. As with VIA Rail, as we put our position forward continuously at that stage of the game. We will continue to do that with CP and CN. We will try and make sure that the interests of Manitobans are preserved.

### Right-To-Farm Legislation Timetable

**Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) and relates to the whole question of right-to-farm

legislation. The Minister put out a discussion paper on farm practices in December of this year. Can the Minister indicate what plan he has in terms of public consultation on this and the timetable that he is looking for in terms of bringing forward a Bill?

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, we have held a number of discussions with farm organizations at this point in time in terms of drafting the discussion paper. That discussion paper has been distributed to 11 farm organizations or people that represent farmers in one capacity or another in the Province of Manitoba. We are prepared to distribute it to anybody who would request a copy of it and we are asking them for their input before any Bill is drafted. If it is feasible to draft a Bill, it will come in next Session.

### Animal Rights

**Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, in the discussion paper that has been released, it dwells primarily on such things as odour, noise and nuisance. Will the Minister be planning to include in that issues relating to animal rights and animal welfare, an issue that is causing some concern to farmers at the present time?

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, the intent of the farm practices Bill is to do with odours, noise and dust as the Member mentions. The animal rights aspect, we are in the process of discussing what we need to do in terms of being sure that we have the right standards that farmers are using. The various commodity groups, particularly the marketing boards, are very conscious of that because they use controlled and confined rearing situations for their birds and animals.

Yes, we are looking at it, but it is not going to be part of this Bill. At least at this point in time, it is not intended to. We were in discussion with organizations to have in place the kind of mechanisms to protect themselves from any adverse actions that the animal rights movement might bring upon us.

### Stubble and Peat Burning Government Strategy

**Mr. Laurie Evans (Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, I have a final supplementary then that is somewhat along the same line. Can the Minister indicate what action he has taken to date to reduce the likelihood of us having problems with straw and stubble burning in the fall of 1990 before that happens again?

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture):** Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned to the Member when we were in Estimates, I am very greatly concerned about the amount of straw burning that has occurred around the City of Winnipeg and the impact it has on citizens of the City of Winnipeg.

I have instructed my staff to go out and work with the farmers who do still use burning as a farming practice and ask them to explain all the benefits of not

burning. We are working one on one with those producers, through our various department staff, to attempt to convince them to minimize burning and use it only in the very extreme circumstance where it is needed as a management tool.

### **Manitoba Public Insurance Corp. General Insurance Divestiture**

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister responsible for the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation (Mr. Cummings). The Government has stated that it wishes to divest itself of the General Insurance Division of MPIC, even though jobs are at stake and policyholders may be hurt.

In the spirit of open Government, Mr. Speaker, will this Minister tell us what the process is. Is MPIC itself actively seeking buyers or is the Government simply waiting passively for interested buyers to come forward themselves?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister charged with the administration of The Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act):** Mr. Speaker, in the interests of open Government, as the Member indicated, I am quite prepared to indicate that we have now made contact with a number of companies, many of whom have expressed interest, and those negotiations are continuing.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Mr. Speaker, I understand that no firm bids have yet been received, and further that the Government is keeping its options open. Therefore, my question is, is this a serious option? That is, will the Government now admit that it is not in the public interest to divest itself of this important business and allow MPIC to carry on?

**Mr. Cummings:** Unfortunately, the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) chooses only to listen very often to the things that he wishes to hear and not what is actually being said. He constantly in Brandon references the fact that there will be some jobs that will be affected, but in fact there will be about a dozen or less jobs that will be affected in Brandon, not the number the Member continually refers to.

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

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

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Speaker, the Member is listening to rumours that he wishes to bring to the House that there has not been solid interest expressed. There has been solid interest expressed, and we are evaluating that interest on the basis of the policyholders, on the basis of the employees, and on the basis of what is best for the taxpayers of this province.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Mr. Speaker, there may be strong interest but the Minister did not indicate whether or not there were firm bids received.

The Government's consultants have suggested that the uncertainty surrounding this MPIC General Insurance future is hurting the business. Will the Minister tell us when a decision will be made one way or the other for the sake of MPIC and everyone involved? Exactly when, what is your timetable, when will a decision be made?

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

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

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Speaker, we have received some very solid interest from a number of companies in the general insurance area. The Member wants to know if I can give him a solid deadline. The evaluation of those interests on behalf of the concerns that I expressed a moment ago, in other words, meeting the criteria that we have set forward as a Government is what will consume the next short period of time and then we will be making a decision.

### **Child and Family Services Investigation**

**Ms. Avis Gray (Ellice):** My question is for the Minister of Family Services (Mrs. Oleson). A young boy was sentenced last week for the murder of two women. During the trial, concerns were expressed about the lack of intervention and follow-up by Child and Family Services. My question to the Minister is this: has she ordered an investigation of this situation?

**Hon. Charlotte Oleson (Minister of Family Services):** The department will be following up with this young boy as he serves his sentence to be sure that, if there are counselling services necessary, then they will be given to him.

\* (1410)

**Ms. Gray:** With a supplementary question to the Minister, my question to the Minister is this. Has she ordered an investigation of this situation in light of the serious concerns that have been expressed by a lack of intervention follow-up by Child and Family Services?

**Mrs. Oleson:** I am sorry I omitted that from my answer, but yes, I have asked staff for a follow-up and information on just exactly what took place, and to be sure that sort of thing does not happen again.

**Ms. Gray:** I have a final supplementary to the same Minister. Can the Minister indicate to us when we can expect that report, and can she also indicate to the House when we will be receiving the report about Child and Family Services in Thompson? She had promised the report since September in regard to a follow-up of cases in that area as well.

**Mrs. Oleson:** Those reports are internal documents to the department. I believe the one that she raised, the second issue she raised, is also before the Ombudsman and I have not had a report from him on that subject either.

### Lynn Lake Seminars Government Representative

**Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon):** This weekend the Member for Churchill (Mr. Cowan) and I attended a series of seminars and workshops in the Community of Lynn Lake to discuss with the community and to explore opportunities for development in the Community of Lynn Lake.

My question is to the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld). Can the Minister of Energy and Mines first tell the people of Lynn Lake and the people of Manitoba why no representative from the front bench was in Lynn Lake to discuss the future of a major mining community in northern Manitoba? Can the Minister explain why the Minister of Energy and Mines did not have a representative there to explore the—

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The question has been put.

**Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines):** I might tell the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) we did have a representative at Lynn Lake over the weekend. Mr. Speaker, I was invited to attend the weekend, but I had other commitments and was unable to attend. Let me say here and now that we encourage the kind of weekend seminar that was put on by the people of Lynn Lake. We encourage any community that takes the initiative to supplement a lost industry such as Lynn Lake has.

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

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

**Hon. James McCrae (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, in the Chamber today, we will continue consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Education and Training, and in Room 255 we will continue consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Natural Resources.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**MOTION presented.**

### MATTERS OF GRIEVANCE

**Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupert's Land):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity, as provided in the Rules, to grieve. I have many things to grieve about but let me say first that I would like to talk about the relationship of the aboriginal people with the Province of Manitoba and also indeed with the federal Government and Canadians as a whole.

I may explain to the people that we as aboriginal people have been here many, many years, centuries, thousands of years. We have welcomed many foreigners to the shores of this country for many years, hundreds

of years. We have welcomed Europeans, we have welcomed from different parts of the world. When we look at ourselves as aboriginal people to see where we are today and where we expect to go, we are still it seems in the dark ages with only conditions that you would find in the Third World countries.

I can mention many of the situations, the social conditions, that exist on the many reserves here in Manitoba and across the country. I can refer to many statistics that show an appalling situation that you would not tolerate anywhere in Canada but that is happening in many of the communities, in the back yards of many of the urban communities, many of the towns that are here in Manitoba and across Canada where poor housing conditions exist. We do not have any running water. We do not have any safe water supply for the community. We have high infant death rate. We have high hospital use. All those things that are associated with the poor conditions on the reserve. In terms of education, we have students who drop out of high school or do not complete high school, higher than anywhere in the country, higher than any other towns across this country.

Yet we try to find the cause or try to alleviate some of those problems and ask ourselves, where do we go from here? Why are these things continuing to exist on many of the reserves? Possibly one of the reasons why is that we do not have the resources to attack many of these concerns and situations. Yet we live in a very rich country in Canada, one of the richest countries in the world. Yet we as aboriginal people have Third World conditions in our back yard, conditions that are terrible and also cause human suffering in terms of the sickness and also the illness that we have due to our living conditions.

Many of the people at home live in crowded homes. I know when I was in Berens River last year it was brought to my attention that one of the houses there, 19 people were living in that one house. Yet people in those communities need to work with the Governments, with the provincial and the federal Governments, to address many of these concerns.

When we talk about the resources that we need, we always say that we signed the treaties with the federal Government, with the Queen, through the federal Government, and yet we have been at the short end of the stick so to speak. We have not had the resources to be able to build our communities, able to educate ourselves, able to provide the infrastructure, the housing that is needed in many of these communities. We have in a sense been denied the right to govern ourselves.

For many years, we were looked after by the Department of Indian Affairs. The Indian Act, an Act which has been detrimental to the Indian people in terms of advancing themselves, is basically a paternalistic document which binds or shackles the Indian people from governing themselves. The Minister of Indian Affairs has tremendous amounts of power to make decisions on behalf of Indian bands. For many years, we have been fighting to get out of the bureaucracy of the Indian Affairs. We were able to have more say in terms of our community at the community level.



\* (1420)

The person mentions, should we abolish the Indian Act? Certainly what we need to do there is a change of legislation that will reflect the needs of the people and also the ability of our Indian people to govern themselves. Certainly the Indian Act has been a source of attention, a source of misery, that contributed to the Indian people. I speak with experience, from personal experience mainly, the things that have happened on reserves and people as a result lost their rights as provided under the Indian Act.

As you know, we have been fighting or at least trying to get support from all the provinces to secure or at least to recognize self-government on many of the Indian reserves. We did advance a resolution at the Canadian Constitution to support Indian self-government on many of the Indian reserves. We did advance a resolution at the Canadian Constitution to support Indian self-government. Certainly many of the Conservatives across this country have not supported self-government. Tory administrations at the time like Saskatchewan, Alberta, B.C. did not support the quest for self-government to be recognized in the Canadian Constitution.

I feel that the Indian people, the aboriginal people in this country, have been shortchanged. The relationship they have had with the Canadian Government and the Canadian society is appalling. It is a national disgrace. Yet when we ask for mere things trying just to keep ourselves afloat and to survive, basically to survive, we are told oftentimes there are no resources available.

This summer we discussed the issue of education, which many of the aboriginal people believe is an aboriginal right. The federal Government in terms of dealing with education is trying to deal with the funding arrangements with many of the bands so that the Indian people can go to school. In dealing with the funding arrangements, what they have done is kept the funding in a sense limiting the amount of resources that students need. I know that there is a greater number of students going to university. At the time when Indian students are furthering their education, the Government seems to be at this time cutting back on education funding. The federal Government may say, well, we do not have the resources to provide unlimited funding. Yet we were assured in the treaty-making process that we would be guaranteed education, although the federal Government also states that education beyond Grade 12, the treaties did not mention university education so it was not part of the treaties.

When you look at the treaties, I believe they should be interpreted in modern terms to include education. It seems to me that a lot of times treaties are being interpreted or they are being interpreted against the Indian people, such as education was guaranteed under the treaties. Also if you look at the treaties there is no mention of the minerals or the oil that are available under the ground. It was never mentioned under the treaty. So in fact if you want to interpret it in such a way that would favour Indian people, be favoured in a way that only those items that are mentioned in the treaties would be recognized. Surely, the federal

Government has interpreted the treaties in a way that they recognized land and other things to include oil and minerals under the ground.

On the other hand, when we try to say that university is not covered in the treaties because at the time when the treaties were made there were not any universities. I know that under the treaties that schools were to be provided to the residents.

Also, the federal Government—there is a misunderstanding as to the funding that is made available to Indian people. A lot of people say we get free education. That is not true at all. What we have given up in exchange for that education is the land and resources that we gave up to the Canadian Government. Also I might add many other things which the federal Government has not lived up to, its obligations.

When the Canadian Government talks in terms of trying to cut back and also reducing the deficit at the expense of Indian people, that should not be part of the Government cutbacks or to reduce the deficit, because the taxpayers' money has to be looked after. In a sense, the federal Government would like to get the general public to recognize or assume that the taxpayers are being used to finance Indian education as such, but what we have said all the time is that we do not necessarily want the taxpayers to pay for our education. We have already paid our education through the land and resources that we have given up. All the resources and all the, I am sure, money made from those endeavours or the use of those resources, I am sure the Canadian Government has enough money to pay its treaty obligation to Indian people for education, for health, and other things that were promised to us as Indian people.

In terms of our relationship with the federal Government, it has been very dismal. We have just been living, merely living. We are the poorest of the poor. We do not have the resources to do many of the things we want to do.

If you look at the Canadian Constitution, as to where we are recognized, we are not even recognized as the founding people in this country. Yet, we were the ones that welcomed many of the people, the French and the English here in Manitoba, who welcomed many of the people through the Nelson River, through Churchill, Hudson Bay. The Lord Selkirk settlers, Chief Peguis helped them out. If Chief Peguis did not come to their aid, I think many of those settlers would have died.

Yet, we do not get any recognition of the contribution that we have made in this country. Only English and the French are recognized in the highest law of this land, the Canadian Constitution, the supreme law. We were originally left out in the first Constitution when the Constitution came across to this country, yet we fought back and tried to be part of the Canadian Constitution. I might say that the Minister of Justice at that time who neglected to leave out the aboriginal people to be recognized in the Constitution was Jean Chretien, the person who is seeking the federal Liberal leadership at this time. Also I might say that he was the one who brought in the 1969 White Paper policy paper to wipe out the special relationship of the Indian

people. As you know, there was a great outcry from the Indian leadership across this country.

I might say that it saddens me as to where do we get the recognition, what do we have to do to get recognized? For all the things that we gave up and all the things that we have done in this country, we are not afforded the recognition. We are constantly reminded on our reserves of the situation that we live in, and yet this country is a rich country.

\* (1430)

I always feel that the most well-off people should be the aboriginal people in this country. We are still living in the Middle Ages and the Dark Ages, something that Canada should not be proud of, something that they should try to make amendments in terms of outstanding issues that need to be done. One of course here in Manitoba is the outstanding treaty land entitlement, land that is still owed to the Indian people here in the Province of Manitoba. That issue still has to be resolved.

In terms of, as an aboriginal person, the kind of treatment that we receive from Governments and also the attitude that is apparent in society and causes us a lot of things to think about such as recently when we had action about the pins, about the posters and about the calendar, where is this all leading us to? I wonder whether we could live together in harmony with each other. My grandfather, my grandmother, taught me to respect everybody and to embrace your friends, strangers. As such, that has been demonstrated by aboriginal people throughout the centuries that we have had a relationship with Canada, not that we wanted to assume total domination, but to share our land, our resources, our knowledge, to survive in this country.

Canada is becoming a multicultural society, a mosaic of societies in this country, and yet we are being peppered by posters and sometimes remarks about certain people. If our objective is to live in harmony, to live in peace, there should be a greater understanding amongst all people. You like to treat people the way you like to be treated. Certainly, I have always tried to do my best from the teachings that I received from my people, is to help each - (interjection) - the Member says they never taught me to be NDP or Conservative or Liberal. I think what I represent with my people here is to educate sometimes, to bring forward things to the Legislature that Members here do not necessarily understand.

As you know I mentioned earlier that some time ago— I guess in my remarks about Indian people afforded the first time the right to vote. That would be about 30 years ago, I believe—

**An Honourable Member:** John Diefenbaker.

**Mr. Harper:** —John Diefenbaker, a Conservative Government at that time, gave them the right to vote. That is the last time I remember the Conservatives being progressive, so in that sense they need to move on some other issues.

Certainly at that time the Indian people were not aware of what rights they had before. Certainly more

and more, Indian people are becoming involved in politics, provincial and federal politics. I have tried to bring many of the issues in the Legislature within the domain of the province of my jurisdiction of Manitoba in terms of what it can do for aboriginal people we brought here.

We have here right now the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry that has been going on for some time and, hopefully, the report will be coming out some time this year. Many of the recommendations will be coming forward, and I hope that some of those recommendations will be acted upon by the Government. Some I would assume, would have to be looked at further, such as the Native justice system and some of the bands or tribal courts' ability to handle some of their own cases.

There is so much that I can grieve about that I can spend probably a considerable amount of time to talk about some of the things that I am very concerned about. I may focus rather here provincially in the North, northern Manitoba and the northern aboriginal people as to where are we going to go from here and what kind of programs, what kind of action that this Government is going to take.

In the North we had a lot of development taking place, the mining industry, the forest industry, the hydro development in the North, tourism, and yet we have not been a part of that development in the North. We have many of the communities in the North that have not developed and yet close to their towns we see mining taking place or hydro development and some of those developments have been detrimental to the lives of the aboriginal people, flooding of their lands, lost their traditional way of life. As a result of the developments, we have not really benefited from those developments. We wanted to be part of the developments, we wanted to be part of the mining, the forestry, the hydro development, to take part in the work there or maybe owning a share in some joint venture. Those opportunities are there, but we have not been able to take advantage of them. Maybe we did not have the resources to do so or the programs, or lack of programs, to be involved. Most of the communities are stagnant and yet many of those towns have a good standard of living with quality houses, schooling, hospitals, but many of the surrounding communities have none of those amenities.

\* (1440)

If you look at the issues that need to be looked at from the perspective of the aboriginal people, look at the Hydro. We have the Northern Flood that is still up in the air as to resolving many of the issues there, the land that needs to be exchanged for the reserve lands that were flooded. I believe that still has to be resolved, the Treaty Land Entitlement, land that is still outstanding.

As a matter of fact, when I was Minister of Northern Affairs I did sign an Order-in-Council accepting the Treaty Land Entitlement and unfortunately the federal Government never took seriously to it, never dealt with it and just left it there. As a consequence, the powers that be would not reactivate it, and it would probably have to take another form.

Monday, February 5, 1990

I know that negotiations were ongoing for many years, even at the time, in 1978 or '79, when I was Chief of the Red Sucker Lake Band we were negotiating with the provincial Government at that time to resolve the Treaty Land Entitlement issue, but we have not to this date been able to resolve it. I hope the present Minister of Northern Affairs would be able to resolve that issue, be able to come to grips with it. Hopefully the Indian people will be able to have their land that is still due to them.

It is unfortunate that the federal Government at that time did not or chose not to deal with it. If we had dealt with it, we would have had probably some developments by now, but we will have to wait and see how the Indian people are going to pursue this matter, whether they will demand or start negotiating again on, such as land quantum, which is already outdated by over 10 years or 15 years by now, and whether we have to reconsider that.

So those are a number of the issues that we have to resolve, the land issues. It will certainly have an impact when we deal with Conawapa and also the land line that needs to be built on the east side of Lake Winnipeg and, hopefully, many of the bands will take that opportunity to train people to take on jobs to bring new opportunities into our area.

As a matter of fact, the Constituency of Rupertsland has been, I guess, neglected by Governments. There has not been much development on the northeast side of Manitoba, whether it be highways or railways or mining or any major development. There has not been any of that happening in my area for many years and certainly there has not been, up to this date, and we want to bring opportunities and open up those opportunities so that people can acquire jobs. They can have a better lifestyle, and a better standard of life would certainly be enhanced by all the development that needs to take place in my area.

One of the areas that I mentioned earlier is about education being on treaty rights. I know the Members supported the resolution about aboriginal rights, that the Indian people needed a break and also they needed further funding arrangements so that they could have more students for the universities or other educational opportunities.

One of the areas that this provincial Government has an opportunity to address is in the area of fees, the bands that pay resident fees and non-resident fees to the school boards when they come in from the northern communities. I know we have many of the students coming into Teulon from northern Manitoba, from Garden Hill or Ste. Theresa Point, Wasagamack, all of them attend school in the Town of Teulon. Each one of them pays, I think maybe, about \$4,000 to go to school there and other students that come into the city also pay fees, maybe \$4,400, also people that go into Thompson pay \$4,900.00.

When people go to school in Cranberry Portage, to Frontier Collegiate there, they pay I believe over \$8,000, and if the provincial Government could somehow pay only 25 percent resident or non-resident fees they would be able to save the bands more money so that they

can send more students to school. Also many of these students, for instance, when they go to school in Teulon they live in residence and they still pay for board and room, so they are being charged a considerable amount of money. Those people who are supposedly running the boarding houses, some would pay taxes to the municipal Government for the services or for a business that they operate, so provincial Government has an opportunity to look at that.

We, as Indian people, do not have the luxury of paying an enormous amount of money. I know that people when they come from Thompson to the City of Winnipeg, some of the students only pay 25 percent of the cost.

So I would urge the provincial Government to take a look at that. It will be good in light of the actions taken by this Government in terms of excluding the Indian people from the municipal assessment. That provision existed for hundreds of years, 117 years I think in terms of that provision being there.

The Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) knows that we had undertaken many of the issues dealing with taxation like gasoline taxation, one the municipal, so many other issues. The Minister knows well where we were at on some of these issues. We did not go quite far into many of those issues.

In terms of the actions taken by this Government, especially in the North when we have lost the Northern Development Agreement, this Minister had an opportunity to negotiate for a new agreement. Unfortunately, that agreement has expired.

When we were in Government, we managed to extend agreements so we could provide opportunity for Native people and also for them to do an assessment and also provide recommendations as to what they would like to see happen.

Those recommendations have been forwarded to the federal Government already, and they have come up with probably a different plan. I know they are not going to extend the NDA, Northern Development Agreement. That agreement, I think, has provided for close to 275 million through the life of that agreement. We put in a lot of human development aspect of the programs that were undertaken.

Many of the northern and aboriginal people benefited from the human development sector of the NDA, Northern Development Agreement. We had Brandon University, the education program at Brandon University, teachers' education program. We have had northern nursing. We had social workers' programs that people were able to take advantage of. Many of the programs were delivered, not necessarily, in institutions but delivered in many of the home communities.

\* (1450)

Many of the people, as a result of the NDA coming to an end, the people in the North, the aboriginals, were wondering where the provincial Government are going to get the dollars to provide the services or provide the programs that were provided for under the Northern Development Agreement and also from the training programs. Where are they going to get the

money, because the money that the federal Government put in was cost-shared 60 percent?

The province, I would assume, would have lost that revenue now. We are wondering where the province is going to get the money to carry on many of the programs, many of the projects or programs that were ongoing.

We still have to hear from the present Government in terms of what it intends to do. We had Special ARDA that provided some assistance to the trappers and to the fishermen in those areas. I know that there is going to be some assistance provided to the trappers and hopefully fishermen too in terms of the forest fires that took place this summer. We are still wondering how they would appropriate or distribute the compensation to trappers.

In terms of—I was trying to bring out in my speech many of the things that we lack as aboriginal people and also many of the outstanding issues, how we have been treated, and certainly as a people in Canada, we still have a long way to go.

We need the support of the Governments, we need the support of the people, we need the support of the people here in the Chamber. We can start, and certainly we look forward to working with many of the people. Certainly the journey that we have taken so far as aboriginal people may have been only an inch, but we need to go on and be progressive in many things and, hopefully, attain many of the amenities and live equally with the Canadian people.

Certainly I look forward to many of the debates and discussions here in the House, and also I look forward to debating the Government. Hopefully, they will come across with some programs that will benefit the aboriginal people. Certainly we need their support to get our self-government, our treaty rights, recognized, also to be treated as an equal and also to be recognized in Canada as founders contributing in this country. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Reg Alcock (Opposition House Leader):** I too would like to rise on the matter of grievance. I am using this particular vehicle to raise some of these questions because of the absence of other forums, to raise some of the concerns that I would like to spend a few minutes putting on the record.

We have now—this is the second Session that we have sat in this House as a relatively new Party and a new Opposition. I think we have felt for some time that there are some serious problems with the way in which we do business in this House. There are some serious problems with the way the rules are structured and in the way in which they interfere with our ability to carry out the business which we are charged with.

Today, we are in day 118 of this Session. That is not the longest Session that we have ever had. In fact, the record I am told is some 165 days, which was established by the previous Government and the previous official Opposition '83-84. In '83-84, where we sat for 165 days out of 184 sittings and they even got into Speed-up.

(Mr. Neil Gaudry, Acting Speaker, in the Chair)

The problem is that the rules that we function within were written for a time when we had only two Parties in the House. We are now at a point where the 240 hours available for Estimates is going to run out and that is going to leave us in the position of having moved more quickly than we would have liked through some departments, of being unable to have held some of the Ministers to account in the way that we felt was appropriate. Also, that leaves us in the position of having some very important departments—Justice, Finance, Executive Council, Government Services—as yet unfinished.

Mr. Acting Speaker, when the current Government was the Opposition, they had 240 hours of Estimates time available to them. We have half that amount of time. We have 120 hours, give or take an hour or two. The third Party has an equal amount. I have reviewed some of the debates in Estimates from before, and I would say that we have made more efficient and more effective use of our 120 hours than the current Government did of their entire 240.

Nonetheless, we feel that it is irresponsible to simply rush through the remaining departments without taking the time to examine them with the same care that we have the others. So we will be working today to deal with some of the questions that remain in Education and, when the clock runs out, when those 240 hours run out, we are simply going to put forward this debate into the concurrence debate, and we have served notice to the Government that we are prepared to proceed in an orderly fashion through each one of the departments that have not been reviewed to ensure that each Estimate gets appropriate review.

We intend to go through slowly and carefully. We intend not to rush through any one of the departments. We will, and I serve notice to the Government House Leader that we will accommodate Ministers to the extent that we can and we will serve notice as to which Ministers that we wish to question, but we will follow the order that was agreed upon originally.

Mr. Acting Speaker, now that I am up, I would like to speak a little bit more about the Rules of this House because there is a problem. It is not just a problem with this Chamber. It is a problem that has been recognized across this country. A number of other Legislatures have undertaken reviews of their rules and their structures in order to update the way in which they do business. Some of the Legislatures such as Ontario, Newfoundland and B.C. have already passed extensive revisions to their Estimates. The Minister of Finance, who I realize is getting a little nervous as his Estimates are coming up, notes that no other Legislature has 240 hours. That may in fact be true, that is in fact true, except that a number of other Legislatures have other vehicles for dealing with their Estimates and they do have other ways of giving proper examination to the expenditures of Government. I mean, Mr. Acting Speaker, just to give you an idea of how ridiculous this is, we are currently in the process of examining Estimates of expenditure in a budget year that will be over in less than two months.

**An Honourable Member:** Now whose fault is that?

**Mr. Alcock:** Mr. Acting Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) asks whose fault that is. Well, I think the answer is very simple. He has been completely unable to get a budget before the people in a timely fashion. If he has been able to resolve those issues, I would ask him to do it now. We should be looking today at the Estimates for next year and the budget for next year so we can serve in a timely fashion some notice to the community of what the level of expenditures will be.

Mr. Acting Speaker, how can businesses plan when they do not know what the level of taxation will be next year? How can departments plan when they do not know what the level of support is that they will have?

Mr. Acting Speaker, we worked very hard during this Session to accommodate the wishes of the Government, and -(interjection)-

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gaudry):** Order, please; order, please.

\* (1500)

**Mr. Alcock:** Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker. Once we get the Estimates passed, it does not end there. We witnessed the process last year that I understand is common practice in this House that when we get to the eleventh hour, when we get to that point when the House is to close down, that we end up passing an enormous number of Bills very quickly. We sit late into the night to do the business of Government.

We received a great many concerns from members of the public who had wanted to speak to Bills, who had wanted to make presentations, who felt they were not given the respect due them and the time to properly prepare and properly present. I think we should avoid that this year, and I think in future we should avoid that practice. I think you make very poor law at three o'clock in the morning.

I again have informed the Government that we are not prepared to proceed with a last minute flurry to pass Bills. We have been moving Bills and indicating our willingness to pass Bills as quickly as possible so that we can in fact proceed to committee stage and review in order to see that people have an opportunity to comment on them and they are passed in an orderly fashion.

Mr. Acting Speaker, another area is Public Accounts. Once the Estimates are passed and once we have seen what the Government plans to do, we have an opportunity to then in Public Accounts look back, once they are out, and see what the Government has done and to look at whether or not the wishes of the Legislature were in fact carried out in the manner in which we determined when we passed those accounts.

There has been a considerable amount of work done by the Member for Niakwa (Mr. Herold Driedger), along with other Members of this House, supported by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) and the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), in looking at the processes which currently govern Public Accounts and looking at ways in which that process can be improved

to ensure true accountability, to ensure that, for example, Crown corporations come before legislative committees and that there is an opportunity to review them, to call the officers forward and to have some discussion with them about the protection of the money that they hold in trust for us.

Mr. Acting Speaker, what all of this comes down to I believe is that there is a very serious need to get together as a committee of this House representing all Parties of this House and to look at the rules that govern the way in which we do business in this House. I think many of our rules are outdated. I think—

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

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gaudry):** Order, please.

**Mr. Alcock:** I think that it is time to recognize a reality in this House. We are now a three-Party system. It is difficult to determine how quickly we will become a two-Party system, but the rules that we have right now were built for a two-Party House. That is simply no longer acceptable. I think we have got to move quickly to work in negotiation with the other two Parties to put forward a number of recommendations to Rules Committee to see if we cannot establish a system of doing business in this House that is more orderly and that does in fact address the needs of the Government to get timely review of their Estimates—any Government, not just the current Government—and gives the Opposition an opportunity to appropriately and thoroughly review the spending Estimates of this or any other Government.

The current Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has spoken at great length, as he spoke on budget debates in the past when he was in Opposition, about the most important thing that a Government does is allocate the money that it spends to tax people and provide a credible, accountable accounting to the public for the money that it has to spend.

I think, Mr. Acting Speaker, it is time that we do that. I would call upon the Government to consider calling the Rules Committee. I will end by simply serving notice that we are going to be continuing in concurrence to complete the departments that we have not had an opportunity to question. We are going to be going back, and we serve notice in a couple of ministries, particularly the Ministry of Health when we got nothing but filibuster and lack of response to questions.

We served notice then that we would go back to that department in concurrence, and we shall do that. There are two or three others, Mr. Acting Speaker, that we shall be going back to because it is time to serve notice to this Government that we are simply not going to stand by and watch them ram through whatever they choose to do without any accounting to the people of this province.

Mr. Acting Speaker, with that—

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

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Gaudry):** Can we have order, please?

**Monday, February 5, 1990**

---

**Mr. Alcock:** Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

I will just simply close by thanking you for the opportunity to speak and by saying that I do think it is extremely important that we find an opportunity to look very carefully and very thoroughly at the Rules of this House in the way that almost every other Legislature in this country is doing at the present time, and some of them are far ahead of us. Thank you.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Second Opposition House Leader):** Mr. Acting Speaker, I too would like to rise on my grievance and address a number of the points that have been raised today, because I think they are important points raised by the Liberal House Leader (Mr. Alcock).

I have had the opportunity to be a Member of this House for eight years. I remember the days when there were no limits on Estimates, as do many of the Members here this afternoon. I believe one year we went 360 hours in Estimates. That was a time—

**An Honourable Member:** Three hundred and sixty-two.

**Mr. Ashton:** —362, the exact figure, which the Member for Osborne (Mr. Alcock) has obviously researched. I remember when we waived Private Members' hour. We extended the sitting hours for that extra half an hour or an hour each day. That was going to get the Estimates completed timely and on schedule. Well, Mr. Acting Speaker, it never happened. I think one of the more sane decisions that was made a number of years ago was the decision to limit Estimates discussion to 240 hours.

At the time—and let us remember this is at a time when the Conservatives were in Opposition, the New Democratic Party was in Government—the trade-off on that was that there would be debate allowed on concurrence. The debate was put in specifically to deal with filibustering on behalf of the Government.

I tend to agree with the Liberal House Leader (Mr. Alcock) to the extent that I believe a number of Ministers have essentially filibustered their departments.

I took the time to go through Health Estimates. The Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) spent twice as much time in Estimates as I did. Let us remember the Minister of Health was supposed to be answering questions, was supposed to be giving answers on very detailed questions, which presumably the numbers should have been reversed.— (interjection)—

Well, the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) is rather sensitive, so he should be. From what I have heard of the Education Estimates, he seems to be filibustering his own Estimates as well —(interjection)— so should the Minister of Education be sensitive.

I will not necessarily go around the rest of the front benches of the Conservative Party. I would suggest that a statistical analysis, and I have done it, in terms of the Department of Health will show that a rather inordinate amount of time has been spent by Ministers in terms of their departments.

I will give an example of a Minister who I am critic for, who I believe did not do this. I hope that this does not get this particular Minister into any trouble, because believe you me I was fairly critical of the Minister on policy issues in committee.

The Minister of Labour (Mrs. Hammond), I thought, made a real effort—I hope I do not get the Minister of Labour in trouble with her own caucus—to give concise answers where answers could be given. I was not always in agreement with those answers, Mr. Acting Speaker, but I think if you were to do a statistical analysis once again, you would find in the Department of Labour that there was a fairly better balance in terms of that. I pick that because I am not rising to be strictly critical, tar everybody with the same brush. I believe that some Ministers have made that effort.

I believe that is what has contributed to the fact that we are almost out of time in terms of Estimates. But I will also say, I do have frustration in terms of critics, particularly when we had attempted to establish some time limits, and the Liberal Members know my concerns. I do not want to get into any specific examples of it, but I have expressed concern from that side in terms of the allocation of time resources. It is an unfortunate situation we find ourselves in at this current point in time.

I do agree with the Liberal House Leader (Mr. Alcock) to a certain extent that perhaps we can have improvements in our roles. I think personally the whole process of Estimates needs to be re-examined almost entirely. I believe it is not possible to give each department full consideration in one year with 240 hours worth of Estimates time. It is simply impossible to get into the detail of the budget process. There are other options that are available. The House of Commons has quite a different way in dealing with Estimates. Each other Legislature does. I should note that it is really a question of the efficiency of use of time, because other Legislatures spend far less time on Estimates than we do with the 240 hours. That is where I perhaps do have some disagreement with the Liberal House Leader in terms of his proposed resolution.

\* (1510)

I do not believe the resolution to what we are dealing with here is to have time added onto Estimates after the 240 hours is finished, either directly or indirectly, because that essentially is what would happen if we were to spend concurrence time on Estimates-related matters. I believe that is there as a safety valve if Governments do filibuster their own Estimates. As I have said, I believe that a number of Ministers did, not all Ministers. I am not laying that as a blanket accusation.

So I believe that there was a fair amount of overuse or excessive use by Ministers of the opportunity to not answer questions but to debate. I am quite willing to go through Department of Education in terms of their Estimates, Department of Health, as the Health Critic can pinpoint factually, both in terms of the questions and answers that were placed and given and also in terms of the time allocation.

**Monday, February 5, 1990**

I can say from our side in the New Democratic Party, yes, we are frustrated that we have not had the opportunity to deal with all the departments. I believe what we should be doing though is looking at perhaps a complete change. That is one area by the way in which, and I have discussed this with the Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae), I am not betraying any confidences. I have stated this in the Legislature, our caucus has been clear. We feel that there needs to be a meeting of the Rules Committee to deal with a whole series of issues, not just Estimates time but in terms of other items, for example, the use of non-political statements.

We have had discussions as House Leaders. I believe there is a model in Ottawa which will improve vastly on non-political statements, Member's statements as the process that is followed. I believe that process, for example, would allow backbenchers on the Government side as well as Opposition Members to have a far greater role in terms of the legislative process, allow them to raise constituency issues whether they be non-political or in fact political. That is one example. I believe there are other areas where we should be looking at reform in this province. We can follow once again the model of the House of Commons which has adopted a whole series of changes in terms of parliamentary form which in particular strengthened the role of committees of the Legislature.

There may be an alternative to the consideration of Estimates that we follow through with two simultaneous committees of the House during normal sitting hours. There may be another way, Mr. Acting Speaker, and that would be through the strengthening of the role of the standing committees to deal not only with Bills as they are referred or reports of Crown corporations, but perhaps to have those standing committees have a stronger mandate so that they could deal with analysis of departmental expenditures. I believe that would be advantageous. It would take some of the load off the Government, which I believe is in a very difficult position now.

I look at this and I do feel this is a point that they have raised legitimately because of the length of the Session. We are currently in February. We are going to be dealing with a situation where I do not believe the Government has its Estimates for the next year ready. I believe they are going to run into some difficulty in having those Estimates ready over the next period of time.

I think we have to look not just at reforms in terms of process, but a more fixed schedule, Mr. Acting Speaker, that I believe could combine moving away from summer sittings, which I do not believe have been very positive for this Legislature in the time that I have been here, perhaps having a fixed system in terms of other adjournments, the mid-term break we have moved to in the last number of years. We use to sit through that, which was a major inconvenience for people and I thought a poor use of time, the Christmas period. We are only talking about two months of the year perhaps or three at most which I feel have been used improperly in that way because for one thing in the summer not too many Manitobans will pay much attention to what

we do in the Legislature. I believe that we could use the other time.

We have traditionally sat for a minimum of around four months, upwards of six and seven, apart from the Session that the Liberal House Leader referred to which was obviously an unusual Session in 1982,'83 and '84. I believe that we could look at not just changes to the Rules, but some improvement in terms of the schedule of this Chamber. That will take give and take on both sides, I recognize that. Traditionally, Governments have the power to call Sessions and essentially Oppositions have the greatest influence but not the sole influence on when a Session ends.

I thought it was unfortunate for example in 1988 when the Government had given signals that it was calling the Session at one point in time and then changed that, brought the Session earlier. I do not believe it did anyone any good. I do not believe it resulted in an earlier finish date to the Session.- (interjection)-

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) said that he was ready to govern, Mr. Acting Speaker. That was not the indication that was given. I think we saw when we came in, as we have seen in this Session to a certain extent, that the Government was not that ready to govern. In this particular Session, we have seen Bills introduced by the Government right up until just recently. Just a matter of days ago, the Government was still bringing in Bills.

It may happen yet. We are in day 118, Mr. Acting Speaker. The average Session length has been approximately 90 days. We are already 28 days over the average Session length and the Government is still bringing in Bills. I do not believe they can really claim that they want to get out of this Session. I believe they are doing everything possible to extend it, which is their right. That is their right I suppose as a Government, but I do not think they can have it both ways.

I would point out by the way for the record that in terms of the passage of Bills that our caucus was approached in November. Not only did we agree to pass through the important finance Bills, as was agreed with the Minister of Finance. We set a timetable on a Bill that required more time for discussion and passed it through on January 12, The Municipal Assessment Act. Our caucus sent back a list of other Bills, in addition to a number of Bills that the Conservative Government asked for, asking that they be passed because they are important priorities, the environment -(interjection)-

While I appreciate the sentiments of the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns), the Minister of Natural Resources, a number of his Bills were the Bills that we had asked to be passed, a number we had been working on, a number of them are priorities areas I think for all Parties of the Legislature. But we are still sitting at this point today where a number of those Bills have not been dealt with at committee level. I would like to stress again that we asked for those Bills. We were not asked by the Government. We asked the Government. We asked in writing. My understanding is there was agreement and I believe that the Government should as a top priority move in terms of the passage of those particular Bills.

I would suggest, Mr. Acting Speaker, that perhaps one of the difficulties we are facing in this Session is I am not really sure what the Government's agenda is in terms of this particular Session. If they had an agenda of getting out of this Session, of continuing with work on the Estimates process, trying to move the Estimates forward, the budget forward, I do not believe they would have been as slow as they have been in terms of dealing with their legislative package.

It is not the Opposition that is responsible for Bills that are introduced at the 90th and the 100th and the 110th day. The Government has sole responsibility, has sole power, has sole discretion in terms of the introduction of Bills. They have chosen to introduce Bills even up to this point in time. So the bottom line, Mr. Acting Speaker, is whether we are dealing with Estimates and in fact we are running out of Estimates time, or if we are dealing with legislation. We are indeed still receiving Bills in that area, so we are still a long way off in terms of the passage of legislation. I believe some Bills on the Order Paper are going to be contentious, so we are going to have fairly lengthy debates on those.

**An Honourable Member:** Some could be contentious.

**Mr. Ashton:** The Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey) recognizes that some may be contentious. I am glad that he agrees with my comment. Final offer selection I assume is one of the ones on the list. We will hear a lot more about that over the next period of time, but I do believe that the Government has to a large extent gotten itself into that position and I recognize the sentiments of the Liberal House Leader (Mr. Alcock), the frustration of what is happening on the Estimates side and what is happening in terms of Bills, Mr. Acting Speaker, because I do believe that a number of Ministers of this Government have filibustered.

I do believe that in terms of legislation a number of Ministers have been slow in bringing in their legislative package. That is one of the reasons we have sat as long as we have. Now having said that, I also believe that within a three-Party system with a minority Government it should be expected that Sessions are going to run longer on average than when one has two Parties or one has a majority Government situation. It is logical, Mr. Acting Speaker, because this Chamber becomes far more important and I believe the Minister for Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) had the appropriate response to the Liberal House Leader in talking about the power of Government. The Liberal House Leader should have been around during the majority Government days, certainly the Sterling Lyon majority Government, which used its power in this Chamber to say the least. That is an understatement.

**An Honourable Member:** Judiciously.

**Mr. Ashton:** The Member says judiciously. I am sure some of my colleagues who were around in that era might say rather excessively, but in a majority Government situation you are essentially dealing with the fact that decisions that are made by the Government

Caucus are binding pretty well on the Legislature. They can bring those decisions in. The only power that an Opposition really has in a majority Government situation is to be able to block Bills, and it does. The Conservative Opposition did that with a number of Bills, either postponed their passage or prevented their passage. As the debate back and forth is always the extent to which that is obstruction, whether that should be their role as Opposition, that is a time-honoured tradition in the parliamentary system.

\* (1520)

What is happening in the minority Government situation, Mr. Acting Speaker, is that the Government does not have the power to do that. The Government requires the support of not just its own Members, but other Members of the Legislature. In essence, the Government needs the support of one other Party in this Chamber. That is why for example on one of the more contentious Bills of this Session, final offer selection, that it appears, unless the Liberals change their mind and I suppose they may very well do that—they are quite good at being on both sides of the issue and flip-flopping back and forth. But unless they do change their position, even though it is a very contentious issue for us and we are going to fight it, we are going to oppose it, there is not much we can do in the final analysis if the Liberals support the Conservatives.

On the other hand, Mr. Acting Speaker, if the Liberals show what I believe would be a sense of fairness on their part and decided to oppose the Government in what I believe is a very unwise course, they can block it. That is why the Legislature takes on a much - (interjection)- Well the Liberal Labour Critic asked what I am talking about. It is final offer selection.

It will be interesting to see whether the Liberal Critic who told the committee on Labour in terms of Estimates that the Liberal Critic speaks for the Liberal Caucus, we will be interested to see if that will remain the case or perhaps whether the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) himself will change his position on final offer selection, come to his senses, recognize that there is no reason for the Liberals to be supporting the Tories on this, and defeat the legislation.

Now I digress, Mr. Acting Speaker, but my point is that in a minority situation you end up with a different dynamic in this Legislature, and I believe that is what has led to a number of these situations we are dealing with.

That is why, by the way, I do believe a meeting of the Rules Committee is needed. I believe it is needed for a number of the items I have mentioned today. I believe it is needed in terms of dealing with the matter of privilege that was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, because we ran into once again what I would consider to be a major problem with the rules, a loophole in the rules. That is why we have the Rules Committee. That was why, Mr. Acting Speaker, a number of years ago for example we changed the rules not only in terms of Estimates' time. The power of an Opposition existed and was used in 1983 and



Monday, February 5, 1990

1984 to ring the bells for an unlimited amount of time, and thereby paralyze the functioning of the Legislature.

I think it is important to note that what happened was that not only the Government sat down and saw the difficulties of the rules, it was the Opposition as well. I do give particular credit to the former Opposition House Leader, Gerry Mercier, and I know the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) was also House Leader for a period of time as well. I believe that what we saw during that period was a recognition by the Opposition as well that there is a give and take, as was the case with the Government, and there were a number of compromises that were reached.

I believe we are in that situation now. I am not sure if the course of action that the Liberals are adopting, of simply treating concurrence time as Estimates time on an unlimited basis, is really what was intended by the rules and is really the solution.

I am not suggesting that we may not raise some issues in the concurrence debate, but I do not see it as an extension of Estimates. Concurrence was put there, yes, as a safety valve. It was put there at the specific request of the then Conservative Opposition to guard against filibustering.

As I said, I do believe there is filibustering, so there may be in fact room to use the concurrence debate, Mr. Acting Speaker, to raise that point and perhaps compensate for part of that. I do not believe that rules are best adopted in this sort of fashion.

I believe that in this particular case we should all sit down, and I would really urge the Government House Leader (Mr. McCrae), once he is finished concurring with his counterpart in the Liberal Caucus, whether he would in fact agree to a meeting of the Rules Committee, and agree to a meeting of the Rules Committee fairly soon. My intention, and I will say it right up front, is not to hijack the Rules Committee because I think that is one of the concerns of the Government Members. I believe in a minority situation, since they do not have a majority of the Members of the Rules Committee, they are concerned that somehow the combined strength of the Opposition will ram through a series of changes. I do not believe, for example, that we would be seeking to re-instate unlimited Estimates time or that we would seek to re-instate bell ringing—

**An Honourable Member:** You cannot trust them.

**Mr. Ashton:** Well, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) says he cannot trust the Members of the Opposition. I hope he would and I hope he will take, as is the parliamentary tradition, my word and the word of our caucus. I mean, he will have to talk to the Liberals in terms of their position, but I do not believe that the Rules of this House are to be adopted as a result of a grouping of Members, a majority, whether it be a Government majority or whether it be a combination of Government and Opposition Parties, a combination strictly of Opposition Parties.

Rules are best, in the truest parliamentary tradition, adopted as a result of consensus. That is what happened in 1983-84 when we changed the Rules. The

decision to move away from unlimited bell ringing, the decision to limit Estimates time and have the debate on concurrence was as a result of a prior agreement.

In many ways, the Rules Committee was a formality. That is what I am suggesting take place here, that the Government House Leader sit down with Opposition House Leaders sit down with Opposition House Leaders as a first step towards calling the Rules Committee.

I believe, and I have said it a moment ago and I believe the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) probably has a particular interest in this, I believe that is the way we should be dealing with the matter of privilege. We should be dealing with it in terms of changing the rules, in terms of what occurred in the—and I do not want to get into the details. We have had extensive discussions of what happened and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) remembers those discussions well, as does the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer) in terms of what happened with that committee. I do believe that is the way to deal with it and that is to try and resolve the rules committee.

Mr. Acting Speaker, in concluding, I did not agree totally with the Liberal House Leader in terms of what has happened. I have raised this with the Government House Leader. I believe a number of Ministers did filibuster their departments. I believe also critics have some response in this area. I believe the Liberal House Leader should be the first one to recognize that perhaps some of his critics have gone rather extensively.

Our bottom line is we want to see the House continue to function fairly smoothly. A Rules Committee is the best way of ensuring that. It is up to the Government, I believe, to take the initiative and deal with it. If they do not, I do believe it will see continuing problems of this type in upcoming years with Estimates. You will see continuing problems I believe in terms of length of Sessions. You will see continuing problems and lack of a calendar that leaves us to be having 118-day Sessions. They are all over the map in terms of different months of sitting. I do not believe that is in the best interests of all Members of this Legislature. My offer and our caucus' offer to the Government House Leader is to sit down to talk about it. Perhaps we cannot resolve some of the problems but I believe that is the first process towards some changes in the rules that would be very beneficial to this Legislature. Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker.

**QUESTION put, MOTION carried** and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Member for Minnedosa (Mr. Gilleshammer) in the Chair for Natural Resources, and the Member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry) in the Chair for Education and Training.

## CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY—NATURAL RESOURCES

**Mr. Chairman (Harold Gilleshammer):** Order, please. I call this section of the Committee of Supply to order to consider the Estimates of the Department of Natural Resources.

Monday, February 5, 1990

When we last sat, the committee had been considering Item 7. Forestry; 7.(a) Administration; 7.(a)(1) Salaries, \$210,400—the Honourable Member for Dauphin.

\* (1540)

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask the Minister where—I guess we can just talk about forestry in general at this point rather than line by line I would think in the brief time we have. I have some general questions about the situation with regard to the allocation of cutting rights in the Parkland area to Repap.

The one question first of all would be the softwood allocation. I believe 100,000 cubic metres of cut, allowable cut, was granted to Repap and I would ask the Minister if he can explain to the committee where that additional cutting authority was freed up from, because I recall that it was fully allocated, the softwood forests in the Duck Mountain and Parkland area. I am just wondering what was not allocated, where they managed to find this 100,000 cubic metres.

**Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources):** Mr. Chairman, I am advised that, contrary to the information that the former Minister puts on the table, in the main it was made up of previously uncommitted available allocation. It is also my understanding from the terms of the general agreement that any number of independent private quota holders are in the process of entering into working agreements with Repap that will in addition to that provide the necessary woods.

**Mr. Plohman:** Well, Mr. Chairman, the Deputy Minister will be quite familiar with our involvement in the issue of—I think it was Britcher's sawmill up at Roblin area between Grandview and Roblin, which ran out of timber supply of softwood. It was at that time that I received the information, and I do not wish to take out of context information I got from officials, but it was impossible to find him additional cutting rights supply unless he was to purchase from someone else who might want to sell it at whatever price, but the department was not in a position to allocate additional cutting rights as I understood it at that time.

Now there was a dispute involving two people, I believe brothers, the Stoski's, who had a considerable amount of cutting rights that might have been freed up at some point. Is this where this came from, or was this new cutting authority that somehow was made available, because I understood the sustainable annual cut was fully allocated for that area?

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Chairman, the Member for Dauphin is right and I am right. I suppose that should indicate well for the conclusion of these Estimates. The Member will appreciate that different operators have specific requirements within that softwood designation. Mr. Britcher's operation calls, or he requested, was for all spruce allocations, which was not available. The uncommitted softwoods that I refer to that were available and that largely were made available to Repap are in the pine category, which Mr. Britcher could have

had I suppose or could have asked for, but it is not what he has been asking for. Also in Mr. Britcher's operation, and I met with Mr. Britcher and I have empathy for his lifelong involvement in that part of Manitoba, but he runs a particular kind of operation. It was a question of diameter of wood available as well.

Also in the case of Mr. Britcher, as he has to acknowledge and does acknowledge, who in effect freely traded and sold some of his initial cutting rights that now makes it more difficult for us than to turn around and reissue in view of the demands in that area.

The core question that the Member asked about, the additional woods available to Repap were in a category of which there was uncommitted stock available. I am advised that it was essentially the difference between pine and spruce. Pine is acceptable to, or requested by Repap. It is in the spruce allocation that we are tight and in effect fully committed.

**Mr. Plohman:** To further clarify then, Mr. Britcher was made aware that this was available and was not interested in the pine allocations for his sawmill.

**Mr. Enns:** I am advised that Mr. Britcher has sufficient, or has pine—I will not speak for him—but he has pine, that was not his request. He was asking specifically for additional spruce.

**Mr. Plohman:** So far as the hardwood allocation, the cutting rights that were allocated, what is the total amount of cubic metres allocated in the Parkland? Is this the mountain forest region, as I recall? What total amount of exclusive cutting rights were allocated to Repap in hardwoods?

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Chairman, I will undertake to try to have the specific numbers for the Member later on in the course of the discussion on Estimates, but I am advised that most of the hardwood allocation to Repap consisted of the aspen that heretofore had not been allocated and uncommitted.

Quite frankly I think we in the province and as forestry managers view this as a positive benefit to our forestry, generally speaking, inasmuch as that we now have a major user that is prepared to use aspen in this way, which we have a considerable amount of in different parts of the province, but of all species probably one of the more underutilized, as the Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) will be only too well aware of.

**Mr. Plohman:** I just wanted to know whether all the annual allowable cut, or potential annual allowable cut for this, for hardwoods, for aspen, has been allocated to Repap in the area. Would that be correct?

**Mr. Enns:** I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that we have in the region the Honourable Member refers to about 450,000 cubic metres available in the annual allowable cut. Of this 450,000, some 200,000 cubic metres have been allocated to the Repap organization, which would indicate that there is a substantial amount, 40 percent to 50 percent or indeed somewhat more that remains uncommitted at this time.

Monday, February 5, 1990

**Mr. Plohman:** Is this—

**Mr. Enns:** Pardon me, I should correct that. A portion of that is currently committed to other private and independent operators and there would be some of that not committed at this point.

**Mr. Plohman:** Is this amount, this 450,000 available, is that all on Crown lands that we are talking about? This does not refer to any on private lands?

**Mr. Enns:** This is all on Crown land, Mr. Chairman, to the Honourable Member.

**Mr. Plohman:** Is Repap making any—do they have the latitude to make agreements with smaller operators to harvest this timber? If they do, does the Government have any say in the terms that they would have insofar as agreements or contracts with smaller operators to supply this annual allowable cut from the areas that they have been designated for and have authority for?

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Chairman, not having been party to the detailed discussions that led up to the agreement with Repap that the Honourable Member will be reminded occurred prior to my rejoining the ministry, but I know that in the main there is every indication and every effort made written into the agreement that, just as Manfor was the receiver of a significant number of private and independent operators, woodlot operators, throughout the province—as I might say is Abitibi-Price in the central-eastern portion of the province—the home for many private and independent woodcutters, we certainly have made it very clear that will continue.

\* (1550)

Quite frankly, a large measure of the success in my judgment will be Repap's ability to work harmoniously with the number of private and independent woodcutters that also co-exist in that area.

**Mr. Plohman:** Mr. Chairman, the only difference, and I just want to confirm this is that I would assume that, out of the 450,000 cubic metres, the 200,000 allocated to Repap is the most accessible and therefore that which is cost-effective for Repap to use, or what they would call in their area or accessible to them. Since it has been allocated, the cutting rights have been allocated to that company, they have to kind of sublet their authority to smaller operators rather than smaller operators having that agreement with the Government for those cutting rights. So we have an intermediary involved now, a middleman involved.

I am asking the Minister whether, in fact, he is going to have any say in his department in the kinds of terms that will be set by that intermediary with these smaller operators to harvest the annual allowable cut that has been allocated to Repap, so they are not in a position to pit one against the other and take advantage of the smaller operators and get them working for them for next to nothing?

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Chairman, I would assume that the department, and this branch in particular, will continue

to be an avenue for those involved in the forestry operation in Manitoba to come to, from time to time, to seek advice, seek help.

The company that has inherited, if you like, or taken over the Manfor operations has taken over with it a 15-16 year tradition of working precisely in this matter with a number of independent and private quota holders. It also has a history of working with other organizations such as the Channel Area Loggers and the Moose Lake Loggers who certainly will be given every assistance from this Minister, from this Department, to continue what I hope to be even a more successful operation than in the past.

We will be available to resolve disputes. Should they become of such a serious nature, certainly I would expect my forestry officials to be bringing that to my attention so that Government, if you like, will be there to intercede on behalf of fair practice in our forestries.

**Mr. Plohman:** Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with a couple of different things that have changed. Manfor was a Crown corporation. Therefore, Government policy could be brought to bear in terms of fairness and if there were disputes or problems insofar as their treatment.

Secondly, we are talking about a whole new area here, moving into the Parkland, so it is not tradition that it has been established with Manfor. I understand the area is extended. We do have it here, we have gone through this in the other committees substantially south and therefore and we are dealing with a whole new resource, the hardwood resource there.

As I asked before, and I just wanted to specifically ask, whether the Government has the right to intervene insofar as setting the terms of any agreements between the smaller operators that may be subcontracted by Repap. First of all, if they can set the terms, if the Government can set any terms or intervene in any way. If the smaller operators have a dispute, can they appeal to the Government and what authority would the Minister then have if this is not in the agreement? I appreciate that the Minister was not involved but his department was.

As a former Minister of Natural Resources, I was very concerned that the operators in that area, and I went out in February of 1988 to public meetings in that area and I promised those people at that time that their interests—and there was substantial attendance at some of the meetings in the Parkland area—would be protected and they would be consulted before any deal with signed for the sale of Manfor. I just want to find out whether in fact that was the case, whether there was some protection for those operators so that they will not be taken advantage of by Repap which they could do.

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Chairman, I would have to have before me the details of the actual purchase agreement, if you like, that was signed between the Government and the Repap organization to cite specific sections of the agreement which I am sure are there, that emphasize the ongoing relationship that Manfor had with private

Monday, February 5, 1990

and independent wood operators that is being transferred and carried on with Repap.

Allow me though to make this observation. A recent event happened within this very subject area that we are discussing several weeks ago that, aside from very small notice on page 43 of the local media, I think bears on this subject. It was my understanding that a month ago or three or four weeks ago, the union, International Woodcutters' Union, representing the several hundred, 400 or 500 woodcutters operators, workers at Repap, endorsed by a vote of 97 percent a three-year contract with Repap.

I question whether in the recent history of this province or indeed in too many other parts of this country has organized labour provided such a strong endorsement to a company in recent memory, which seems to indicate to me and ought to indicate to all Members of the committee that the Repap people, the Repap organization is dealing fairly and honestly and obviously as generously as they can in a highly competitive industry to have received that kind of endorsement from their workers.

This is a new company coming into Manitoba. There certainly could be grounds for some concern on the part of the many employees that have gainful employment at The Pas. They may have had second doubts about who their new owners were, but it seems to me that an endorsement of some 97 percent of the work force to a three-year contract speaks louder than anything I can say about the manner and the way in which this company and its officials have conducted themselves, have presented themselves to the people of The Pas, to the workers who work in the plant daily. I would think it is a reasonable assumption to make that they would carry on with that kind of responsible conduct to other people they do business with, in this case the independent woodcutters that the Honourable Member for Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) is expressing some concern about.

\* (1600)

**Mr. Plohman:** Mr. Chairman, not to prolong this, I believe Repap is a good corporate citizen and certainly was a preferred company insofar as the negotiations all along. I am not insinuating that they are not. They want to make money on all aspects of the operation if they can and that is their business. There are limits to being a good corporate citizen. Obviously they have to continue to operate. They want their parent companies to be pleased with the way they operate, and to make as much profit as they can.

If it is Government policy that timber can be allocated, allowable cut can be allocated to a company and they can then subcontract that or subcontract that at a profit, at a higher price, to a smaller operator because of the competitive nature of it where there are a number of operators who want to get in on it, then I would take issue with that public policy, if that is the Minister's policy. I ask the Minister if that is his policy and, if it is, it is reflected in this agreement.

He may not be privy to clause-by-clause analysis right at this point in time of that agreement, but his

staff were involved in that purchase, I would take it. They were involved in the discussions right from the start, the people involved in forestry, so they should have been probably making recommendations in some of these areas. They should know if they were accepted by the Government when they closed the deal with Repap.

Is it Government policy that this annual allowable cut, once allocated to Repap, becomes their property and they can farm it off to the smaller operators at whatever the price will bear?

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member will know that the role essentially for the department in the Forestry division is in the overall management of our forestry. In this particular instance, the allocation of meeting the demands for quota entitlement, different supervision that is required with respect to meeting with the different forestry regulations that apply, we in essence are not in the pricing position nor should we be, in my judgment.

I am satisfied that independent operators that we are talking about, these are people, well-experienced people, have been in the business in many instances all their lives. They are quite adept at making their arrangements. I would have suspected that they would be—as a rule, you would have a comparable pricing arrangement for the supply of timber whether it came through direct agencies of Repap, their Woodlands Division, on some of these quotas that they hold or from the private quota holders. I suspect that the at-plant site price is the same whether it is coming from Channel Area Loggers or Moose Lake Loggers, an independent quota holder, or direct company employees working in their Woodlands Division. The bookkeeping, the costs that the company is concerned with is the cost of bringing product from "a" to point "b" and how that fits in with their overall management.

**Mr. Plohman:** Mr. Chairman, then in summing up this, a company can take the Crown's resource through an agreement, people's resource therefore, a timber resource, and contract it out without doing anything to improve that resource for—it is there and at that particular time they can let their authority that they have received from the Government out to a smaller company and make a profit at doing it.

**Mr. Enns:** I suppose it is not much different than allowing somebody to take a Crown resource, like a piece of reasonably or prime recreational Crown land, spend the necessary millions, turn it into a golf course and then charge somebody some money to come and play golf on that golf course. I suppose that is making money off of a Crown resource through an intermediary, and of course that takes place whether it is at other resort facilities within our provincial parks, whether it is on Crown lands.

I confess I am probably guilty of what the Honourable Member is charging. I lease land from the Crown to graze cattle on. I hope, I do not always succeed, but I hope that after the cattle have grazed off the grass and I sell them through an auction mart and I sell the

Monday, February 5, 1990

cows that there is some profit attached to it for me so I can pay the taxes and carry on my farming operation. Am I missing the Honourable Member's point?

**Mr. Plohan:** Mr. Chairman, I am not talking about the product that is manufactured or results from the agreement after it has been processed or whatever the case may be that there is a profit made. That is perfectly acceptable. There is an agreement and they take that resource, they process it and sell it, and they make a profit in doing that. That is not what I am talking about. I am saying that there is a raw resource standing there, the timber, which the Government could have allocated to the smaller operators as part of this deal to ensure that they get the same price as the bigger operator does, in this case Repap.

I am saying it is not proper for Repap to take that resource, which is not theirs in the first place. It is ours, it is the people's resource, and to charge a higher price to the smaller operators for the right to get a part of that authority, to get a piece of the action, part of that authority that company received from the Government in the first place. That is what I am talking about. There is no expenditure or additional monies spent on their part necessarily to improve that resource in order for them to have justification for charging more money for that resource.

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Chairman, I am attempting not to in any way evade any of the Honourable Member's questions. I simply submit that it becomes a bit more complicated than that just as the Member portrays. Repap, by virtue of this agreement, is responsible for some very specific obligations that it undertakes. It undertakes to reforest, to provide a growing tree for everyone that is harvested. I might add that is the first such agreement, I believe, signed in Canada where a major consumptive wood user, whether it is in pulp or in lumber, has that written right into his contract.

In addition to this, we charge for every cubic—we charge a forest fire charge to help us combat forest fires. The Honourable Member quite correctly even points out that this is in Repap's self-interest, and of course it is, but they are being specifically, under a formula, charged for this, which the independent operator is not being charged for. So there are these kinds of differences. Now if the Honourable Member will assist me in passing through the amendments of the Forestry Act that I currently have before the House, then all consumptive users of forestries will be charged a forest renewal charge, but not comparable to the charges that are built into the Repap agreement.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it would be an appropriate opportunity for this line of questioning to be pursued when—and I do not know what stage we are at, I suppose maybe under the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) who is more answerable to the Crown corporations to ask some of these more specific questions as to the details of the agreement. I will, Mr. Chairman, undertake to provide some of these additional agreements for him, but it is just simply not available to us as we sit here.

**Mr. Plohan:** Just to follow up on that, the Forestry end of it in terms of the management of the forests is

the Minister of Natural Resources' responsibility. It is appropriate to ask the questions about the kinds of steps that were taken to protect those forests and ensure renewal, and the Minister points out that there is a tree-for-tree replacement agreement which he says is the first in Canada. I know there have been forest renewal agreements in the past. It is a question whether this one is a better one for the Crown than any previous ones, and I will not get into that debate. I think it is important that is there, and we hope that Repap will honour it.

Of course there is a cost to it. If they pass that on to the smaller operators in the absence of a charge by the Crown to those independent operators, that would be a legitimate cost that they have to pass on. I would take it that the Government would not have, unless the Minister's amendments will deal with that, any authority to assess this charge against these operators who are subcontracting this authority from another company who has already committed to an agreement to replace tree for tree. It strikes me that the Minister's amendments will not apply to an operator who is engaged in an agreement with another company that has already got this authority from the Government. In fact we will not be seeing a charge and, if the Minister can clarify that, I would like to know. It is important I think that we know if the small operators will have to pay.

\* (1610)

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is our intent to do a double accounting on any of the charges that are contemplated in the amendments to The Forestry Act. The charge will be made once. It will be determined by the nature of the arrangements as to who will pay that. If I suspect they are cutting under a fairly integrated arrangement with Repap, then Repap will pay it. It will come out of their allocation, and they will pay that charge. On the other hand, if it is a looser or truly independent operation, then the independent woodlot operator will pay that. We will see how that advances.

**Mr. Plohan:** I would take it the Forest Management Agreement here applies to hardwoods then as well as softwoods, to all trees, and that Repap will have to pay the cost of that management agreement and that they will want to recover that from some of the independent operators who they contract with.

What I am saying, and my point all along because that tends to be a red herring, is not that they should not recover their costs on that, but they should not be making a profit on that raw resource which the Government owns and which is allocated giving them the privilege to harvest. They should not be able to make profit in subcontracting that to another company who could indeed have received an agreement from the Government, an allowable cut, just as has been done in many areas in the past with softwoods with all the smaller companies. That is the part that I think is missing if in fact there is no protection for those smaller operators insofar as what those terms would cost and charges will be.

I lay that on the table for the Minister to consider. He was not involved at that time, but I think that was

**Monday, February 5, 1990**

---

something that I was concerned about. That is why we went out on those meetings and said they will be consulted and their interests will be protected before an agreement is signed. I wanted to know if in fact that happened.

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Chairman, I can only assume that inasmuch as my office has not been besieged with letters of concern on this matter that that indeed is the case.

**Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk):** To the Minister, in the Forestry Management Plan, Areas 1 and 2, it designates some 10.8 million hectares. When you factor it out, it seems to be missing about 8,000 square miles unaccounted for or 2 million hectares. I was just wondering if the Minister's department could get back to me and explain exactly what the Forest Management Plan entails, whether all the lakes are inclusive or exclusive and whether the designated lands set aside are accounted for in the management plan. There is some discrepancy between 10.8 million hectares and 12.8 million.

**Mr. Enns:** The Member will appreciate that she is asking for a fair bit of technical information that we would be led to respond to, just as I would like to respond to a question that she asked when last this committee met about fire-killed timber and the salvage thereof in the Interlake.

I perhaps take this opportunity to pass her that detailed information. For the Honourable Members' information, this is a sample of the kind of processed material that is made from fire-damaged timber, is used by the Palliser Furniture people, one of the few that have successfully used fire-damaged timber in this kind of processing, and I hope that they can continue with it. I will pass it on for Honourable Members' edification.

**Mrs. Charles:** I certainly appreciate that this information would take some time in coming and would be pleased to receive it at the earliest possible date, whenever that could come.

The forest management plan, as we all know, is a 20-year agreement as is stated in the Act. There has been an interim operational plan, I believe, tabled for 1990 to '94. Can the department indicate exactly where that plan, what lands that plan will designate for forestry cutting?

**Mr. Enns:** Again we are quite prepared to provide the committee and Honourable Members with a map whereon the allowable cutting areas would be designated with amounts shown over the period referred to, namely '90 to '94.

This would have to again take some consultation perhaps with Repap. They are of course responsible for scheduling, timing of where and when they cut. They are issued a management plan and an allowable quota. Circumstances, including development of access or access trails or roads, would from time to time determine precisely where the timber would come from. Again with the co-operation of the company, it would

take some time for the department to prepare this information, and I might say that this kind of information is subject to change.

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

Certainly the department had an additional workload thrust on them by rearranging quota allocations and cutting rights as a result of last year's forest fires. A considerable amount of time was taken again, principally with our principal users such as Abitibi-Price and Manfor, to redraw, reschedule the management and the cutting plan that they are currently operating under. This is information that is publicly available, is available and will be made available to Honourable Members of the committee.

**Mrs. Charles:** Can the Minister tell me if there are any plans to enlarge the allowable cutting block areas for Repap, in that the national standards have been set at 300 acres, I believe, for a block that is allowable to be cut? Will this be expanded so that Repap can cut a larger area at any one given time?

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Acting Chairman, I suppose maybe this is as good a time as any for me to take advantage and to explain in some further detail the process that the department has embarked on right at this time, which I was pleased to announce last Thursday I believe it was or Wednesday wherein we are currently embarked on a very serious effort at developing an overall forest strategy. I appreciate that while we are currently dealing principally with the consumptive user of forestry, let me just simply say that we also look for and seek guidance as to the different aspects of forests that are of a non-consumptive nature, recreational use or how we should approach forests in our parks system.

The urban forest, we have as we are all aware an incurable problem with the Dutch Elm disease eventually taking more and more of our fine shade trees here in the City of Winnipeg as well as that one aspect of forest management, forestry use that has really seen little attention, but perhaps the problems in rural agriculture will see more attention, that is the agricultural woodlot, farming of trees. All of this hopefully will be under discussion in a wide series of meetings.

We have scheduled meetings in a number of communities throughout those areas, particularly where forestry is a chief concern. I have a listing of those communities where public meetings will be held available to committee Members. I believe the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) had asked for that listing at the last meeting. I will undertake to provide that information to him or the committee Members and I am prepared to pass that around to the committee Members.

Regrettably the kind of knee-jerk reaction or criticism from some of our opponents, and when I say opponents I am not necessarily referring to my political opponents, but for those who feel that this is window dressing, that this is closing the barn door after the horses and cattle have left the barn, let me simply say, Mr. Acting Chairman, where and when do you start a serious review of any matter?

Monday, February 5, 1990

\* (1620)

We did the same, carried out the same program with respect to our first identified priority, namely, water and soil. We are now embarked and will be in this coming year on certain policies that directly reflect those meetings that were carried out by my predecessor with respect to soil and water policies. This is precisely what we are doing with forestry now. The kind of policy guidelines that will evolve out of this exercise that we have now embarked on will eventually influence the very question that the Honourable Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) asks as to the size of cutting blocks, as to certain practices that ought to become part of our overall forest strategy. They will influence future forest management agreements that we sign with individual companies and consumptive users of our forest.

It is a commitment of this Government to sustainable development that we undertake this look. It is unfair I think in my judgment to say that we should stop the wheel, let everybody stand around for awhile while we develop a new forest strategy. There happen to be 5,000 people in this province whose livelihood is directly dependent on forest-related activities, another 5,000 indirectly.

Just as we have not stopped farming while we review soil and water policies, we hope to as a result of these kinds of hearings and as a result of this kind of examination in the future be able to influence and shape our overall forestry policies in a manner that is consistent with sustainable development, in a manner that will ensure that our forests will be there for future generations to enjoy, in a manner which forestry will continue to be the important element to our economic well-being in this province, providing some \$450 million to our gross product in this province, providing the jobs that they do for so many people in this province and hopefully doing it all in a way that is consistent with the kind of policies that the 1990s, the year 2000 are asking from their managers.

**Mrs. Charles:** Will Repap be allowed to cut a larger block area than the national standard of 300 acres?

**Mr. Enns:** The short answer is no.

**Mrs. Charles:** Since the agreement—and it is not like a farm agreement, farmers do not go into a business agreement with Government and the usage of the land, although perhaps maybe it will come down to that at some future date.

This is a business agreement and Repap is allowed to use our forest and it is going to make profit off of our forests, and yet no research has been done in any great extent on an inventory of our forests or of the lands or of the water usage or wildlife usage of the forests covered by the Repap land that they now have rights to. Will this Government hold off on critical areas or ones that are seen as more critical areas until a detailed inventory has been done of the forestry in the Repap cutting districts?

**Mr. Enns:** With the greatest respect, I simply have to refute some of the presumptions in that statement. A

big part of the Forestry Branch's activity has to do with inventory. We are constantly revising inventory information with respect to forests. We have had in fact over the years joint federal and provincial forestry agreements that have enabled us to constantly improve our inventory control of our forest industries.

These are being constantly adjusted as we deal with such things as fire laws and as we deal with such things as monitoring successive reforestation in certain areas of the province. To assume that we have—and of course that presumption is one that I will refute. It is constantly being made that we have given a commercial operation something for which they can make some profit at.

I simply hope the current operators that have taken over that forestry administration can make some profit at it because I have had to go back for the last 18 years and ask my little farmer in the Interlake to dig into his pocket for another \$300, \$400 or \$500 to pay for the losses for the last 18 years that Manfor suffered as long as it was being run by Government. Manfor cost the taxpayers of Manitoba upwards to \$30 million, \$40 million a year and that \$30 million or \$40 million was money that could have been used to build a personal care home, a hospital, or improve our park system. I devoutly hope that the people who have entered into a contract to use those resources will do so at a profit so that they are finally off our taxpayers' back.

**Mrs. Charles:** If the Minister goes back to his poor little farmers, as I think he referred to them, in the Interlake, I think he will find that they are very concerned about the environment and that is the issue that we are talking on today, not that Repap should not make a profit, but it should do so when protecting our environment at the same time.

We are talking about trees that are regenerated in a 100- to 120-year span. We are talking about clear cut over an amount of territory that is unheard of definitely in our province and in many areas of the world. We have not done a complete biophysical study of the lands so that we really know the full impact of what this degree of clear-cutting will have on our environment, both for Manitobans and for the world.

The rate forests are cut down all over, we cannot just assume that it can go forward and not be questioned. It is not that the questions cannot be answered. We just want the answers. In giving those complete answers, we hope that we can see Repap be able to have a sustainable plan that will make them money, be good for the province and maintain our forestry.

I understand there is a McLaren Plan search going on on somewhat of a bio-physical study. Can the Minister outline what areas that search will be done on, and if there are any plans to doing a further study on the total cutting area of the Repap industry giveaway?

**Mr. Enns:** I am advised that the specific study that the Honourable Member refers to, the McLaren Plan, is not a study that is contracted by Government but

rather by Repap, and I would assume that her inquiry to them may make that information available to her when available.

**Mrs. Charles:** Is the department going into any complete bio-physical study of the area in conjunction with Repap? Certainly we congratulate them for doing what seems to be plans for a very thorough study in a limited area, but limited is the key word here. I was wondering if the Government is going to enter into working with them to understand the full impact of the cutting on the areas concerned.

\* (1630)

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Acting Chairman, the department, as you would expect, has an ongoing experience in studying results of those areas that have been cut in the past. We monitor particular types of silviculture practice, that is a big part of our branch's occupation.

We will to a large extent be forging those kinds of policies as we move in this direction. At this point, a great deal of this is, of course, in the future. Repap as yet has to obtain its licences to begin any major alterations from what in fact has been the practice in that whole general area for the last 15, 18 years, when it was a Government operation under Manfor. There are some generalizations that are made that simply are not correct.

It is my understanding—the previous questioner. We talked about the hardwood and particularly those taken by Repap in the north Interlake, which is principally aspen. I can assure her as a practising rancher that aspen does not take 110 years to regenerate. In fact, what you cut down this year, in three or four years will provide an eight- and 10-foot growth cover. There are—

**An Honourable Member:** I do not think she was talking about aspen.

**Mr. Enns:** A lot of the north Interlake we have a lot of aspen that —(interjection)—

**Mrs. Charles:** The Minister knows that the area that is of major concern are hardwoods, which Members of this Government have had witnesses brought forward in committee and have said in committee that it will take 120 years—and I had previously ranged it from 80 to 100 years. Major forests out there will take 100 to 120 years for regeneration, and those are the areas of major concern. I think we all know there are different types of forests and trees of different—oh softwoods, I am sorry. Did I say hardwood? The different regeneration of woods is at different lengths of time, and in that time the soils will be susceptible, the wildlife will be susceptible, the regeneration of the ways—

**An Honourable Member:** Like the rain forests.

**Mrs. Charles:** Yes, it all interreacts, and the Minister cannot make light of the fact that aspen in the Interlake will regenerate. We certainly know that, and we are not speaking of just that type of lands and forestry.

I wonder if the Minister will indicate what type of assistance will be available to the Repap if they cannot regenerate all these trees. What type of fines will be set in place? I believe the clause in the deal was that they had to replace all the trees, if seedlings were available.

Now I realize in some cases there will be scarification of the land and natural regeneration, but it seems to me the clause in the agreement has allowed them a little bit of an escape that if seedlings are available—I am just wondering what guarantees they have in having to do this. Are there fines within the agreement if they do not replace one for one as the Government speaks of?

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Acting Chairman, I suppose the bottom line is that Repap's continued operation in the province is always, in the final analysis, at the call of the Government. Their licences are at risk of failing that if they do not live up to agree to terms and conditions of their contractual undertaking. If there are reasons and conditions that can be demonstrated why something cannot be carried out, that would then involve pretty serious negotiations with either this Government or whoever was Government at the time.

I make this further point. Much has been made, from time to time, by those who are opposed to this kind of use of one of our most important resources, namely forestry, about the size of the lease, one-fifth of the province or 60 percent or 70 percent of our available forestry being included in this leasing arrangement with this one commercial firm.

Part of the very reason for the size of the lease is in the recognition early on—this was when it was originally granted to Churchill Forest Industries or to Manfor for these past years—is an understanding of the very thing the Honourable Member relates to in terms of regrowth cycle of trees. It is to enable to do so in this agreed to vast area, harvest in such a manner without having the kind of consequences that she speaks of, to be able to harvest in rotation in perpetuity to back to an area 80, 100 and 110 years later in what I would support as being a sustainable manner and yet provide the kind of base raw material a large undertaking of this kind requires.

That means you are not going to have this large area clear cut for 110 years. You are going to be hard pressed to see a noticeable difference except for that particular area that was cut that year or two or three years ago. Come back to that area five, six, eight years later and you will see five, six, seven and eight metre growth, green covered. Come back in those areas that were cut 20 years ago and you will see some substantial growth throughout the areas.

(Mr. Chairman in the Chair)

The impression is kind of left that the Forestry Branch is going to end up with one-fifth of the province denuded into a lunar landscape, which I just do not think is responsible or helpful. The requirement for such a large lease under our forestry conditions made that necessary so that the cutting will impact nominally on the overall other resource requirements of our forestry.



Monday, February 5, 1990

I certainly take in account the use of our forestries by other users, our Native people in terms of their trapping privileges through that area, the wildlife users of the forest.

When I remind the Honourable Members and all Members of the committee that we lost more forestry resources through forest fires this last year than Abitibi-Price and Manfor put together, we lost three times as much forestry through fires -(interjection)- what was that trouble—three times as much forestry resources than we harvested, all of this has to be put into that kind of context.

I know the Honourable Member will have the occasion, if she decides this summer to forego the camping experience of Ontario parks and come up north, that she will be surprised at the regeneration that has taken place, even from last year's devastating forest fires, when people will fly her over some of those areas, the marvelous way that Mother Nature has in regenerating itself.

**Mrs. Charles:** I have had the opportunity of flying over the area. I have been up into the Duck Mountains and seen the logging and the forest, as it is, and there is no way the Minister can talk me out of a concern for the forestry industry. That it is our position as Opposition to make sure that the usage of the forest is compatible with sustainable development. I think if he insinuates that we should just let them go without any watchdog appointment by us as Opposition Members, then I guess he does not understand what the practice is all about. I surely do not believe that he has a lack of understanding of the situation.

The concern is, as the Minister mentioned, because of the conditions of our forestry, they had to give Repap such a large area. I think that in itself talks about how slowly our forests do regenerate to the size that the forests are at right now. Otherwise, they could give them smaller blocks. They come back faster, and they would not have to have such large area.

Onto the new forests that are growing after the forest fires, I have had a concern put to me that perhaps some of the seeds that have been coming up through scarification, or I believe there have been a few planted, fewer areas planted, that the saplings from trees that have been pretty well killed but are coming back are actually overshadowing the seedlings that are coming up. I was just wondering if there was a concern about that or if that is an appropriate area to ask questions on.

\* (1640)

**Mr. Enns:** I am advised, Mr. Acting Chairman, that in some instances that kind of shadowing by adult trees is required for the successful regeneration of the seedlings. There have been other cases where we have encouraged, after a certain period, cuts to be made in that area, to then allow them to see the light of day and flourish, but I am not a professional forester. I invite the Honourable Member to visit some of our forestry operations, if she has not, such as our major operation at Hadashville and Clearwater, The Pas, where

we have substantial investment in providing the seedling requirements for the province and indeed are looking forward to providing the expanded requirements should Repap receive the necessary licensing authority to proceed with its Phase 2 developments.

**Mrs. Charles:** When it is necessary to get rid of the so-called weed trees, does the department do it chemically or manually?

**Mr. Enns:** I am advised that it has been the practice to attempt to doing it chemically, but laterally we are doing it mechanically.

**Mrs. Charles:** Then I am taking it that chemically has ceased to be, that from now on it will be manually?

**Mr. Enns:** My advice is that we are still using both, but our preference is it is a question of I suppose being able to encourage operators into that area to salvage them. That is not always possible, either because of access problems or just not interesting enough from a commercial point of view for operators to do this.

**Mrs. Charles:** Because certainly most of those chemicals that are used in a forest, particularly for killing, are not totally environmentally friendly and because there is large unemployment traditional, unfortunately, to much of the North, could they not use Native employment to do this manual cutting or has that been dealt with with the Minister of Native Affairs?

**Mr. Enns:** Again, as long as there is no representative here from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), I encourage the Honourable Members to help me get some additional monies into this department, and I tend to concur with the Honourable Member's suggestion. I think that wherever possible, and to the greatest extent possible, we ought to take advantage of a chronic unemployment situation in many of the regions of the North, just as we, my department, have a long-standing and a good association with calling upon the same work force to help us in the forest fire suppression role. A substantial majority of our forest firefighters are Native people, as I might say are a large number of those people that are involved in the reforestation program that operates on individual contracts, some 20-odd that plant the millions of seedlings that this department is involved with, either in association with Abitibi and with Manfor.

It seems to me that it is in this area that we should be doing everything we can to address and improve the economic opportunities for our Native people. The area that she mentions is an acceptable one. I would have to say it is budget constraints that limit our capacity.

The chemicals that are used from time to time in these operations are ones that are known to the agricultural industry. Roundup is a favoured chemical that is used for growth depressant.

**Mrs. Charles:** Further to the information supplied on the fire-killed timber, I understand there have been a few quotas given out on that. It is my understanding

Monday, February 5, 1990

as well, and certainly to be corrected if I am wrong, that the areas given out are very small in area and that the quota holders have to continually go back to the department to get another quota given to them instead of being able to be out in the field harvesting as much of this fire-killed timber as possible while they are out there and making it cost effective to the operator as well as perhaps harvesting the total number possible for the kill. There is certainly no sense of having any of that timber go to waste if it can be used. I am just wondering if there is any further comment the Minister can make on that situation.

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Chairman, I cannot really comment on that. I accept the Honourable Member's statement. I would ask staff present who have had an opportunity to hear this directly from the Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) to look into the matter.

I said earlier that it has been an added workload for Forestry staff to work on the whole area of quota allocation, bearing in mind as a matter of policy we try to salvage as much as is salvageable. The fires did not always run in those places there that make for easier quota allocations. It means moving people into areas that traditionally have not been harvested. I know that I, as I am sure the Honourable Member has, have received some concern from areas such as parts of the Interlake that have not had logging taking place in there, and experiencing this for the first time felt some concern about it.

I certainly invite the Honourable Member to feel free to address and to direct any individual or specific concerns that she may have received as critic of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, and they shall be summarily dealt with.

**Mrs. Charles:** I think it is important that where possible we should harvest as much of that killed timber. I appreciate that you agree with that and will direct the persons involved to your department directly.

**Mr. Enns:** Does that mean we can pass the Forestry Estimates now?

**Mrs. Charles:** I just wanted to ask one more question on the forest fire situation that may be a little bit out of the department's line that we are on, but what are the fines in place? Is the department able to tell me what the fines are in place for starting a forest fire and if they have to consider, as has been suggested by one citizen, that they should be increased for the fines for starting a forest fire?

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Chairman, our biggest difficulty in that area is getting the kind of hard evidence that will support a prosecution. One virtually has to find a person or persons in the process of setting a fire that will stand up in any kind of court of law that would secure prosecution. That is by far the biggest difficulty. We are dealing in isolated, remote areas where that kind of evidence gathering is extremely difficult.

I recall during the height of the fires, asked that same question of departmental people. I am told it varies.

I am not satisfied that those fines that are available to us in The Forest Act are indeed sufficient and in my judgment need revision. I think they just do not reflect today's values and the seriousness of the willful destruction of this most important resource. I think, from my understanding, the fines are quite nominal, in the order of \$200 to \$250.00.

\* (1650)

**Mr. Harry Harapiak (The Pas):** Mr. Chairman, this is an extremely important section of the department for the economy of parts of the province. I think we should look at the forestry from the economic viewpoint. I think the forest also plays a very important role in replenishing our oxygen supply. I think, when we have often accused the Third World countries of doing away with their rain forests, we to a degree are guilty of the same thing.

I am wondering in the forestry handbook that the Minister is coming out with—and I congratulate him for doing that because I think there needs to be consultation with the people who view our forest not only from the economic viewpoint but from all perspectives: recreation, wildlife, and regeneration of oxygen.

I am wondering in the book that you are putting out, are there any plans and discussion on having some debate on the clear cutting versus selective cutting process, because as you get more and more information from eastern Canada you find that more and more of the operators are moving towards the selective cutting process. They feel that there is a better return in their forests when they use that process. Is there going to be an opportunity to discuss that, the different viewpoints?

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Chairman, there will be no attempt made, certainly, from the department to in any way limit or steer the discussion. The subjects are, in my judgment, pretty inclusive from integration of environmental economic decisions to the very global responsibility that the Honourable Member just referred to. That includes the recreational use and value of our forests, that includes the wildlife value of our forests, that includes hitherto unused aspects of potential forest activity such as in agriculture in farm wood lots.

It is not that our Forestry Branch has not been aware of it, but I think that we will see a considerable change in attitude towards our forests as we move into the '90s, and what this document and what this process hopefully will do, it will solicit the widest range of opinions from any number of Manitobans.

I might say that when we did this with soil and water they told us many things. They told us that we need to concentrate on the global husbandry of our soil and water and not necessarily look for the quick fix by building the big dam and so forth, but to conserve and to preserve those supplies that are available to us. I suspect that we will get some very good direction.

Certainly there will be an opportunity for a diverse mix of opinions. There are those who believe, as Dr.

Monday, February 5, 1990

Suzuki believes, that trees grow forever. They reach all the way to heaven and eventually that is man's path to reach that utopian goal. I am told differently by my foresters, that trees actually have a finite lifetime, that they live for a certain number of years, then they die and they fall and they rot, and/or forest fires come along and burn a good portion of them. There are different opinions about these resources and there will always continue to be so.

I believe very strongly that my department, this Government, will be challenged by a lot of Manitobans who will tell us how they feel about the forestry resources and that, as a result, forest managers like Mr. Rannard here, who is our chief forester—who by the chance I did not have the chance to introduce before—and his staff, along with whoever his Minister and other people are at the time, will in the future provide for a more comprehensive set of policies directed at our forestries as we move into the year 2000.

**Mr. Harapiak:** I am a great admirer of Dr. Suzuki. I think he is a very learned man who has many expert opinions on many subjects, but I have never heard the statement that he was saying the trees were a stairway to heaven. I guess I have missed some of his programs because I had not heard that before.

Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if there is another Canada-Manitoba forestry agreement being negotiated at this time. I guess because of the urgency of the forest fire, will there be a greater emphasis on silviculture production or are you satisfied that there is sufficient capacity in Manitoba to produce the seedlings that are required in Manitoba?

**Mr. Enns:** I think the department position is that currently we have sufficient capacity. We are not up to full capacity at Clearwater but there is some room for expansion there. We are monitoring very carefully of course the need for expansion of that capacity should the Repap organization specifically be licensed for their Phase 2 operation which could considerably increase the requirement for that capacity.

As well, it is my intention to reintroduce to Manitoba an energetic shelter belt program throughout southern portions of the province. Part of the recommendations coming out of last year's soil and water deliberations was the need to concern ourselves about soil erosion, better water management. That has to do—part of the solution was reintroducing more trees to southern Manitoba, where we have in the past 100 years done a pretty good job of getting rid of them. It is my hope that we will move energetically in that direction, and whether or not such traditional sources as Indian Head will continue to be the sole supplier, or whether or not we cannot encourage some local Manitoba production of some of the requirements are all things that are being considered.

**Mr. Harapiak:** What about the agreement?

**Mr. Enns:** Pardon?

**Mr. Harapiak:** The agreement, the Canada-Manitoba Agreement?

**Mr. Enns:** I have not the pleasure to report that we have been able to sign an additional Canada-Manitoba Forestry Agreement. Our agreement is on hold. We are departmentally operating and planning at the same level as though we were in a forestry agreement. I am advised—and personally aware, having attended a mini forestry conference late last fall—that we are in the company of numerous other provinces that are in a similar situation. While we applaud the federal Government's move to pass a forestry Act in this Session, we applaud the federal Government's move to setting up a Department of Forestry in its own right.

I want to assure Honourable Members that I certainly took every occasion presented to me that a concluding of continued federal and provincial co-operation in agreements in this area would be the most forcible way that the federal Government could indicate their dedication to the future of our forests.

\* (1700)

**Mr. Harapiak:** Just a few more short points, and one was that I am surprised at the amount of increase for seedlings that have been purchased from Hadashville. There was a massive increase for the small operators and I guess another area that I would like to—from \$100 a thousand to \$150 a thousand, which is quite a substantial increase for purchasing of seedlings.

One other thing I would like to mention is the whole forest fire review schedule. There has not been enough time for those people, from the time you gave notice that it was going to happen, for those people to get organized and put their presentations together. I think that is a function that is going through too quickly.

I think that you are not going to get any good feedback, and that is what you are looking for. I think it is a long way short from what you promised during the time when the forest fires were raging in this province. You promised a complete review at that time, public review—

**Mr. Enns:** Sometimes you just never win in this business. I thought if anything the Honourable Member would criticize me, and with some justification, that I was too slow off the mark on this one. Why have you delayed it so long, fires are long gone and here we are in February of 1990? I thought that the Members would be berating me for dragging my feet on this matter, for not looking into people who have forgotten about the fires by now.

Now I am told that I am moving too quickly. I know that individual communities and individual people contacted, in fact were the author of these hearings took first—as these fires occurred initially right in some of the early spring fires in the Ashern, north Interlake areas, municipal officials asked that they wanted the opportunity to sit down after the fires were all done to discuss with departmental people and/or with a more neutral person, chairman, some of their frustrations in some of the areas that they thought they could do a better job, might have been done in certain areas.

Those people all were aware of the kind of timing. In fact some of them have been phoning from time to

Monday, February 5, 1990

time asking me when the hearings would commence. I am simply pleased that I have those hearings taking place. The Chief Commissioner, Mr. Bill Newton, is a long time respected public servant of the province, whom some of you will be familiar with. He is undertaking these hearings at this time, and I do expect to get some good advice from them.

**Mr. Chairman:** The hour is now 5 p.m., we have to pass these line by line. Do we have leave to? (Agreed)

Resolution 111: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$10,857 for Natural Resources, Forestry, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1990—pass.

I am interrupting the proceedings for Private Members' hour. The committee will return at 8 p.m. this evening.

\* (1530)

## SUPPLY—EDUCATION AND TRAINING

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Gaudry):** Would the Committee of Supply come to order, please. This section of the Committee of Supply has been dealing with the Estimates of the Department of Education.

We are on item 5. Post-Secondary, Adult and Continuing Education and Training, (p) Market Driven Training: (1) Salaries \$1,875,000, shall the item pass—the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**Mrs. Iva Yeo (Sturgeon Creek):** I would like to ask the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) how the programs for the Market Driven Training are selected. What is the criteria for selection? Do they evaluate somehow the needs in the community and then establish programs? What kind of vision do they have to look ahead of the game? Because, of course, some of the programs are fairly lengthy programs and one has to be careful that unnecessary programming does not take place, I would think.

**Hon. Leonard Derkach (Minister of Education and Training):** There are several ways that Market Driven Training programs may come into being in a particular area or region. First of all, there could be an identified need by an industry or by a community group with regard to training in that area, then that group or that industry would approach the Canada Employment and Immigration people to ensure that they could get funding for that program. After that has been negotiated, there will be consultation with either the community college or training agency to provide the training that has been identified.

There is another way to do that, and that is to perhaps conduct a needs assessment in a particular area. If the Member, through her questioning, I am sure must be aware that we have done that in the Portage area where needs assessment has been conducted to ensure that in fact any training that is going to be delivered in the area is such that will be beneficial to that area. Then it is up to both the industry, the community, and in that case the community college, to identify which of the

programs are most important together with the Canada Employment and Immigration Department, to structure the kind of programs that will be most beneficial in a community.

**Mrs. Yeo:** Can the Minister indicate what agencies actually produce the educational programs that would come under this particular appropriation?

**Mr. Derkach:** There are a host of organizations, industries and agencies that would come under the umbrella of being eligible for support through market driven programs. There are lists and lists of these organizations that have applied and are eligible.

I can table that for the Member if she wishes, or if she would like, I could read them, but there are literally lists. I will just give some examples: there is Manitoba Child Care program; there are, for example, Jackhead Reserve, Little Black River Reserve, Standard Aero, Bristol Aerospace, Boeing of Canada, Manitoba friendship centre; then there are individuals like, we have Lois Dreidger, we have drop-ins. There are a variety.

Basically, the program can be delivered for either agencies, public agencies, private corporations or private agencies, or institutions. All of these have to meet the criteria that have been set up by the CEIC office for the Canadian Jobs Strategy Program.

**Mrs. Yeo:** The Association for Community Living is an outstanding organization that was created, I believe, to assist handicapped young people beyond the age of 21, beyond the age when they are cared for in the schools, to work or find some sort of meaningful existence in the community. The parents of these young people have been terribly frustrated because although the school systems allow the students to continue in the actual school programs beyond the usual age of 18 to, I think the extended age is usually around 21. What often happens is that these young people find themselves in a fairly protected school environment until the age of 21 and then dumped into the wild world with nothing available for them, minimal funding, although I know that under Family Services there is some assistance.

I see that the Association for Community Living is mentioned in the activity identification. I am wondering what programs are offered for the ACL individuals under this particular appropriation, or are these fairly lengthy as well.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, the Department of Education and Training provides the training programs for the individuals who look after them, and the Skills Developmental Worker Program is one that falls into this category.

The programs themselves for the individual clients come under the umbrella of the Family Services Department, so many of the programs are delivered through Family Services. The Department of Education and Training does not in any way specify funding for those particular programs. We will conduct the training for the workers for those programs, and that is really where our mandate ends.

**Monday, February 5, 1990**

---

**Mrs. Yeo:** I believe, too, that I had asked for the curriculum for the Developmental Worker Program from Red River, and I would hope that would be available sometime, at least maybe before the end of the week.

I had not realized that this was just for those individuals who were working in the programs. I did ask the other day—I had some questions regarding Morden College, and that is why I asked which agencies produced educational programs under this particular appropriation. I would like to ask some questions about that particular college and other vocational institutions. We probably have passed that appropriation, but I could not ascertain the appropriate area in which to ask the questions. I can certainly wait until Minister's Salary, if that would be the best thing, whichever the Minister wishes.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, the Morden College is a private vocational school, but if there are some questions that we can assist her with, certainly, I am prepared to answer them now if she would like to pose them.

With regard to some questions that the Member asked for, Mr. Acting Chairman, regarding issues that we indicated we would table, I can table a series of documents now that were asked for. There were some that were to be tabled and others that she had asked that we read into the record.

First of all, if I might, courses that are available using computer software through Distance Education and Technology, I have a listing of current status of field-based projects here that I would like to table for the Members. We have, additionally, the Developmental Services Worker Diploma Program, the program objects here. We also have the specific areas of the program that are addressed in the entire program. I would like to table this for the Member and for the Members of the Legislature.

\* (1540)

We were also asked about grants to special needs students and the comparison of student aid given to—I am sorry. This is different. This is the grants that are given to various private schools, and this was asked for a period of three years. I have that information here as well.

I have also the compensatory grants that were requested for various school divisions. I have enough copies here for the Members as well, and additionally, some information that the Members had requested be read to the House. First of all, we have the Drug and Alcohol Education Program. The number of schools involved in the program to date are approximately 70. The number of teachers attending workshops throughout the province to date have been 140. There are 21 teachers and coaches who have been trained as leaders of these programs to date. That is information that was also requested.

We had also a question with regard to the EMO Program, the first school's emergency planned course that was held. I would like to indicate to the Member that the pilot program that she referred to was—or

pardon me, it was the Member for Niakwa (Mr. Herold Driedger) who was asking a question.

First of all, the pilot program was sponsored by the Manitoba Association of School Trustees with the assistance from EMO and my department. The program was a first of its kind. There were about 40 senior school administrators from throughout the province who attended, and a second course is being planned for early in 1990 and during the month of February, we hope. The course was introduced to assist participants with the potential threats to Manitoba, their community, their school districts, and how they could most effectively respond. I have the specific dates of the next course held. It will be on February 8 and 9. It will focus mainly on rural school divisions.

One other question, Mr. Acting Chairman, with regard to the MEND Program which was asked, this is a program for Manitoba Educators of Native Descent. This program is to prepare members of the Native community for Native management, if you like. The proposal is one where we have Native students involved. The association was one which approached the former Government with regard to this kind of initiative. We are seriously considering it.

At this point in time MEND has approached Core Area Initiative for more funding. They are asking for a staff person to help market this proposal, but today we are simply corresponding, if you like, discussing it with the Native community. It is certainly a program that seems to warrant some credibility in that as we move toward Native self-government, this kind of program is going to be needed in our society.

**Mrs. Yeo:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, The Private Vocational Schools Act is in place. I am wondering if this is an Act that is governed by Manitoba Education, or does it come under the jurisdiction of Labour or the jurisdiction of Family Services. Whose department controls this?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, it is the Department of Education and Training through the PACE Division.

**Mrs. Yeo:** There have been a lot of concerns raised by the individuals in various corners of our province regarding some of the vocational schools that are in place with a fair degree of autonomy on their part, which I suppose is a good thing. Many of them operate without boards, governors or whatever, and I would ask the Minister what level of accountability is there from his department? How many times are these schools visited per year? What kind of scrutinizing is done for the individuals?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, private vocational schools, as I indicated, come under this department. We have staff who have responsibility for private vocational schools. Schools are visited annually by members from staff.

We try to ensure that when new schools apply for registration that in fact our department considers the financial information of the institution that is applying, the stability of the school, the curriculum that is

---

**Monday, February 5, 1990**

---

proposed for delivery in the school and our department, the PACE Division, would review all of those aspects before licensing is granted.

Mr. Acting Chairman, when these discussions are going on, the curriculum itself is reviewed by a variety of people who get together to ensure that in fact the curriculum meets the criteria that are set out for vocational schools. We will have representatives from the private vocational schools, we will have staff from the Department of Education and Training, and we will have specialists from the field, from industry, for which students perhaps are going to be trained in the various programs that are going to be offered in that vocational school. For example, if it is a pharmacist that will be trained, then we will have a pharmacist who will help us with the curriculum and ensure that the curriculum in fact meets the need. The decision to register the school is based on the review that is done by the department and by the curriculum review committee if you like.

We have not experienced a great demand or a great explosion of private vocational schools in our province. We have seen some over to the neighbouring province in Saskatchewan, but indeed we try to keep a close tab on what private vocational schools are offering, the effectiveness. If there are concerns we surely try to address them as quickly as possible. I personally have not heard any glaring criticism of the way that the private vocational schools are conducting their business. We always have a certain number where we have concerns raised and at that point in time we try to address those concerns in the best possible way.

**Mrs. Yeo:** Can the Minister tell me how many private vocational schools are operational in the province?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, there are 36 private vocational schools in the province.

I did not address one of the areas that the Member asked about. That was the whole area of boards on vocational schools. This is an area which is really left up to the jurisdiction of the vocational school because they are private. Therefore the department does not have any say over the administrative structure of a private vocational school.

Mr. Acting Chairman, I guess for the Member's own information I will table the list of private vocational schools and then she has a listing of them.

\* (1550)

**Mrs. Yeo:** A specific school in which I had concerns raised was about the Morden College which I believe was started through the job strategy funding two or three years ago. It is my understanding that there are a number of students, some 20, 25 students, enrolled there and some of them in fact are taking courses such as ESL.

The concern raised was from a couple of the students who had attended the courses, who said they doubted the quality of instruction that was given to them and that in fact there never was any inspector out to the

particular college. The school offers courses in office accounting and secretarial courses and office automation. The ESL is part of all of these programs as well. There are I believe a couple of Native individuals, although there are no Native people who actually live in the area. The concern raised from this individual was that she, the one in particular, had spent a number of months under some duress I might say because she in fact had to arrange for someone to look after her young children, she was working very diligently, and she felt that the course content was quite weak and that in fact her time was wasted there. I think that is unfortunate.

If there are people in the province who are attending courses, and I must admit I have taken courses that I have felt were a total waste of time as well, I think it is unfortunate when there are new Canadians who want to become educated to the level of being able to find gainful employment who are in need of looking after their families to be, not railroaded because they do have some degree of choice but because the course is offered close to home, they would maybe access it.

I would ask if the Minister could tell me what the date of the last inspection of Morden College was by a Member from his department.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, first of all, you know in any institution you will see that there will be some portion of students who are—some fraction of the population will not be satisfied with the program when it is delivered. Indeed, that may be the case with this particular institution. I have not, that I can recall, heard of an incident where a student or a group of students were complaining about a program en masse. We have to respond to each complaint as it comes in and certainly our department would.

I have to indicate that the Morden College is a private vocational school that received its registration in August of 1989. It is registered to deliver several programs, one being the General Secretarial program, the Clerk Typist program, the Automated Office Systems program and the Accounting Computer program. If there were ESL programs delivered through that college, they were certainly not ones that were under this umbrella of programs that are registered for that area.

Indeed, if there were complaints since then, I would certainly be interested in hearing about them. I do not have the specific date when this school was last visited but I can assure you, if they received their registration in August '89, then there have been staff out there during that time.

**Mrs. Yeo:** Well, there was a fairly lengthy and rather harsh Free Press article in which an individual certainly was quite vocal. I think when you look at the private vocational schools Act and you see that the purpose of the Act is to ensure that the training provided by private vocational schools is of a high quality, providing an individual with the skills and knowledge required to obtain gainful employment, I wonder what the definition of the term "gainful employment" is, as this particular Act pertains.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, the ESL programs are not ones that fall into the category where you can

Monday, February 5, 1990

anticipate gainful employment as a result of taking a program. ESL programs are designed to assist the individual with a better understanding and a better ability to speak the English language.

Mr. Acting Chairman, the Member refers to an article in the Free Press. However, I do not recall that there was a college named in that particular article. Secondly, I have not personally received or my staff have not received a written complaint from any individual on that particular campus. It may very well be that someone was dissatisfied with the program and has raised the issue with someone else, but certainly if we receive a concern we certainly investigate it and ensure that in fact the allegation is either substantiated, and if it is not we try to deal with the individual in a very rational manner. There are always complaints no matter what kind of a program a school or a college may deliver, but as much as possible we try to address any specific complaints as quickly as we possibly can.

**Mrs. Yeo:** Can the Minister tell me if the Applied Linguistics Centre on Wall Street has ever requested some assistance with funding, or do they in fact obtain some assistance with funding from Manitoba Education?

**Mr. Derkach:** No, Mr. Acting Chairman, there are no grants given to any private vocational school. The funding comes through the CJS program through CEIC.

**Mrs. Yeo:** I have had a couple of calls raising concerns with the grants to the community-based literacy programs and the method of selection from individuals from different parts of the province actually. I wonder if the Minister could tell me what—I do not know how to pronounce it—Laubach, L-A-U-B-A-C-H refers to?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, that is a method of instruction for literacy, and that is the method that uses the volunteer approach, if you like, or volunteers to do the literacy training.

**Mrs. Yeo:** There are a number of programs that are listed in the schedule that was sent to each of us, I guess, in Orders-in-Council outlining the individual programs, and I am wondering if the Minister could tell me what the Brandon Friendship Centre offers, if he knows anything about that particular program. It has received \$5,000.00.

\* (1600)

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, all of the programs that were listed in the Order-in-Council that the Member refers to are community-based programs which originated from the community as a result of the literacy task force and the report that was handed to the Government. With regard to the Brandon Friendship Centre, the grant was \$25,300, and it was a program designed to help those adults who want to further their education through the community college or the university system or who wish to find employment. This was a project that we submitted and certainly one that the committee felt warranted support and one that has

worked very well in the past as well. It has received funding in the past.

**Mrs. Yeo:** Can the Minister tell me about the Stevenson/Brittannia Community Resource Centre which I believe received \$21,600.00?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, as with all of these programs, again that is a community-based literacy program. This is the way that we try to approach most of the projects with regard to literacy, so that they would indeed focus on the needs of the individuals in that particular community. They would be delivered at the local level by local people, many on a volunteer basis I might add, to assist those individuals who want to continue their education in a post-secondary institution or because of their inability or their illiteracy condition will be able to gain better employment and perhaps advance in the field of employment that they are currently in.

I might suggest, Mr. Acting Chairman, we have seen in some areas where literacy programs have been asked for such people as mechanics who perhaps have to read more detailed maintenance programs, repair programs, and who require an upgrading in their literacy ability. That is the kind of community-based literacy programming that is embarked on and does not just address those people who are in the workforce already, but also addresses those people who perhaps because of their inability to deal with it need literacy programming. It also deals with people who require to have a better handle if you like on the English language. So there is a variety and it depends on the community aspect I guess as to what specifically a literacy program focuses on.

**Mrs. Yeo:** The figure I have been given several times, there is usually some sort of a range, but the highest number that was told to me was that there are 180,000 individuals in Manitoba who are in fact illiterate. The concern there is more for the, well not more for, because anyone who is unable to read and write and communicate effectively, it is very tragic in this day and age with all the technology available and the teaching methods, et cetera, supposedly being so good.

Can the Minister tell me if his figure is about the same as that, and if in fact as Peter Calamai says that they are gaining on us, and we are losing the race, that we are running faster and faster but we are getting further behind. What is being done beyond just funding? I am not sure how many individuals are going to be helped with \$21,600, for instance, at a Stevenson/Brittannia Community Resource Centre. I think the major problem begins in the school system.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, many of the programs that are delivered through literacy are delivered for adults who perhaps are newcomers to the province, who may be from Native communities, who perhaps did not have the opportunity to attend an educational institution when they were growing up. Those kinds of programs are based on the needs of a community and they are identified by the community.

The Member says that \$21,000 may not go very far in a particular community. We have to take a look at

---

Monday, February 5, 1990

---

what the community needs are, what they are physically able to deliver, try to match the dollars with the need, and match the dollars with the ability to deliver. This is how all of these programs are structured. There is no sense in throwing another \$50,000 at that particular community and then find that their programming, or their ability to deliver those programs, is just not there. There has to be a balance.

Mr. Acting Chairman, I have to indicate that before we came to Government there was very little done in terms of the extra funding that is now available for community-based programs. There was some work done, yes, indeed. There was a beginning, but we decided that we needed to address the problem in a more serious manner. We started to address the problem by first of all structuring a task force that we were criticized for by both Parties. Everybody said—although they did not have the information at their fingertips, indicated, oh, that information is already there, you know, your staff have given you the information on what kind of programs you should be delivering.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Acting Chairman, the reverse was the truth. In fact nobody really understood exactly the seriousness of the problem, where the pockets of illiteracy were, how we should address it best, whether it was through community-based programs or other programs. Since then the report has come out very positively and people across Manitoba have indicated that there has been a need for the task force report. Since then we have put a focus on illiteracy by putting together an office, a literacy office, and secondly, putting together a council. Two of the major recommendations that were made in the report.

We have committed significant funds, provincial funds, to addressing this problem. The problem in this province is indeed serious, there is a need to address it. The Member says that 180,000 Manitobans are illiterate. The Southam Report indicated that about 20 percent to 25 percent of Canadians are illiterate. We are finding that in Manitoba we are at the national average or perhaps slightly above in some areas. The problem is there. The problem, yes, has to be addressed through our school system. We have to ensure that students stay in school longer, that programs are designed to meet the needs of students, that students are challenged.

I think we have allowed students to drop out too easily and then we pick them up when they become adults and cannot find work, or find themselves in jails. We try to address the situation that way, which is a very, very expensive way of addressing it.

I am confident that we can address these problems, and I think that from hearing from Manitobans, through the process of the High School Review, will give us some indication of how we can better address the needs of Manitobans. Manitoba has a unique problem in terms of the type of population we have here and we know we have a great deal of work to do ahead of us. We cannot do it all at once, but I think we have embarked on the correct path to date.

**Mrs. Yeoo:** I would certainly not dispute the need for funding, and I look at the figure of \$912,000 in a joint

federal-provincial venture, but I think more than the funding, we need to have programs, more than establishing offices and salaries which everyone knows the highest dollars are spent for salaries in any department. Certainly that is where the Department of Health is having difficulties as well.

\* (1610)

We need to have meaningful programs that are evaluated, that we are sure are producing good programs that will help these individuals who are finding themselves in the dilemma of the illiterate. There are more and more of these people walking the streets daily, and I really hope that this is a serious effort to try and clear this particular problem. Certainly, the Minister mentioned the High School Review and there were a significant number of recommendations that would assist in addressing the problem at the high school level. As I suggested earlier, I think the problem in the early ages is the one that really needs to be addressed.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, one of the areas that I was insistent upon when we embarked on many of the community based programs this year, was that there would be an evaluation done of the programs that are being carried out. That the department has complied with and there is a process whereby each and every program that is out in the field today will be evaluated by the department before any further funding is allowed to be extended to that particular program.

There are some very, very good programs. We know there are some programs that need some beefing up in terms of perhaps in-servicing, perhaps an understanding of how better to deliver literacy programming. The most effective way is to deliver programming at the community level by community people. We find that is indeed the best way to get involvement, to get participation, and to put the money directly where it belongs and where it should be. Because if we do it through the department or through a community college or our universities or school divisions, we find that the money is probably taken up by administration and there is very little money left for actual delivery.

For this reason, we have tried to focus literacy in this province by establishing an office. Yes, establishing an office may be one way, but indeed it is a way in which we can address the community needs. They are not then calling regional offices. The office that we have in the city here can address those needs and then the council that is established, that is done to sort of monitor what the office is needing, is doing, whether it is meeting the needs and to see whether or not programs are indeed reflecting the needs that have been expressed through the task force report.

**Mrs. Yeoo:** Can the Minister share with us, either in written or verbal form, the criteria that is used to evaluate each application for funding for the literacy dollars that are there, and if in fact they received a significant number of increased requests—more requests than there were dollars available?



Monday, February 5, 1990

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, there is always a greater need than what we have money for. I can say in this round of projects there were more applications than we could approve. There is a criteria that has been set down with regard to approving projects. I would be pleased to share this information with Members opposite. It is criteria for provincial funding of literacy programs, and it deals with community based literacy programs. There are approximately eight different objectives here that have to be met. We have program supports which spell out the way a program is going to be supported. There are an additional six points here that talk about how these projects will be supported and how each community has to abide by specific regulations with regard to the supports. There is the special literacy projects funding, and those are special projects that we will fund and there are some criteria that have to be met in order to qualify for those.

As the applications come in, Mr. Acting Chairman, the criteria are gone over with the applicants to ensure that they understand very clearly what the criteria are and to ensure that their community indeed meets the criteria. I would table that for the Members opposite.

Mr. Acting Chairman, I could also add that we had 40 new applications received and of these 40 applications that were received there were 13 new ones supported and 10 of the existing ones were supported.

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Gaudry):** Item 5.(p) Market Driven Training; 5.(p)(1) Salaries, \$1,875,000—pass.

Item 5.(p)(2) Other Expenditures, \$1,117,500—the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**Mrs. Yeo:** I just have one question. Again I hope this is maybe the right area to ask it. The Manitoba Association for Licensed Practical Nurses sent out a future practical nursing education discussion paper. I am sure that the Minister also received this particular discussion paper. I am wondering if the Minister has looked at it or his staff has looked at it, if there is a recommendation that they will forward to MALPN with regard to some of the thoughts in this discussion paper.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, I have to indicate that I personally have not seen the document the Member refers to. I can assure the Member that if the department has received it, we will certainly ensure that we go through it very thoroughly, that indeed if there are some responses that we have to make, we will make them.

I can indicate also that there are a couple of LPN programs that our community colleges are offering as new programs this year. We need to always ensure that we have enough licensed nurses out in the field. There is a program that is being offered by Assiniboine Community College. I believe that program is being offered in Killarney. There is one that is being offered by Keewatin Community College as well as a new program for LPNs.

So, yes, I would be happy to look through that document and ensure that we are addressing their requests in the best possible way, given the resources that the province has.

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Gaudry):** Item 5.(p)(2) Other Expenditures, \$1,117,500—pass.

Item 5.(q) Special Programs; 5.(q)(1) Salaries, \$769,400—the Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon):** Mr. Acting Chairman, I just have a question before we leave this section. Could the Minister provide us with a list of projects that were funded under this category?

I am not expecting that immediately. I would be perfectly happy to receive that at some later date.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, there is not a big list, so I can even read them, they are not that extensive. First of all, we have the Civil Technology Program from Red River Community College; the ACCESS Thompson Program, the jurisdiction of which was transferred to the Keewatin Community College; we have the Electrical/Electronic program at Red River Community College; the ACCESS Winnipeg Program; we have the community-based University Entrance Program; we have the Post-Secondary Career Development Program; and the Engineering ACCESS Program. I can provide this list so that the Member will have it for his own reference.

**Mr. Storie:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, the Civil Technology course, is that the one that is being offered by Red River in Thompson? Is that course continuing? Is that course currently operating?

**Mr. Derkach:** The Civil Technology Program is being offered from Thompson and it is still ongoing.

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Gaudry):** Item 5.(q) Special Programs: (1) Salaries, \$769,400—pass; (2) Other Expenditures, \$1,958,300—pass.

Resolution No. 32: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$88,588,200 for Education and Training, Post-Secondary Adult and Continuing Education and Training, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1990—pass.

Item 6. Universities Grants Commission, \$187,844,100. Provides grants to the Universities of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Brandon and St. Boniface College to enable them to maintain existing services. Included are grants for debenture sinking funds and interest payments. (a) Salaries, \$215,800—the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

**Mrs. Yeo:** The Minister indicated that he had left one student nominated by the students' union, I believe, off the names for board appointees. He also indicated that when there was the opportunity he would replace a person, or if somebody resigned I would guess or if their term expired, with a student representative. Can the Minister indicate whether in fact that has occurred or if he anticipates this occurring?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, that has not happened yet. As soon as there is a vacancy I will certainly be replacing that vacancy with a student, as I had committed to earlier.

Monday, February 5, 1990

\* (1620)

**Mrs. Yeo:** Can the Minister indicate if in fact the Senate or the UMSU or any other organization submits their duly nominated individuals, one or two or however many are required for the positions on the board, if the Minister will in fact name these particular individuals for the university board, or does he request, from the organizations, a list of names and from that list he then makes his selection?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, the way it is usually done is that an organization will submit a list of people, and from that list usually Government will select candidates that Government wishes to have sit on boards or commissions.

I have to indicate to you that by the statute there is no requirement for Government to have student representation on the board of governors. This has just been a courtesy that has been extended to the students, and certainly we will ask them, the students' union, for representation. We will ask them for a list of four, six, whatever, and from that list we will select, as Government always does, the members that we wish to have on that particular board.

**Mrs. Yeo:** Is the Minister considering perhaps changing the statute so that the traditional practice of having student representation will become a legislative practice in the future?

**Mr. Derkach:** Well, Mr. Acting Chairman, the former Government did not see fit to do it. Certainly that is not something that is beyond discussion. I think that students in the past have had an important contribution to make to boards of governors, but it is not something that I would move on unilaterally. It would be something that I would want to discuss with all the bodies involved; that means the Grants Commission, the university board of governors, the universities themselves and the students' union as well. It is not just something that I would move on unilaterally. It is something that I think we need to have some consultation on, and I am prepared to do that.

**Mrs. Yeo:** Not too long ago, I believe in October of '89, the federal Government declared 14 centres of research excellence in Canadian universities. There were many in Manitoba who were quite concerned that our Manitoba Universities did not fare too well, as far as the grants were concerned, or the stipulations or the finances were concerned.

Can the Minister tell the House what dialogue he had with his federal counterparts to try and encourage the research centres to be located, some of them, in Manitoba?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, we are involved in six projects. We do not have the chair of any of the projects, and that certainly was somewhat disappointing to me. I think as a province we made our case extremely well before our federal counterparts. There was a structure that was established in determining which centres of excellence would be selected, the locations

and where they would be. Certainly we have to respect the process that was put in place.

Mr. Acting Chairman, I have to indicate to you that I have been since then talking to federal counterparts about how we can perhaps move in other areas to establish centres of excellence right here in this province, because I think we have some very unique characteristics, which I think we can build upon in ensuring that we have centres of excellence in other areas as well.

**Mrs. Yeo:** It has been proven I believe that individuals with university degrees have the lowest unemployment rate of any other individuals, and the thought there is that if we want to address the unemployment situation, we should in fact address favourably the assistance to our students, the university funding.

Some people are saying that this in fact is not happening, that we are falling fairly far behind. In a survey that was done not too long ago, 56.7 percent of Manitobans said that they felt university students were worse off than they were some 10 years ago. Over 70 percent of those surveyed felt that the provincial Government should be assisting Manitoba universities and the students that attend these universities even more.

I have spoken with students from all four universities in Manitoba, and most of them in fact have said that they would not disagree with the need for increased tuition fees if, in fact, they saw an increase in the level of service provided to them in the way of smaller class size averages, because there are some beginning arts and science classes with upwards of 200 students in them.

There are some electronic professors, the big television set that sits at the front of the classes that students march in, sit down, crank on the TV and this is how their classes are run. The students say that is unacceptable to them with the increasing and increasing tuition fees.

Can the Minister tell us what innovative programs he is planning to put into place, or has put into place, that will help these students to believe that they are getting better services at the universities?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, it is always easy to talk to students and have them give you the worse scenario that you have ever seen with regard to university education. Of course, students who are at university do not understand the funding mechanism that is in place for their education. As a matter of fact, if you ask many university students—and I not saying all—what a one-year university program costs in total if the program was not subsidized many students would not be able to tell you. Many of them would venture to guess that they are paying the entire cost of tuition. That is indeed not true.

Over the years, although there are some who say that university education has slipped, I think it has to be pointed out that provinces and Governments in general are supporting a greater portion of the education a student is getting today than Government

**Monday, February 5, 1990**

---

was some years ago. Students are paying a smaller percentage of the total cost of education today than they were some years ago.

The Member says students agree there may be a need to increase tuition fees if the services were improved. I have to tell the Member that last year we supported the universities by 5.4 percent over and above the level of inflation, one of the higher percentages of support that we have had. I am talking about operating support, Mr. Acting Chairman, besides the additional \$2 million that was put into capital over and above what was there before.

In addition, we supported the dental school by ensuring that it would maintain its accreditation. The steam tunnel is another example of deterioration that is existing at the university because the issue has not been addressed over time. We have committed ourselves to ensure that is addressed adequately.

I have to tell you that we have embarked on a different approach to delivering university education. Yes, students may not like to watch a screen to get their lectures, but indeed when you have a province that is as sparse as ours and you try to deliver services at the best possible cost sometimes Distance Education is a way that you have to go. Rather than having 250 students sit in front of a lecturer it is easier to have 25 students perhaps sit in front of a monitor.

For that reason we have embarked on a pilot project. We are anticipating that we can deliver a program by Distance Education to regions of this province where that kind of education is not available today. We are doing considerable amounts in terms of providing services to students in Manitoba, and we are indeed committed to that. There is, however, a level of responsibility that has to exist with the student and with the parents of the student as well in terms of the commitment in dollars and in time, and we anticipate that is a responsibility that each resident of this province should take.

We are not going to leave ourselves in a position where we are paying the entire cost of education, but indeed we are doing I think as much as any Government has in the last number of years with regard to support to post-secondary education. I am not talking just university education, I am talking about the community college education as well.

\* (1630)

**Mrs. Yeo:** Over the past couple of years, Stats Canada has said that education and training has been getting a smaller and smaller share of the federal budget, which I personally believe is unfair, and irresponsible.

I think that if you were to talk to individuals, and there was a recent survey done now that said I believe it was 79 percent of individuals said that education and health, respondents of a survey, said education and health, were actually ranked No. 2 together, and care of services to the elderly were No. 1 at something like 82 percent.

The expenditures on education and training have dropped from 1.3 percent of Canada's gross domestic

product in 1986-87 to 1.1 in '88-89, which is a significant drop. I think the high was in '85-86 at something like 7.3.

Again, realizing that this is a federal Government directive and that the funds come from the federal Government, can the Minister indicate how frequently he dialogues with his federal counterpart to urge continuing assistance from the federal Government at a level that is necessary to provide the programs that are essential for our universities and colleges in Manitoba?

**Mr. Derkach:** There are several ways that Governments address the whole issue of federal transfers, with regard to post-secondary education.

There is some reference made to the answers I am giving. If the Member would like to pose some questions he is certainly free to do so. I have not heard any questions from him.

I would like to indicate that federal transfers and sums of money are negotiated not simply through the Department of Education and Training, but by Government and through the Department of Finance. We have addressed this issue, yes, in several ways. The Canadian Council of Education Ministers has also addressed the issue. I have met on several occasions with the Secretary of State to discuss the issue as well, and there are no easy solutions to this problem.

There is funding available in many different ways for education—sometimes we forget to account for that—and that is through the Canadian Job Strategy, for example. There are training dollars which come to the province in other forms through the CEIC office, so that, in addition, has to be considered as part of the training and education component of our society.

Yes, we are concerned about the level of funding that we are getting from the federal Government. There is never an adequate amount, but indeed I think we are supporting education provincially as good as and better than many of our counterparts across this country.

**Mrs. Yeo:** I am well aware that we in Manitoba and we in Canada are not different from some other countries. Just this weekend I was made aware of what is happening in North Dakota, the state just to the south of us, where they have a good number more colleges and universities in that state than we have here in Manitoba. What they are doing in North Dakota is, because of the decrease in federal funds that particular state is receiving, they are having to stipulate that certain colleges or universities will only present certain programs. Some colleges or universities are becoming specialists in the business sector and some are becoming specialists in the sciences, some are dealing more specifically with technology, computerization, et cetera. Is there any thought or have there been any discussions with this particular Minister to perhaps look at creating specializations within certain universities instead of having the broader arts and sciences available at all four of our universities?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, that is an issue that we are aware of, but I have to indicate that our

Monday, February 5, 1990

universities are somewhat autonomous and at arm's length from Government. Certainly I do not know who would be successful in trying to pull certain programs from universities and leave them at others. As new programs are asked for, I have to indicate that we seriously review them to ensure that there is not a duplication of programs where there is not a need. I think that is an approach that we are using and have used, but to create certain streams within certain universities is certainly going to be a very difficult task in a province the size of Manitoba which has a very sparse population in the rural parts, which has three of the major universities right here in the city and only one rural if you like university.

To try and say that we are going to specialize universities is something that I have not considered and neither has the University Grants Commission at this point in time. It is not something that I have on my agenda for the next while for sure.

**Mrs. Yeo:** A couple of months ago the Minister announced French courses grants that were distributed to the four universities. St. Boniface College quite obviously and I guess logically received the largest grant, \$55,500; the University of Winnipeg, \$27,800; \$8,900 to the University of Manitoba; and \$2,200 to Brandon University. Some of the individuals at the University of Manitoba were quite concerned with \$8,900 and wondered just how on earth they would spend that amount of money for their French courses grant. Can the Minister tell the House how the particular bits of funding, how did he decide how many dollars went to which facility?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, this is basically done through the federal Government. Yes, we are consulted on it and we discuss it, but basically the criteria and the level of funding for each institution is determined through the federal Government.

**Mrs. Yeo:** Does the Minister have anything to do with the criteria for selection or is that strictly the federal Government's criteria? Is that what he is saying, that he does not get a lump amount and then there is some criteria to state which facility receives which amount?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, that is basically done through the federal Government.

**Mrs. Yeo:** My alma mater, the Health Sciences Centre School of Nursing, is currently negotiating I understand with the University of Manitoba to incorporate a teaching program that would be run by the University of Manitoba, I believe, utilizing the downtown campus on Bannatyne and McDermot, utilizing the practicum bed spaces at the Health Sciences Centre.

My question is, does the Minister know if the graduate from the program would be considered a graduate from the Health Sciences Centre School of Nursing, or would this individual eventually be a graduate from the University of Manitoba and with what degree?

\* (1640)

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, I think it is premature to say whether the program will be

recognized by the Universities Grants Commission. It has not come before the Grants Commission at this point in time. When it does, the Grants Commission will consider it and then will make their decision based on the evidence as provided.

**Mrs. Yeo:** Is the Minister then saying that there is not a target date for this to be implemented and for it to be fully operational?

**Mr. Derkach:** It will follow the same process that all programs follow, and that is, that first of all, once the program is developed by the university, it will be submitted to the Universities Grants Commission. The Grants Commission will then review the program. They will establish whether or not they approve it. After that, it is the funding question of course. At that point in time they will establish whether there is funding available for the program in this next fiscal year, or whether the program may have to wait for another year for funding.

As I indicated, that has not been presented at this point in time to the Universities Grants Commission. I cannot speculate on whether or not we are going to be in a position to acknowledge the program in September, because we do not know whether the program has been developed to that extent.

**Mrs. Yeo:** Can the Minister tell us how many postgraduate medical programs are at the risk today of losing their accreditation? There apparently is a committee that is meeting at this very moment that is looking at accreditation and the ability for programs to remain viable. I am wondering if the Minister has any information as to which programs or how many programs are in the problem of perhaps losing their accreditation?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, the accreditations committees meet from time to time to look at programs. I am not aware of any postgraduate programs right now, medical programs that are in danger of losing accreditation.

The only program that we were made aware of was the dental program. Therefore we had to move very quickly on that particular program. At the post-secondary level we have the dental assistant program which we have to do something about. That has been addressed already.

**Mrs. Yeo:** I am wondering what is the total number of postgraduates in the various medical programs that are offered by the University of Manitoba Medical College, and if the Department of Anesthesia is offering a successful program and will have enough individuals and enough funding to be able to continue. Is that a concern?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, I am not aware of any concerns with regard to that program, or any others in that area. Certainly, I know that if there was a danger of the program closing because of insufficient numbers, or because of a program not meeting accreditation standards, that I would be apprised of the details, but at this point in time I have no knowledge of any such development.

Monday, February 5, 1990

**Mrs. Yeo:** My colleague, the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Cheema) has asked several questions over the past 20 months about the scarce number of psychiatrists throughout the province. Is there any attempt to address this problem and use some vision that will increase the numbers of psychiatrists that may well be available to the province by increasing the funding to the Department of Psychiatry so that they may offer a larger number of residency spots for the psychiatrists?

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, that is a question that is really the responsibility of the university, the medical school, if you like, and certainly it is an issue that has been addressed, I know, on several occasions, and one that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) has had some concern about because of the shortage. I have to indicate to you that we have shortages in many of our professional fields. If we could graduate more, for example, speech therapists, we could place every single one that this province could graduate. But it is a matter of being able to afford to deliver those kinds of programs, and indeed this is a question that has to be addressed in terms of priority and need.

I know that in the area of psychiatry, especially the geriatric psychiatry, there is a need, and certainly the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) has been discussing this with the medical profession and when those kinds of proposals come before us we will certainly be in a better position to address and respond to them. But right at this present time we have not had any direct communication with the University of Manitoba, or the medical school, with regard to that particular issue. I think that is an issue that has basically been discussed and been handled with the Department of Health officials.

**Mrs. Yeo:** This is the problem, when it comes to overlap between the various departments. What we hear in the Department of Health is, well that is really an Education problem. The concern for the ophthalmology program is another one that we have raised in the House. Is it an Education concern when we talk about educational programs for future ophthalmologists, or is it a Health? I think there certainly is an overlap. There were discussions, I understand, with the two departments about having the ophthalmology program re-established and I understood that Seven Oaks Hospital was perhaps going to be considered for the area in which this program would function from as far as from a clinical setting. I am wondering if the Minister has any updating on the ophthalmology program.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, I would like to first of all correct the Member for Sturgeon Creek (Mrs. Yeo) with regard to the overlap of departments, and one department saying that it is the responsibility of another department. I do not think she has heard that from the Department of Health with regard to saying that it is an Education problem, because I have never heard those words mentioned by the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). I have never said that about this program regarding the Minister of Health either.

Mr. Acting Chairman, it is really up to the university to set its priorities, and then that priority is given to

the Universities Grants Commission. We do not interfere as policy people, if you like, with regard to saying, you must deliver this program because there is a perceived shortage. With regard to the ophthalmology program, there has been that communication between Health, between the university and between the Universities Grants Commission. That is an area where there is some considerable discussion going on at the present time. Certainly nothing has been finalized at this point in time, but indeed I can say that there is discussion going on and work is being done towards establishing the criteria and re-establishing that kind of a program in this province.

**Mrs. Yeo:** Another area where there is considerable overlap is in the area of speech pathology. Certainly there are needs in the preschool level, and we have talked about the needs in the school-age child. Therefore, we need to do something to address the shortfall of speech pathologists in Manitoba and to try and encourage our young people to enter the programs that are available around the City of Winnipeg, because none are available in the Province of Manitoba or in the city. I was pleased to see that there was some movement this weekend, again following the papers.

I am wondering if the Minister can tell us what activities are in place for perhaps a post-graduate course for students to obtain their Masters level of speech pathology which I think was discussed in one of the newspapers this weekend. If that is going to be in place, if he could answer when.

**Mr. Derkach:** Well, Mr. Acting Chairman, again I have to address the issue of overlap. It is not necessarily overlap, it is the cooperation between departments that you need when you establish programs and when programs like this are run. Education does not take responsibility for preschool programs, and Education and Training does not take responsibility for post-education programs; in other words, for adult programs. Those programs would fall into the Department of Health or the Department of Family Services depending on the nature of the program.

Education is not everything to everyone, and it cannot be. Indeed I do not think the Members opposite would expect that kind of a situation to exist. However, with regard to speech therapy programs, we do have those programs in North Dakota. Our students travel to North Dakota to get their Masters degrees. We have a working relationship with the universities there, and we try to get these students back to Manitoba. We are experiencing a shortage problem throughout the country. It is not just a situation that is present in Manitoba; it is a situation that is prevalent throughout the country.

\* (1650)

Yes, right at the present time Alberta is throwing considerable dollars at attracting those kinds of students. I do not believe that the simple solution to that is to try and match the dollars that perhaps a more affluent province has to try and attract those people here. I think we have some very unique kinds of aspects

---

Monday, February 5, 1990

---

about Manitoba where we can attract individuals like that to this province.

The supports that we have from Government, the supports we have from the department with regard to these people working in the field and, yes, we need to do something else and we are looking at alternatives, at how we can attract even greater numbers into this province, but I have indicated to the Member that we have just recently hired three additional speech therapists for this province.

**Mrs. Yeo:** Just one last comment: that the Premier has in fact stated that education is a lifelong learning thing and this Minister has talked about lifelong learning as well, so what I had asked was, if there were any plans because I saw an article, albeit a small one, in the newspaper indicating that there had been some discussion about speech therapy, speech pathology courses being considered for Manitoba and I know that there has not been anything because the Minister evaded the question that I had asked.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, when programs like that are considered we have to consider several things: the cost of the program, the establishing of a Chair, if you like, for that particular program, which is a very, very costly issue. That is why we have agreements like we have with Minnesota, like we have with North Dakota for these kinds of programs where we can reduce the costs for the students, have student data available to those students who go to Minnesota and also those who come from Minnesota or North Dakota to Manitoba.

We are looking at the needs that we have with regard to speech therapy, with regard to ophthalmology, with regard to psychiatry, and we do not have those kinds of resources in this province to try and establish a program in each of those areas. So universities then have a responsibility to identify their priority areas and make representation to the University Grants Commission as to what areas they think are most important and which areas they want to establish programs in. The University Grants Commission will then look at it in an overall sense and will either give approval or reject it based on information that they themselves gather.

Mr. Acting Chairman, I have to indicate that we are not going to, at this point in time, try to target a great deal of money into any one of those areas. We have an agreement with North Dakota. They are accommodating our students at the present time. It seems to be an effective way of delivering programming at this point in time and yes, we need to do something perhaps with regard to student aid and even with regard to attracting some of these students back to Manitoba when they finally graduate, and that is what is being addressed at the present time.

**Mr. Storie:** Mr. Acting Chairman, just to follow on that line of questioning. The Minister referenced in his closing remarks the fact that one of the issues that has to be addressed is the question of student aid. I am wondering if the Minister can indicate right now, because of the

agreements with Minnesota and with North Dakota, whether there has been a change in the student aid policy which requires or provides for assistance, provincial grant assistance in particular, but also student loan assistance, only in cases where the course of studies is not available in other parts of Canada because there have been examples, including potential speech pathologists who wanted to be trained who chose North Dakota but were denied student aid on the basis of similar courses being available in Canada, and this of course was outside of Canada.

I am wondering if the agreements the Minister has signed include a recognition that student aid should follow the student to the training location.

**Mr. Derkach:** Mr. Acting Chairman, first of all, with regard to the agreement with Minnesota. At the present time, the staff have met to, first of all, establish a very preliminary aspects of the agreement. Next week, the staff will be meeting to go into more detail with regard to the agreement, what it should include, and how we can address some of the needs of both Minnesota and Manitoba students. Specifically, with regard to student aid, this is something that has not been addressed with regard to the Minnesota agreement because it is far too early at this point in time. I can tell you we have looked at student aid and how it addresses some of the needs of students in this province, and we know that there need to be some changes made. But every time we make a change it is going to cost considerable dollars, and we understand that as well. There are some needs to change, to address the needs of students travelling beyond the boundaries of this province for their educational needs, and certainly we are prepared to do that over the course of the next year.

**Mr. Storie:** I am disappointed obviously that the Minister has not understood the need in particular for speech pathologists in the Province of Manitoba and addressed that more quickly through student aid. I appreciate that he is committed to doing that. I will take his word as the gospel and assume that he will follow through and that by next year for students who are following through, particularly in professional training areas where the province is experiencing shortages, we will actually see that kind of thing in place. It is not just a question of student loan; it is also a question of bursaries.

I am not opposed, and the Minister can quote me on this, to establishing some requirements for a reciprocal agreement between a student and the province whereby if the student is gaining an education outside of the province that he/she reciprocates by spending some years delivering a service in Manitoba, particularly in rural and northern Manitoba because we experience those shortages more acutely than most other parts of the province. I would like to see that—obviously the sooner, the better. There are people in Manitoba who are prepared to train as speech pathologists who, for lack of assistance, have not been getting the training, and they were prepared to train in Manitoba. I think we have to make sure that those kinds of situations are eliminated quickly because we need those people in the province.

Monday, February 5, 1990

A couple of other questions related to university grants commissions and particularly Brandon University. I am wondering if the Minister could indicate whether any of the \$9.5 million that is allocated as capital grants to the universities or any other funding within Resolution 33 is for Brandon University's capital projects, particularly their steam plant and the necessary improvements to their library resources area.

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Gaudry):** The Minister has time for some short answer.

**Mr. Derkach:** I would like to indicate to you that Brandon University's needs are being addressed as they are presented to the University Grants Commission. The steam tunnel is an example; it is a completed project. The library, I believe, is one that is being addressed in the current year. So, yes, there are dollars designated for Brandon University. As the Member knows, Brandon University will be offering a Master's program next year for the first time. Although that is not a capital project, it does certainly include some extra costs for the university. Yes, Brandon University's concerns are addressed.

Might I say on the former topic that the Member was on with regard to the Minnesota-Manitoba agreement, Manitoba has designated Minnesota institutions as institutions which are eligible for student aid for students from Manitoba. Indeed, that is a part of the agreement and an important part, I think, so that student aid is part of it.

\* (1700)

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Gaudry):** The hour being 5 p.m., and time for Private Members' hour, I am interrupting the proceedings. The committee will reconvene at 8 p.m.

Call in the Speaker.

## IN SESSION COMMITTEE CHANGES

**Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended: Uruski (Interlake) for Storie (Flin Flon).

**Mr. Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed.

The Honourable Member for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux).

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Committee change. I move, seconded by the Member for Transcona (Mr. Kozak), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: The Member for Seven Oaks (Mr. Minenko) for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles).

**Mr. Speaker:** Agreed? Agreed.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

**Mr. Speaker:** The hour being 5 p.m., time for Private Members' Business.

## PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS RES. NO 33.—SELKIRK LANDING PROJECT

**Mr. Speaker:** Resolution No. 33, Selkirk Landing Project. The Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer).

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie),

WHEREAS Manitoba needs orderly economic development in rural areas as well as urban areas; and

WHEREAS the Selkirk Landing concept for downtown development is a logical progression from the success of programs such as Mainstreet Manitoba; and

WHEREAS the Government of Manitoba first committed \$2 million conditional upon matching federal funds in 1986; and

WHEREAS a finalized Selkirk Landing proposal was made public and forwarded to the provincial and federal Governments in October of 1987; and

WHEREAS other proposals for development in downtown Selkirk and nearby have been put on hold numerous times in order to accommodate the Selkirk Landing proposal; and

WHEREAS the Selkirk Landing proposal would revitalize the entire downtown business sector as well as benefit the town as a whole; and

WHEREAS both the previous provincial administration and the federal Government committed several million dollars to the project in 1988 despite partisan differences; and

WHEREAS a smaller province such as Manitoba is dependent upon a fair distribution of federal spending; and

WHEREAS the projects of the scope and concept of the Selkirk Landing project are needed in rural Manitoba; and

WHEREAS the Selkirk Landing project has its provincial funding suddenly withdrawn this January putting in jeopardy the federal funding and the entire project; and

WHEREAS the loss of the Selkirk Landing project would be a major blow to the Selkirk region.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba hereby requests the provincial Government consider reviewing its decision to withdraw funding; and

---

**Monday, February 5, 1990**

---

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Assembly declare its belief that this project should obtain provincial funding and requests the Government consider the advisability of providing the required financial assistance in the 1989-90 fiscal year.

**MOTION presented.**

**Mr. Doer:** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to stand on the project, one which I feel has great merit. One of the advantages of putting forward a proposal like this is we have an opportunity to get an update from the Government on this project and have on the record where this project stands, both from a provincial and a federal perspective.

Mr. Speaker, we first developed the resolution almost 10 months ago, so I would have expected by the time we were dealing with this resolution that it would be out of date. I would expect the announcements to be made and the projects to be announced and every politician to take credit for it and therefore it would be going ahead. But, unfortunately, I have not heard of any announcement on this project, and certainly we think it is one that is worthy of consideration from the Government and has merit.

It seems to us, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness to the Government, that this project is often caught in between two Governments, and I include all political Parties in this. At some times the federal Government is willing to go ahead with it, and the provincial Government is not. At another time, the provincial Government is willing to go ahead with it, and the federal Government withdraws its money.

What we have to do is, I think, get all the ducks in a row on this project, if I can use that analogy—I know there are lots of Ducks Unlimited pins across the way—get all the ducks in a row in terms of getting the community, the federal Government, the provincial Government working together on the Selkirk Landing project.

The intent of the resolution is to put our Party's concern on this project on the record, but secondly, also to hear from the Government of the Day where it stands and where it is going.

As I say, there have been times that the federal Government has been willing to go, and we have not, and then there has been the opposite situation. That is what seemed to us to be the opposite situation. After the federal election, it seemed to us that the commitment from the federal Government disappeared. Then of course the provincial Government said, if this is going to be a three-Party agreement and there are only two Parties, we are not going to participate.

In all fairness, I believe the federal money disappeared before the provincial commitment. I believe it disappeared after the November 1988 election, Mr. Speaker, those dire results in terms of that election, in terms of this project.

The site is one I think that is worthy of looking at. It is on the riverbank. I have toured the area on two occasions now. From the members of the community

that we have talked to, they certainly support this project. There is a question of tactics of how we accomplish it, whether we should be vocal, whether we should be silent, whether we should be strident or whether we should be quiet. There are some tactical considerations, but the bottom line is the project, as we know it, unless the Government is going to provide further information today, is stuck in limbo. We want to hear from the Government what their deliberations have been with the Rural Development Department and the community of Selkirk and their committee. We believe that this project should go ahead.

As I say, it has a potential for a housing component as I understand it, when we first looked at it, a commercial component, Mr. Speaker. It has the potential to have an enhancement of the harbour area or the historic area of the Selkirk community. All three levels of Government have supported the revitalization of downtown Winnipeg, both in the Core, the North Portage and The Forks. It is fair that communities, not just Selkirk, Brandon and Portage also receive support, particularly those communities that did not get a lot on a per capita basis from the Main Street Manitoba project which was so successful outside of Winnipeg across the province under the former Minister of Municipal Affairs, the famous Pete Adam. "Main Street Pete" I think they still call him admiringly across Manitoba communities.

If the Member for Portage (Mr. Connery) was known with such terms of affection as the former Member for Ste. Rose, "Main Street Pete," I think he would be able to retire, as we all would, from politics or public life in a pretty good way, Mr. Speaker. The report card would be pretty positive. Not many people from this Chamber can say that.

This project has been going for a number of years. As I say, it has had a 10-year history, so that affects the former federal Liberal Government. It affects the former New Democratic Government. It affects the former Lyon Government. It affects the present Tory Government, both federally and provincially. There are no angels in this thing, quite frankly. Let us be honest. What the problem has been is getting all three parties together at the same time, the community, the provincial Government and the federal Government. We had it for a brief period of time and unfortunately that evaporated.

In 1989, Mr. Speaker, in January, just a little over a year ago, there were major accusations made against the Premier of the province, Premier Filmon, about this project and about killing the project. The mayor of the community had thought the Filmon Government was under an obligation, both legal and moral, to proceed on this project. The Deputy Premier of the day, or the former Municipal Affairs Minister, the present Member for Ste. Rose (Mr. Cummings), said, well, their priorities are sewer and water services, which helps communities with infrastructure.

I do not disagree that should be a priority. We cannot talk about rural diversification without talking about sewer and water, particularly in Dauphin, Portage and Brandon.- (interjection)- Well, that first envelope is quickly running out, and you had better prepare the other two envelopes.



Monday, February 5, 1990

\* (17 10)

What we cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, is how the present M.P. from Portage, David Bjornson, the present Member for Selkirk, the M.P., said the federal Government supports the project and does not understand why the Filmon Government has withdrawn their support which he thought was legally and morally a binding on the community of Portage.

Now I do not think, quite frankly, that the present federal Government does support the project. I think that the present federal Government has withdrawn support, and now the provincial Government has withdrawn support.-(interjection)- We await the update from the provincial Government, because it has been almost a year. The Member for Charleswood (Mr. Ernst) says—the Honourable Minister mentioned smoke and mirrors. I hope there is more in his statement and speech on comments than smoke and mirrors on this project. I hope it is not first envelope talk and second envelope talk. I hope this is a good idea. We would like to hear from the Government: is this a good idea? If it is not a good idea, they should say so on the record. If it is a good idea, where is it with the federal Government? Is it one of these projects that is going to get cut back in the Western Diversification or in the ERDA grants and all the other projects that we cannot get anywhere with with the federal Government, or is it one of the ones that is on the front burner, not the back burner, like many of the other projects? We would like to hear that if they think it is a good idea. Where is the federal Government, and where are we going from here?

We believe the whole Legislature should support this resolution because the resolves merely state the provincial Government consider reviewing the decision of withdrawing funding, and hopefully they are already doing that. Secondly, that this Assembly declare its belief in this project to obtain provincial funding.

So we would like to know if it is a good idea, where it is. Can we be any help with our colleagues? We tried to help out with the Port of Churchill when there are no ships coming there. We are not always here just to take partisan shots. Sometimes we believe that we should all work together to help our communities. We supported the concept of decentralization of Government Services because we believe in the concept. We will judge each decision on its own individual merit, but -(interjection)- well, anybody should not give out blank cheques, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry for the Member for Portage (Mr. Connery), but I do not think blank cheques are appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good idea in our opinion. The Government should say that. The Government should tell us where it is with the federal Government. If it needs help from all of us, or if there is anything else we can do with the federal Government as a united voice, let us do it. Let us show our unity on this resolution by unanimously passing this resolution today, passing the resolution and voting for a good project for the people of Selkirk, not in a partisan way in Question Period, but in a quiet, non-confrontative way, a way in which all Parties in a minority Government can work together for the benefit of the people of Selkirk.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and we, as I say, look forward to the Government's advice on the status of this excellent project.

**Mrs. Gwen Charles (Selkirk):** This project that the Member for the New Democratic Party has brought forward today has been an ongoing project, as the Member has mentioned, for the whole last decade. It has been a question in the community of Selkirk since I have known it, and in fact in the very initial proposal of the downtown landing project, I was hired to write some articles on the project; I believe it was in '80 or '81.

I have been a long-time proponent of the idea of supporting downtown development in the Town of Selkirk. The development has ranged from different ideas and has now included the development of the riverbank property that is still being held by the council of the Town of Selkirk for future development in a very well structured way.

They are not leaping on board to make whatever dollars they can off the riverbank and have turned down at one time a senior citizens' home planned for the riverbank in order to keep options open for this very profitable land, but more so profitable for the future of Selkirk that it should enhance Selkirk and not limit or obstruct the usage of the river and the riverbank areas.

The project itself as originally planned would require the three levels of Government, the two senior levels putting in a combined \$5 million. When we talk about \$5 million, certainly it is beyond the normal pocketbook of any of us here in this Chamber, but we could have put four of these projects in place for the price of the bridge that we have north of Selkirk, and it goes to show that money is available for projects as chosen.

This project has been studied by various development corporations and by studies themselves would create 220 direct jobs and from it 200 full-time jobs in the area of the Town of Selkirk. It would be a payback for Government within three years from the taxes generated by the project. This indeed is not dumping money into a project that would have no payback. It would be both beneficial for the Government and beneficial for the community itself.

I have heard the argument put forward that they would rather put money into sewer and infrastructure repairs than to put it into a project of this type. My argument to that is the fact that major repairs under this area are required in the infrastructure so that price would be incorporated in doing the plans for this proposal and therefore you would be accomplishing two jobs at one time under one basic chequebook.

It is interesting in our area that this Government is quite willing to put forward money to attract a quarter of a million people to the Oak Hammock Marsh area and touting this as a major tourist attraction.

The Lower Fort Garry is a major tourist attraction already with, I believe, up to a quarter million people per season coming to Lower Fort Garry, and yet, if I recall correctly, it is 1 to 2 percent of the people from Lower Fort Garry that come on into the Town of Selkirk.

It has been the feeling of the Town of Selkirk that there is no major attraction in the shopping districts to attract tourists from Lower Fort Garry into the Town of Selkirk and I feel the same will be true of the Oak Hammock Marsh plans. If that is just going to be a tourist attraction, then we should put something in the area to further attract these tourists up through Selkirk, past Selkirk, into the Interlake, and beyond up into the circle route that we often talk about as necessary to make a viable tourist plan for the Interlake and for the beach area. There is also in our district the Lockport and Selkirk area what has in some departments claimed to be a \$10-million tourist industry in the fishing, trophy fishing, component of the Red River.

You are looking at an area that, hopefully, or as projected, will have an ongoing and growing tourist industry and yet this Government and past Governments have not been able to get together and put money that will pay back in three years into a project that will enhance tourism and enhance the Town of Selkirk.

\* (1720)

It is unfortunate when any citizen and any groups of citizens end up in the runaround of Government structures. I am sure, as MLAs, we all here experience that from time to time as constituents come to us. Perhaps even family members, ourselves, have run into this pass the buck routine where you go here, and if they say yes, you can go there. I think it all reminds us of the times when we were young and we would go to the mother and ask if you could go somewhere, and she would say well what did your father say. You would go to father, and he says what does your mother say.

This is what the Town of Selkirk has been getting for many, many years. I was very pleased during the last provincial election to feel that both Governments had finally come together and put on the books the finalized signatures that would put forward this money. Since that time we have found that this Government does not believe that they were obligated to put forward the money as was apparently signed by the former Government. There has been some discussion of whether this Government should be legally held accountable for what the other Government, past Government, has signed.

Mr. Pawley himself has spoken to me many times and assured me that the papers were signed appropriately, that the money was designated for this project, and yet this Government claims it was not. I will take this—

**An Honourable Member:** Inaccurate information, you are putting inaccurate information on the record.

**Mrs. Charles:** I wish to point out to the Member for Portage (Mr. Connery) that I am quoting, as I understand, the conversations I have had with the former Premier. I am not indicating any verification on my behalf whether that was or was not in place, but it was certainly the intention or seemed to be the intention, as understood by the committee, that this money was in place and that the project was ongoing.

Now there are also the arguments that have been put forward by this Government, and I am sure have been argued in the past, of why Selkirk should be centred for receiving this money. I have spoken on many occasions, in this House, that Selkirk is in a unique position of being close enough to Winnipeg to have to compete with the Winnipeg market, and yet far enough away to have the extra costs of transportation and long-distance phone calls and so forth put as a barrier to industries and companies trying to compete with the City of Winnipeg.

I believe, if there is really a plan by this Government and by all Members in this Legislature to decentralize Government services, that we also have to decentralize municipal monopolies, especially the municipal monopoly that the City of Winnipeg has on the trading district that surrounds the centre of Winnipeg. Selkirk is very much affected by the City of Winnipeg and this Christmas launched a program where interest-free loans were available to citizens if they shopped in Selkirk. They are trying hard to do their best to maintain themselves. I really do believe that if we invest a small amount of money in towns such as Selkirk, as proposed by the Selkirk Landing project, that we would have our money returned as is indicated by reports many times over. Sometimes you have to put this money up front in order to make sure that you have a community that is thriving and living on its own.

If we do not invest in our communities as corporations such as Dow Corning which is now interested in the area, other corporations that perhaps could move out of the City of Winnipeg and encourage decentralization of services will not be as attracted to the Town of Selkirk or any other community of the like if they do not have all the services available that are wanted by people moving into the community. I do not think—and my personal opinion is that this project should not be mini malls as has been indicated by some, but that we should find unique understanding in the Town of Selkirk and create a marketplace for the residents of Winnipeg to come and shop in Selkirk perhaps in more the boutique areas and specializing in the tourist industry.

We have the industry available; we have the community supporting revitalization. We have the need, we have everything but the Governments getting together and agreeing to make the project viable. I support this resolution and am pleased that the Member has brought it forward. I have been reasonably quiet on this issue because I have been requested by the community not to make it into a political confrontational battle. Perhaps, as they were encouraged to do, they could meet together on many occasions and discuss it, because the community had faith that the Government was going to work with them.

To my knowledge, unfortunately that type of association has fallen down somewhat in the last while. The Government has not met with the committee, I believe, in the last five or six months. I hope that this resolution will bring it back to the Government again that the need is still there, that the public is still willing to put forward, that the council is waiting because they have to make the decision. The decision is going forward whether they support downtown redevelopment or

Monday, February 5, 1990

abandon this idea and put strip malls along number 9A Highway.

I think the cost to that in the long run is going to be more to this Government if they have to support in tax basis for the extended sewer lines which will go for miles out Manitoba Avenue to the highway. The amalgamation of the lands and so forth necessary to put in the strip malls and the cost to the highway itself, as they have to put access roads and so forth in, will probably be equal, in the long run, to what would have been the Government's part if they had participated within this proposal as planned. I think it is just poor organization and management if the Government does not look at this proposal one more time and see the cost benefit to the community and to the Government in supporting what can be a very viable project, rather than forcing the town council to go to proposals along the highway that will have added costs both to this Government and to the municipal Government themselves.

It is a very worthwhile project, and I do encourage this Government to take another look at what is proposed by Selkirk and not in any way to think that they have to bow out of past Governments obligations and not be associated with ideas from the past Government. There may not be many, but there are a few ideas that come forward from each Government that are worthwhile taking. I hope this Government will see that this is one of them themselves.

There have been many, many hours put on this proposal by committee Members. I would also like to take this opportunity on behalf of the citizens to thank those that have worked so hard throughout the ten years in putting this proposal continually to various levels of Government at various times and to the commitment of the town councils in holding the land available in hopes that Government would support them some day. I know there is a feeling that Government has let them down by not sitting down at the table and finding out what can be survived out of the original proposal and what can be done to help a town such as Selkirk compete with a market of Winnipeg and add to the enhancement of a tourist industry.

As I have said, and I will reiterate, the proposal will bring money into the province. It will be cost effective definitely within three years, but I suspect for many years ongoing. If this Government wishes to be good managers—and I do hope they will—that they would look at this proposal one more time, because it is beneficial to all. It is a win-win situation and refusal can only be seen as an attitude of stubbornness on this Government's behalf if they do not one more time sit down and look at the issue.

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise to put a few words on the record regarding the Selkirk Downtown Revitalization Project. As Minister of Municipal Affairs for a year, I had a considerable amount of time to have discussions with the people of the downtown Selkirk redevelopment project, as I had a considerable amount of time to have discussions with those who were looking after the downtown redevelopment projects in Dauphin,

Brandon and Portage la Prairie. Frankly there are a number of communities across this province that have had to realistically look at the long-term development of their communities. Long-term development of the community means that the community cannot just survive on piecemeal implementation of plans.

We saw the previous administration put a fair bit of money into the Main Street Manitoba project. A lot of main streets across the Province of Manitoba now have identical rustic sidewalks, identical flowerpots, identical rustic lighting and it has enhanced esthetically a lot of the storefronts on various businesses across the communities in Manitoba. Other than the actual construction jobs that were involved at that time, I am not too sure how much long-term lasting jobs and stability this put into those communities.

\* (1730)

We need to put into the communities of rural Manitoba, as we do in the City of Winnipeg. Any community that wants to build its long-term stability needs to be able to put forward a number of proper faces to those who would invest and those who would build and plan to be there for the long haul. You need to have stable jobs and to have those stable jobs in an awful lot of communities, you have to have some infrastructure to go with it.

When we look across the Province of Manitoba and look at the problems that we are faced with, in terms of encouraging the development of these communities, we find ourselves with a very interesting situation. A lot of the issues that are brought forward are related to the communities such as Selkirk, Steinbach, Portage la Prairie, Brandon, and Dauphin. They all have one thing in common, Mr. Speaker, in that every one of them, to a larger or less degree, has a need for a genuine ability to expand that is limited by the infrastructure that is presently in place, their ability, their capacity to deal with growth is severely restricted because of their sewer and water responsibilities.

Not knowing that I was going to end up being a Minister of Environment, I can tell you that I have had that amply reinforced, however, since I came into this ministry because we do have a common problem with all of those communities across the province.

I met with the people in Selkirk on a number of occasions. I have walked the area where they are hoping to bring forward a project. I do not in any way want to minimize the potential that they see in that project. They see that as an opportunity for core area development and bringing into play some new businesses into the community.

I do not totally accept the argument that this has to be done or they are going to end up with strip malls along Highway 9. Undoubtedly, there is going to be some pressure to build on the highway frontage, but they are the local planning authority. They are the oldest planning authority in the Province of Manitoba. They were the first to receive the level of independence in planning that they have. They have ways and means of controlling the peripheral development, and making sure that they get the development in the areas of their community, which they believe it should be.

They are not without assets to work with in terms of their downtown redevelopment. Selkirk, along with cities like Portage la Prairie, was blessed with some very farsighted city fathers when the area was laid out. It has one of the widest main streets that you are going to find anywhere, one that is attractive, one that can be used with ample parking and is not going to be crowded as businesses are built up on the street or within a block or so of that street. The community has the asset of the Red River. That is obviously the linkage that they wish to make with this project.

But, when we came into Government and we looked at the request that was before us, and then we looked at what plans had been made and how the former Premier had developed this aura within the community, it became very apparent that the previous Premier Pawley got into a staring match with that well-known and beloved and presently the cultural czar for the federal Government, Felix Holtmann. He had blinked and he said, by golly, I will match those dollars; do not worry. Then he went back to his Cabinet colleagues and he did not say anything. I am not sure whether he went back whipped and beaten or whether he went back and simply found the support was not there, but we have no track of where he ever set aside that money. We have no track of the commitment that was ever followed through on behalf of that Government.

We have an aura out there and an expectation that was created by Premier—but one that we can see was never intended to be included in the budget of the Day. We are not without showing support for the community. The community of Selkirk has seen a fair bit of Government support. We look at the development dollars that have gone into the area and there will be those who will argue, because money has gone into highways and all that is doing is letting the people truck right on by.

On the other hand, if the money did not go into the highways, people would argue, well, they would not want to go there because they have to ride over potholes for half an hour to even get close to the community. If we look at the plans for Highway 9, we look at the dollars that have been spent into the great white elephant north of the town. In fact, we may have a tourist attraction there that will improve the activity in that area.

Well, they say it is a two-lane wonder. The bicycle path on the side of it will become one of the better known tourist attractions, where you take pictures of the boats floating under the bridge, but you may need zoom lens on your camera because you are 70 feet up in the air in order to be able to get a close-up of some of those small boats that are going by underneath.

The fact is there has been a lot of money spent in this area, Mr. Speaker, not specifically in the project of the downtown redevelopment plans would call for, but specifically in that area in order to create economic activity in the Selkirk area.

If you also wanted to look at Highway 230, the acquisition of the right-of-way for the proposed corridor, that is being done. There has been a lot of money go into that area. This Government completed the access

roads that were needed for the bridge that was put together. This Government has not, in any way, shied from our responsibility in terms of development and infrastructure needs for municipalities across the province. We do have to be fair and reasonable on how we approach those needs.

We know the City of Brandon needs 15 million just to make sure that their discharge into the Assiniboine River can come close to beating standards. We know the City of Portage la Prairie probably needs something close to 30 million. We know that Steinbach is now limited by the number of houses that they can build because they simply do not have the sewer and water capacity to deal with them, and unless that is dealt with in the near future, they will not be able to strengthen their underpinning as well. Even the Town of Selkirk itself, as it strives to get more jobs and industries in the town, is going to have to have a development plant to expand its sewer and water capabilities as well.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, adds up to the fact that when we came to Government, we found no evidence of the fact that the gentleman who had indicated that there was going to be provincial assistance had ever gone and taken the necessary steps to assure that. We were in a political firefight, if you will. Some perhaps not carefully considered words were uttered. They were put on the record by the press, the media and the local promoters. It did not end up in any firm commitment that other important items would be set aside, so that this project would receive its funding. That was not done. We know that we are faced with a number of commitments across the province that we are going to have to deal with, not the least of which will be downtown reconstruction in a number of communities.

We are not going to get ourselves in a position, Mr. Speaker, where we will put bricks, where we will put asphalt or where we will put concrete down a street and then have to go back within half a dozen years and tear that up in order to replace the sewer and water that is underneath it, or put money into facades, knowing that the outfalls of their sewage plant is not capable of handling the capacity it is being faced with. We have too many examples of towns like Teulon where the economic opportunity is going to go to waste if they cannot develop the sewer capacity to handle the discharge from their one main industry.

\* (1740)

Every place in this province, Mr. Speaker, where we have a wet industry, where we have the further processing of agricultural products, largely requires extensive treatment of sewage for wet industries. Those need to be there to provide us with the value-added growth that this province needs.

We are committed to that type of expansion, but we are not going to be browbeaten by the hollow words of a previous administration that did not go back and put it into action to make sure that the people they were speaking to were guaranteed that type of verbiage. They were simply given a snow job, Mr. Speaker. It was not constituted in setting aside the priorities in the Government of the Day, and now they have left them

with a situation where they were given a hollow promise, where this Government was not given the tools in the form of designation of funds.

We are prepared to continue to work with Selkirk, with Brandon, with Portage la Prairie, to work with the Selkirks of this province, to work with the City of Winnipeg to make sure that the prioritization of projects of this type of expenditure are very clearly dealt with in a level of priority that provides the best jobs in terms of creation of jobs but provides the opportunity for growth. Mr. Speaker, the growth in the various communities needs to be assured. I can look to my own community.

The Member over there can take some pride in the fact that the previous administration put some money into the infrastructure so that Neepawa could have the hog plant. There is an example of thinking forward, putting the money for the job development, putting the job forward for the growth and the value-added aspect of these industries that we need across rural Manitoba. I would encourage him to apply that same type of thinking even though he is sitting in Opposition today because that is the kind of investment that will build these communities to their potential to the very best of their ability and within the capacity of the communities and the province to work together.

The bottom line is that we need reasoned, practical investment to assure the growth of our municipalities and the towns within those municipalities. That is what this Government is committed to. We will not make false promises that we cannot live up to and we will not live up to the false promises made by previous administrations.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) is worried that we are not going to be able to vote on it because I want to speak to this particular resolution. I am going to keep my comments very brief so that in fact we can accommodate the passage of this resolution.

I was very sad to see that the Government of the Day back in January of 1989 had to withdraw their ZV terms of this particular project in Selkirk. Mr. Speaker, you and all Members of this Chamber no doubt know the importance of having revitalization in not only the urban areas but also the rural communities. Many of the rural towns and communities too deserve to have their towns revitalized wherever it is feasible.

I find that it was somewhat unfortunate to see that the Government of the Day had seen fit to withdraw the funds out of this particular riding, out of this particular town. The loss of the Selkirk landing project is a major blow to the Selkirk region. The are many positive impacts that would have resulted had the money flowed in to improving this, Selkirk. As I have tried to point out, the revitalization of the rural areas is indeed very crucial. I can only relate to some of the things that have gone on in the City of Winnipeg. In fact, even in my own riding of Weston and Shaughnessy Park where we have revitalization programs, these programs have done wonders in terms of improving the community, in particular in Weston where it is actually starting to wind down.

When I first moved back to Winnipeg, I had moved into Weston and had lived there for several years. The monies that were used, you could start to see the improvement from the Weston Revitalization Board as the years proceeded. If you drive down the streets and avenues in Weston, you will see a very remarkable change, in terms of how the community has really come alive, and how it has united the community together. You have a very strong both residents' association and residential revitalization board. Now they have adopted a sense of a community. That is very important, Mr. Speaker.

I feel that a program, that this resolution, which the Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) and in fact the Liberal Party supports, would go a long way in doing for Selkirk what has been done for Weston and in fact the downtown areas of the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker. I find that it is somewhat unfortunate that the Government of the Day, the NDP administration, the Premier himself represented that riding, and that the action was not taken in a much more faster—

\*\*\*\*\*

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Second Opposition):** A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Concordia, on a point of order.

**Mr. Doer:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Inkster should read the comments of the Member for Selkirk on January 25, 1989, and he will know and be able to speak in a consistent way in this House, which should be against the Rules of Order if you are not speaking in a consistent manner between two Members of the same Party.

**Mr. Speaker:** On the point of order raised by the Honourable Member for Concordia, the Honourable Member is aware he does not have a point of order. It is a dispute over the facts. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Concordia does not have a point of order. It is somewhat unfortunate. The Member for Concordia, in defence of his former Leader, is quick to jump up to address what I had just finished stating.

The provincial Government could have developed a revitalization program such as the Weston or Shaughnessy Park or Spence-Memorial, and so forth, Mr. Speaker, in the Selkirk location.—(interjection)— Well, the Member for Concordia just said it himself. Weston, Shaughnessy Park, Spence-Memorial is two-level funding. The Government of the Day could have come up with a revitalization program. As the Member for Concordia said, the federal Government did not want to go in on it, the provincial Government could have gone in co-operation with the chamber or the council in Selkirk and come up with a similar program which would have been able to see some of the improvements

Monday, February 5, 1990

that the Member for Concordia is proposing come forward.

On that note, Mr. Speaker, I did want to get on the record in favour of revitalization programs in general, because as I have pointed out, it does do wonders for the community in terms of improving the outlooks and so forth for that community, in addition to making it cohesive. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) seems to be very upset that I made the comments that the former Premier of the province did not forge ahead with some type of revitalization program. He fails to realize that if the federal dollars and the civic dollars are not there, the province can take the responsibility of having their own revitalizational program if necessary. They can establish a program. The Member for Concordia says, should I say no to federal funds? No, I would not suggest that we say no to the funds.

\* (1750)

What I am saying is that the Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) himself is the one who is being inconsistent with the remarks that he is saying, as I am speaking this afternoon. Maybe, that is probably the best way to leave this particular resolution. I would hope that it does, in fact, pass here this afternoon.

The Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) should be somewhat humiliated in terms of the past performance of the Government in Selkirk, and I know he was very disappointed to see that particular riding go down to defeat. He can rest assured that the current Member for Selkirk (Mrs. Charles) who has been working very hard in the constituency and has stated in her own remarks that this is an issue that she herself would not want to politicize, that this is an issue in which the politics aspect should be taken out and the better and the good for the Town of Selkirk. I think it is a very honourable notion from the Member for Selkirk, and I support her comments which she has made here this afternoon. The Member for Concordia, I think, would do well, if he too would support the Member's comments from Selkirk here this afternoon. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Mr. Speaker, as I rise today to participate in debate on the resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Concordia, the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer), I am reminded of the last election campaign where the New Democrats adopted late in the campaign, in addition to a new Leader, a new campaign slogan, that being, as I recall, new leadership, new direction, New Democrats.

In that regard I find it passing strange that the Honourable Member for Concordia wants to stand today in the shadow of the former leader of his Party, the former Premier of our province, Howard Pawley, the former MLA for Selkirk. I hear the Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) throughout the election campaign gently repudiating his former Leader and gently—I say, gently—repudiating some of the policies of the previous Government, for there were still some on side, I suppose, with the former Leader.

The Honourable Member brings forward this particular resolution to call attention to a commitment made by the former Leader of the New Democratic Party, the MLA for Selkirk, Howard Pawley.

This commitment was something that was never completed. The funding arrangements were not finalized. There were no appropriations identified in any budget that would identify where those funds should come from. As I understand it, there was no Treasury Board approval. There was a Premier, an MLA for Selkirk, standing alone, crying in the wilderness about this particular issue. I come from a community that could benefit from this type of thing, too, so does the Honourable Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton). The Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) seems to want to adopt today, contrary to the election slogan, a style of government that is reminiscent of the style of his previous Leader, that being a badly mismanaged Government. Now I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the approach being taken today by the Honourable Member for Concordia is probably something he is doing out of respect for his former leader.

**Mr. Doer:** I am leading the Party now.

**Mr. McCrae:** Now he says he is leading the charge in this regard. But I do suggest that the Honourable Member for Concordia is doing little more than standing in the shadow of his former leader, and it is not really for me to give the present Leader of the New Democratic Party a lot of advice, but for today—

**An Honourable Member:** Remember the GST rally tomorrow in Brandon.

**Mr. McCrae:** —for today he might be interested in just a little bit of advice, and that would be to put as much distance as he possibly can between his present performance and the performance of the previous Government that he so enthusiastically supported.

It is because of that enthusiastic support, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member and his Party did not do quite as well in the last election as they had hoped. It is very hard to distance oneself in such a short period of time from that sorry record of failure of the previous New Democratic Party Government.

Now, in the Honourable Member's defence, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that he was only a Member of that caucus, that Cabinet, for the last two years of its existence and so we will give him a little leeway for that and say perhaps it is not too late to look for new directions from the New Democratic Party. It is not too late to look for that new leadership, it has been elusive so far, but we are watching for it I can tell you, Mr. Speaker.

My colleagues and I, of course, have tried very hard, not only to talk about rural development, not only to talk about development of those parts of our province which lie outside the Perimeter Highway, but also to actually do something about it, and this is an area where I think we have received a fair amount of lip service from the previous Government, and here we

go into a little more advice to the Honourable Member for Concordia. Get away from that idea of just lip service to everything. The Liberals are garnering the market on lip service. The NDP can still stand for something, and I believe that the people are reaching out and asking the NDP to stand for something. We need a real Opposition in this House; goodness knows we are not getting it from the Liberal Party.

So I think that there is still hope for that concept of new leadership and new directions. It has been nearly two years since that was the platform put forward. The people are slow to come around after the performance of the past, but there are indications that it could happen. I do not know just where just now, but it could happen, Mr. Speaker, and on the off chance that it will, I suggest the Honourable Member should be ready and stop standing in the shadow of the previous Leader of the New Democratic Party.

Now, across the aisle of the Chamber a few moments ago the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Doer) and I were exchanging a little friendly banter about the previous Government and, let us face it, we all know that Howard Pawley is, and was, a very nice man and no one is challenging that, but he was not a competent Premier, and let us face up to that.

The people noticed that—

**An Honourable Member:** If you are in six and a half years then you can start making comments, you have a few more to go.

**Mr. McCrae:** I do not pretend to have been here as long as the former Honourable Member for Selkirk, and I do not really want to belittle his achievements and his contribution to Manitoba society because there was a record of service there that should not go unnoticed, or even unremarked upon. So let that be said, but let us also say the people did make a decision about that particular Government.

The way to run Government is not to go running out here and there, perhaps opening the back door of the Brinks truck everywhere you go and offering that helping cheque book to each and all who come along.

By saying that, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, the Selkirk proposal, the Brandon proposals, the Thompson proposals, are all very important, and I certainly do not mean to or want in any way to lessen the importance of the development of those communities.

I do say that my community of Brandon was more or less left out when it came to the previous Government's Mainstreet Manitoba Program. I should not say more or less. They were left out. Brandon—

**An Honourable Member:** Len Evans built that town.

**Mr. McCrae:** The Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) suggests that the Honourable Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) built the City of Brandon.

Well, Mr. Speaker, other than the clock standing atop the McKenzie Seeds building, known affectionately in Brandon as "Big Len," I really do not know what else could be said about the performance of the Honourable Member for Brandon East, except that he too was a nice man, is a nice man. I give him that. A nice man to be with and to be seen with, but really when we are talking about contributions over a long career span, I think the Honourable Member for Concordia and I might want to talk privately about the record of the Honourable Member for Brandon East when it comes to long-term contributions to his community. It is not to say he was not there and was not trying, but when you have a Winnipeg-based Party as the NDP was and is, it was always a difficult thing for the Honourable Member for Brandon East to get his points heard and understood and respected by his colleagues.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. The hour being 6 p.m., I am interrupting the proceedings according to the Rules. When this matter is again before the House, the Honourable Minister will have seven minutes remaining.

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