



First Session - Thirty-Fifth Legislature  
of the  
**Legislative Assembly of Manitoba**

---

**DEBATES  
and  
PROCEEDINGS  
(HANSARD)**

---

39 Elizabeth II

---

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



**VOL. XXXIX No. 45 - 1:30 p.m., THURSDAY, DECEMBER 13, 1990**



**MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**  
**Thirty-Fifth Legislature**

**Members, Constituencies and Political Affiliation**

NAME	CONSTITUENCY	PARTY
ALCOCK, Reg	Osborne	Liberal
ASHTON, Steve	Thompson	NDP
BARRETT, Becky	Wellington	NDP
CARR, James	Crescentwood	Liberal
CARSTAIRS, Sharon	River Heights	Liberal
CERILLI, Marianne	Radisson	NDP
CHEEMA, Gulzar	The Maples	Liberal
CHOMIAK, Dave	Kildonan	NDP
CONNERY, Edward, Hon.	Portage la Prairie	PC
CUMMINGS, Glen, Hon.	Ste. Rose	PC
DACQUAY, Louise	Seine River	PC
DERKACH, Leonard, Hon.	Roblin-Russell	PC
DEWAR, Gregory	Selkirk	NDP
DOER, Gary	Concordia	NDP
DOWNEY, James, Hon.	Arthur-Virden	PC
DRIEDGER, Albert, Hon.	Steinbach	PC
DUCHARME, Gerry, Hon.	Riel	PC
EDWARDS, Paul	St. James	Liberal
ENNS, Harry, Hon.	Lakeside	PC
ERNST, Jim, Hon.	Charleswood	PC
EVANS, Clif	Interlake	NDP
EVANS, Leonard S.	Brandon East	NDP
FILMON, Gary, Hon.	Tuxedo	PC
FINDLAY, Glen, Hon.	Springfield	PC
FRIESEN, Jean	Wolseley	NDP
GAUDRY, Neil	St. Boniface	Liberal
GILLESHAMMER, Harold, Hon.	Minnedosa	PC
HARPER, Elijah	Rupertsland	NDP
HELWER, Edward R.	Gimli	PC
HICKES, George	Point Douglas	NDP
LAMOUREUX, Kevin	Inkster	Liberal
LATHLIN, Oscar	The Pas	NDP
LAURENDEAU, Marcel	St. Norbert	PC
MALOWAY, Jim	Elmwood	NDP
MANNES, Clayton, Hon.	Morris	PC
MARTINDALE, Doug	Burrows	NDP
McALPINE, Gerry	Sturgeon Creek	PC
McCRAE, James, Hon.	Brandon West	PC
McINTOSH, Linda	Assiniboia	PC
MITCHELSON, Bonnie, Hon.	River East	PC
NEUFELD, Harold, Hon.	Rossmere	PC
ORCHARD, Donald, Hon.	Pembina	PC
PENNER, Jack, Hon.	Emerson	PC
PLOHMAN, John	Dauphin	NDP
PRAZNIK, Darren, Hon.	Lac du Bonnet	PC
REID, Daryl	Transcona	NDP
REIMER, Jack	Niakwa	PC
RENDER, Shirley	St. Vital	PC
ROCAN, Denis, Hon.	Gladstone	PC
ROSE, Bob	Turtle Mountain	PC
SANTOS, Conrad	Broadway	NDP
STEFANSON, Eric	Kirkfield Park	PC
STORIE, Jerry	Flin Flon	NDP
SVEINSON, Ben	La Verendrye	PC
VODREY, Rosemary	Fort Garry	PC
WASYLYCIA-LEIS, Judy	St. Johns	NDP
WOWCHUK, Rosann	Swan River	NDP

# LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, December 13, 1990

The House met at 1:30 p.m.

## PRAYERS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

#### PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

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

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry (Mrs. Vodrey), that the report of the committee be received.

Motion agreed to.

### TABLING OF REPORTS

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** I would like to table the Annual Report of Environment and Workplace Safety and Health for 1987-88.

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Speaker:** Prior to Oral Questions, may I direct the attention of Honourable Members to the gallery where we have from the Victor H.L. Wyatt School fifteen Grade 9 students. They are under the direction of Kelly Regush. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay).

Also this afternoon from the Prince Charles School, we have seventy-nine Grade 9 students. They are under the direction of Mrs. Laurie Bjornson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Connery).

Also this afternoon from the Linwood School, we have sixteen Grade 5 students. They are under the direction of Ed Hume. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards).

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

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

### Goods and Services Tax Amendments

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, as we move into the twilight of 1990, we continue to see the Conservatives pressing through the most unpopular tax in the history of our country, and a tax that is coming in at absolutely the wrong time. Even their own economic advisers indicate that.

Of course, we have had projections next year that corporations will make a 12 percent increase in profits with the GST, and in fact individuals, families and communities will lose disposable income with the recession.

My question to the Minister of Finance is: Was he involved in the proposed amendments that are being put forward by Michael Wilson, and does he think those amendments are fair given the fact that we all agree that the tax itself is unfair?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I am bewildered at the question. I am wondering when the other foot is coming down. Certainly the federal Department of Finance has not consulted with me or to the best of my knowledge my officials with respect to the drafting of amendments that may be coming down either to the Bill or indeed to regulations that may be necessary flowing out of the federal legislation. The short answer is no.

**Mr. Doer:** Mr. Speaker, the other shoe will fall on January 1, 1991, for all Canadians.

\* (1335)

### Exemptions

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is to the Minister of Finance.

The provincial Governments have been lobbying for a change in the relationship with the GST between their administrations and the administration of the GST in Ottawa. One of the changes of course that is being made by the proposed Wilson amendments is the relationship

between the provinces and their lotteries and the federal Government.

My question to the Minister of Finance is: Did this Government ever lobby on behalf of Manitobans to not only stop the tax, which of course was not referenced in their Ministers of Finance meeting last week, but also to look at exempting other more important and fairer issues like heating fuel for the winter, like textbooks for students, non-profit organizations, health care institutions and other facilities and programs in Manitoba that will have a devastating effect on our communities when the GST is introduced January 1, 1991?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I am still bewildered at the question of the Member opposite. It is as if his Ontario source of commentary has not been verified in his own mind.

Let me say to the Leader of the NDP that we have made strong representation on many of those issues, certainly in the area of the non-profit groups and how they will be treated, unfortunately in a variation of ways under the proposed legislation of the federal Government. To that end, my officials were in Ottawa on Tuesday dialoguing again on this and many other issues with respect to the GST.

**Mr. Doer:** Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have confirmed that the Minister's officials were dialoguing on the GST. I wonder if the Minister can table in this Chamber the position that Manitoba took with the federal Government on exemptions.

Michael Wilson, who has been called by the Minister of Finance the most honest Finance Minister in the history of this country—he said that in this Chamber, and he knows that well—said that there would be no exemptions and no changes to the GST before its introduction. Now we find that he is making exemptions, exemptions for the Lotteries Commission and other programs of the provincial Government.

Will this Minister fight for exemptions for textbooks, for non-profit organizations, for our health care institutions, for education, for heating fuel, for hydro, which they have refused to do, and other absolutely essential programs that are going to be GST'd by his Tory friends in Ottawa?

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Speaker, the short answer again is yes, and we continue to do so. We did discuss, again in great depth. Mr. Gannon and Mr. Boschmann, known well to the Leader of the Opposition, were in heavy discussion on these and

many other issues on Tuesday of this week from one o'clock till 5:10 on Tuesday afternoon.

I can say to the Member opposite that our hands are tied in some areas because, for instance municipalities have sensed that the rebate that is being offered by the federal Government is fair. When we make representation on behalf of the municipalities and to some extent hospitals, they have in some cases signed off their argument because they believe the rebate that is being provided by the federal Government is fair.

We still sense that as a Government we are going to be asked to pick up still a larger amount of money—in our case, still a couple of million dollars of shortfall as between what is now paid by hospital acquisition in terms of the federal sales tax buried and the new approach. I say to the Member, we are continuing to do battle in many of these areas.

### Judicial System Public Confidence

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister told us that problems in the judicial system were due to people not reading the same newspaper clippings as this Minister. Now, the Manitoba Criminal liars—Lawyers Association—

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

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

**Mr. Chomiak:** Mr. Speaker, in case my friends opposite had noticed, that was a mistake in wording. This is a rather—

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

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

**Mr. Chomiak:** Mr. Speaker, once the Members quiet down and deal with the problems properly, I will continue my question.

The public has lost confidence in this Minister in the administration of justice in this province. The only person that has any confidence in the system appears to be the Minister. It appears to be in the mind of the Minister.

What steps will he take to restore public confidence in the judicial system of this province?

\* (1340)

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** I will begin my answer, Mr.

Speaker, by referring to the Crown attorneys' code of professional conduct adopted in September of this year. It says, the Crown attorney—and in this case, I stand in the place of a Crown attorney as all the Crown attorneys are Justice Ministers or stand in the place of the Justice Minister. It says in that code of professional conduct that the Crown attorney shall deal in a courteous, ethical and professional manner with defence counsel, for example, not take advantage of or consciously attempt to intimidate defence counsel.

I will not approach my answers today in an effort to intimidate the Honourable Member or one Mr. Rocky Pollack, who raises issues on the front pages of the Winnipeg Free Press today.

I will refer to the various issues raised by Mr. Pollack and his comments by saying that our staff have developed this code of professional conduct for prosecutors which is the first of its kind anywhere.

I will tell the Honourable Member that our caseload in the City of Winnipeg alone exceeded 22,000 cases per year. Only a handful attract attention and, of these, in the past 15 years only two have been reported to the Law Society, which resulted in one caution and one reprimand being issued. Perhaps I will have an opportunity to carry on.

### Inquiry

**Mr. Dave Chomiak (Kildonan):** Mr. Speaker, surely the Minister cannot be satisfied with decreasing morale amongst law officials, prosecutors, attorneys and police officials over the number of the cases that have been thrown out recently.

Will he not take steps to restore confidence in the system and launch an inquiry?

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** When I took over this department in May of 1988, Mr. Speaker, it was in a shambles, having been totally neglected by the previous Government. We were in the midst of a scandal known as ticketgate which required a fair amount of attention on my part.

We enlisted the services and the help of one Mr. Archie Dewar, former Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench of Manitoba, who gave us some advice. Honourable Members opposite will recall their support for what I was doing at that time and

their support for carrying out the recommendations of the Dewar review.

I have in my hand a package of documents. Since February of this year, extending to October, perhaps as late as November of this year, we have developed and refined policies relating from any number of issues, and I can list them very quickly, Mr. Speaker: from disclosure, charges against teachers and child care workers, laying of charges, staying of charges, parental abduction, spousal abuse, Crown counsels conduct at law, conflict of interest, last minute replacements, judicial misconduct and all the way down to dress code.

Mr. Speaker, much has been done and is being done to address the issues related to the confidence that I want the public to have in the administration of justice in our province, just as much as the Honourable Member.

**Mr. Chomiak:** Mr. Speaker, those comments are small comfort to the victims and their families.

The First Minister has no problem flip-flopping and changing his position on many issues and I admire that. Will this Minister consider -(interjection)- that is right, we see it everyday in this House.

Will this Minister consider an inquiry, given the public confidence in the justice system is probably at the lowest level ever today, not six months ago, not two years ago?

\* (1345)

**Mr. McCrae:** I do not admire anybody who consistently flip-flops, Mr. Speaker. The fact is, I believe that from my office there has been a consistent effort to restore and maintain confidence in the justice system.

I do say though that if Mr. Rocky Pollack or if the Honourable Member for Kildonan have complaints, why have they never made one to myself, the Deputy Attorney General or any senior Justice official? The department regularly meets with our counterparts across the country. The suggestion was made that others from outside our jurisdiction are making comments. I can only say that the Ottawa lawyers and judges envy Winnipeg's success, as I referred to yesterday.

We do consult people from outside Manitoba on a regular basis. They come to us to seek our advice on professionalism, ethics, women's issues, aboriginal issues and substantive criminal law. My only question is, why was no complaint ever made

to me, the Deputy Attorney General or anyone else about this? We have a continuing Justice Liaison Committee with the Bar Association—

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

### Remand Centre Construction Contaminated Soil

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Environment.

Yesterday the Minister indicated that the fuel tanks at the old provincial garage were removed some three years ago. I believe the Premier made those statements in the hall as well. That would conveniently make the responsible Party the former NDP administration.

### Point of Order

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I did not make any such statement in the hall or anywhere else.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. The Honourable the First Minister does not have a point of order. It is a dispute over the facts.

\*\*\*

**Mr. Edwards:** Mr. Speaker, if in fact what had been said was true, it would have conveniently made the former New Democratic Party responsible at the time those tanks were taken out.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we now learn that those tanks were removed in August of 1988 under this administration.

Mr. Speaker, the regulations on this issue were passed in February of 1988. Those regulations say that the owner must test the tanks when they are removed, must immediately notify the Department of the Environment and clean up the contaminated soil to the satisfaction of the department.

My question is for the Minister of the Environment. Why did this Government in August of 1988 not respect its own laws with respect to the cleaning up of contaminated soil?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Speaker, just so the record is clear, it was myself who indicated in the hallway that it was approximately three years ago the tanks were removed, but that was not meant to abrogate us of any responsibility.

In fact, it is very clear where the responsibility lies. It lies with the department of this Government. We will make sure that the cleanup is done in the best possible manner.

I would like to indicate that one of the things that is still ongoing on that site is that we want to make sure that we have ascertained wherever that fuel may have migrated within the soil. As soon as we have that final information, then a complete cleanup can be finished.

**Mr. Edwards:** Mr. Speaker, this site was started to be worked on, with respect to the contaminated soil, two weeks ago. The regulation uses the word "immediately." August of 1988 was when those tanks were removed.

### Environmental Laws Enforcement

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** My question is to the same Minister. Given that today we have learned of another spill in which a private company was involved, Mr. Speaker, how does this Government expect the private sector to respect the law that they themselves have written when it is clearly demonstrating that it will flaunt the law if it chooses so to do?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Speaker, as I referred to the Member yesterday, perhaps he should have been asking me about a spill that had not yet been in the process of cleanup.

As a matter of fact, we do intend to make sure that all of our avenues of potential prosecution are explored, and if there has been a deliberate -(interjection)- if there has been any wrongdoing, intentional or otherwise, we will make sure that is corrected.

\* (1350)

**Mr. Edwards:** Mr. Speaker, I look forward to that prosecution of the Government against itself because for two years they let a contaminated site sit and that is against the law.

My final question is for the Minister. Mr. Speaker, for some time now our Party has proposed a plan that would establish a system for monitoring and spot checking the inventories of services stations.

Why has this Government refused to acknowledge the seriousness of the dangers to both public safety and to the environment, which is no more clearly demonstrated by the fact that nobody

thought it important enough to even inform the Environment Minister? The Government of the Day in August of '88—this Government—did not take the required steps according to the laws that they had written.

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Speaker, I happened to be in Halifax I believe the day that the report should have come through to my office regarding the Government garage. The fact is the Department of Environment had responded. Some 6,000 cubic metres of contaminated soil are and were removed under supervision. Additional testing of the radius of the site is to be undertaken in conjunction with a consultant that the Department of Government Services has hired.

It is ongoing and I can certainly report that in the case of the Nelson River truck that we are taking every caution to make sure that we are able to retrieve the truck without any amount of fuel being leaked into the waterway.

### North Dakota Waste Disposal Site Water Quality

**Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Environment.

We have seen that whether it is on Rafferty dam, protecting wildlife management areas, setting energy conservation standards, this Government has not placed a priority on protection of the environment.

Currently there is another issue to add to the list. There is an application to build a disposal site for incinerator waste in North Dakota which may have a hazardous effect on Manitoba. This Government has been silent.

I am tabling a letter from the chief of medical staff at the Souris Hospital who is concerned about how this proposal will affect Souris' drinking water.

My question to the Minister is: What is this Government's position on this proposal?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Speaker, we have had a member of staff attending all of the relevant meetings in the North Dakota area. We have made a letter of our concern available to the responsible licensing authorities. We have kept ourselves apprised of all of the relevant information regarding this site.

We continue to be sure that everything that would possibly affect the Manitoba side is carried forward

to be put in front of the American officials so that we can be confident that whatever they may choose to do there, if anything, does not affect that waterway.

### Manitoba Study

**Ms. Marianne Cerilli (Radisson):** Mr. Speaker, my first supplementary is for the same Minister.

Given the fact that this proposal may have an impact on the Town of Souris, as the study by the hydro geologist of North Dakota which I am tabling suggests, what studies has his department done to assure the residents in Souris that their drinking water will be safe?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Mr. Speaker, our people have been quite involved with the information that is being collected in regard to the licensing of this site. That information is being closely studied. Concerns that we have regarding the site are being relayed to the licensing officials. As a matter of fact, some considerable time over this past six to eight months has been put toward monitoring and conveying our concerns to the officials on the other side of the border.

Frankly, it seems to me that any time we have the Souris River involved, we want to make sure that we are doubly cautious about what we are doing.

**Ms. Cerilli:** Mr. Speaker, will this Minister clarify that there will be a study done to ensure that there will be no impact on Souris' drinking water?

**Mr. Cummings:** Mr. Speaker, if the Member is saying that we have not been getting all of the information we can and putting that together to make an opinion about what possible effects there could be from that site, then she is wrong.

We are working and have had a person assigned to this responsibility all summer to make sure that anything that could occur there that would be potentially dangerous to the Souris River and ultimately to the population on this side of the border is being adequately considered and that all safe practices are imposed upon that site if there is to be a site there at all.

\* (1355)

### Cross Lake, Manitoba Water Quality

**Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupertsland):** My question is to the Minister of the Environment.

On Wednesday, near Cross Lake, a truck went through the ice and threatened the community's water supply. Can the Minister of the Environment tell the House when he expects to hear whether a tank that fell through the ice yesterday is leaking gas into the water supply of Cross Lake?

**Hon. Glen Cummings (Minister of Environment):** Apparently divers went down this morning and they did have some good news for us, although obviously we are a long way from having the potential problem solved.

It appears that the truck is not in as deep water as it was originally thought to be which would have caused considerable consternation and problems. Arrangements were being made and it is possible that they will be attempting to remove the truck from the river this afternoon. The question remains, what is the best way to remove it and remove it intact?

The report that I have is that there is some reason to be optimistic, that we will be able to get the truck and the material that it contains out of the river safely. I certainly hope that will be the case.

**Mr. Harper:** I thank the Minister for that answer. I know he remains optimistic. I was wondering what measures the Minister has taken to ensure a safe water supply for the residents of Cross Lake, what the department is doing?

**Mr. Cummings:** I welcome the opportunity to address that specific issue because one of the first actions that was taken upon notification that there had been an accident was to ask the community of Cross Lake to shut off their water treatment plant so there was no further intake. One of the most problematic things that could occur would be if there was to be contamination by fuel going into a water system.

Further to that, they have imposed upon themselves, I believe, some rationing in order to keep their use of water limited as much as possible. Alternative arrangements are being made to truck in potable drinking water until we are absolutely sure that any potential risk to that water system has passed their intake.

### **Cross Lake, Manitoba Pipestone Crossing Bridge**

**Mr. Elijah Harper (Rupertsland):** My final question would be to the Minister of Transportation.

Last week this Government tried to claim it had an enviable record of building bridges. I would like

to ask the Minister when could the people of Cross Lake expect a bridge at Pipestone Crossing?

**Hon. Albert Driedger (Minister of Highways and Transportation):** Mr. Speaker, let me first of all say that I am very proud of the record of this Government in terms of the money and the priority they have put in transportation, bridges and roads. I am also proud of the record of this Government in terms of how we consult with the people in Manitoba in terms of what priorities should be coming up.

We have consulted with the group as well. It is one of the considerations that the Government is dealing with. When it is being prioritized and brought forward, certainly it will be under consideration.

### **Manitoba Nurses' Union Negotiations**

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition):** Mr. Speaker, as we near the end of 1990 we are faced with some very serious health care problems.

On Saturday the nurses of this province have been called together for the purposes of a strike vote. I do not think the nurses or anyone else in the Province of Manitoba want nurses to go on strike. The Government is already on the record as saying that they have some sympathy with the nurses in the Province of Manitoba and the fact that their salaries have been inadequate in comparison with other provinces.

Can the Minister of Health tell the House if there will be a money offer on the table for the nurses prior to their having to take the strike vote so they can think there is some optimism in their negotiation process with the Government of the Province of Manitoba?

\* (1400)

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** Mr. Speaker, I can agree with my honourable friend, the Leader of the Liberal Party, in that no one in this province is in any way wishing to see a withdrawal of services by the nurses. That is why we approach the negotiating process very, very seriously, not only the formal negotiating process but other initiatives of this Government to bring nursing issues really to the national agenda, for instance in hosting the National Nursing Symposium as a province and as a ministry just last month.

I can indicate to my honourable friend that there will be a monetary offer prior to Saturday.



### Anesthetist Shortage Government Initiatives

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition):** I thank the Minister for that response, and I hope that it will at least give hope to the nurses that it will not be necessary for them to vote in favour of a strike.

Can the Minister tell us what he is doing with respect to the anesthetist crisis which has been identified not just by this Party, but today by letter to all of the doctors in the province by the president of their association in which he has informed them that they should be prepared for serious cutbacks in surgery?

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** Mr. Speaker, the MMA over the past couple of years has put forward information, as I indicated when my honourable friend, the Liberal Health Critic, posed this same question last week and used figures of potential reductions in surgical procedures of 20,000. That was an allegation that stemmed from last year by the MMA.

That did not happen, Mr. Speaker, fortunately because of a great deal of co-operation between Government and the anesthetist groups that practise in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, again my honourable friend, the president of the MMA, is raising this formally in a letter of December 10 to members of his profession. That is why we had hoped that within the monetary offer that was made to the MMA and that reached an agreement in August of this year that they would consider, as Government considered, a priority to certain professional specialties.

We insisted on a 20 percent office fee schedule increase in that 3 percent offer to three specialist groups. We would hope that the MMA in distributing that would not make a level distribution but rather target and focus it as Government had suggested in previous discussions with the MMA.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health is well aware that above average salary increments have been provided to the anesthetists of the Province of Manitoba.

### Anesthetist Shortage Government Initiatives

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition):** My final question is to the Premier. In

that the Premier was a participant in the negotiations with the doctors last summer in which they clearly identified that anesthesiology services was a critical area, can he indicate what he has done to ensure that the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) pays more attention to this impending crisis in our health care field?

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** I am not sure if the Member for Flin Flon was just straightening his tie. Mr. Speaker, the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) and I have been mistaken before as a matter of fact.

**An Honourable Member:** Yes, I know. He is concerned about that.

**Mr. Filmon:** The difference is, Mr. Speaker, that I admit my mistakes, he does not.

**An Honourable Member:** He forgot the question.

**Mr. Filmon:** No, I did not forget the question. Mr. Speaker, I was just waiting for a little silence so that I may respond.

Mr. Speaker, I am very cognizant of the concerns that the MMA has expressed and particularly concerned about the anesthesiologists and their circumstances. The fact of the matter is that we have limited jurisdiction to be able to make some of these changes within the fee schedule because of the fact that MMA really does the ultimate apportioning.

We identified for their purposes our concerns to try and ensure that we remain competitive. We have done so time and time again and so has the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). Mr. Speaker, given an opportunity to have ongoing dialogue with the MMA, we will continue to urge them to try and correct these fee schedule disparities so that we may continue to attract the specialists that we need in this province.

### Fuel Price Increases Decrease Request

**Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon):** Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Energy and Mines.

Mr. Speaker, for some time we have been predicting what everyone except apparently the Government of Manitoba knew and that was that oil companies were gouging consumers. Today, we have learned that the profits for oil companies have increased some 183 percent. We can now quantify the kind of gouging that has gone on. It is in the neighbourhood of three-quarters of a billion dollars.

My question is to the Minister of Energy and Mines. Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Energy and

Mines now meet with oil companies in Manitoba and demand that gas prices in Manitoba be lowered by some eight to 10 cents per litre?

**Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines):** Mr. Speaker, I might read for the Member for Flin Flon parts of an article in the Canadian Business News, Canada's business newspaper, in which a certain former Deputy Minister of Energy and Mines in the Province of Manitoba is quoted as saying that relations with Imperial are quite good and said the company has nothing to worry about. He goes on to say, and I quote, we have seen no evidence of exploitation or gouging.

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

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please; order, please. I am waiting for a little bit of quiet before I recognize the Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

**Mr. Storie:** I appreciate the Minister reading from that week-old clipping from the Globe and Mail.

Mr. Speaker, I am reading about oil profits in the oil industry as of today, not a week ago. That is old news. The evidence is before us. The third quarter profits are up 183 percent, three-quarters of a billion dollars in price gouging. Since October when prices peaked, oil by the barrel has decreased by 40 percent. When will this Government act to stop the gouging at pumps across this province?

\* (1410)

**Mr. Neufeld:** Mr. Eliesen goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, this is the former Deputy Minister of Energy and Mines in the NDP Government—

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

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

### Point of Order

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Opposition House Leader):** I realize, Mr. Speaker, there may be some spirit in the air this last couple of days, apart perhaps from the Premier, about the fact that we may be concluding our business on Friday.

I realize that Members may not be following the rules quite as closely as we normally do, but it is not in order for the Minister to give an answer which is merely reading of newspaper clippings. That has clearly been indicated in Beauchesne.

Nor is it acceptable, Mr. Speaker, for a Minister to give an answer that does not relate directly to the question that was asked by the Member, which was

a very serious question about gas prices in Manitoba.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. The Honourable Member does not have a point of order.

\* \* \*

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Minister of Energy and Mines, who was responding to the question. Order, please. Order.

**Mr. Neufeld:** As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, the independent expert goes on to say, we are monitoring the retail gasoline situation in Ontario on a weekly basis. He sees no reason for regulatory boards such as those in Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island.

**Mr. Storie:** Mr. Speaker, I want to assure Members opposite that I will forward Mr. Eliesen a copy of the third quarter report on profits in the oil industry. When he made his comments, he did not have this evidence, hard evidence before us of the price gouging that is taking place in the oil industry.

### Public Utilities Board Review

**Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon):** Mr. Speaker, my final question is: Given now that oil prices have fallen some 40 percent since their peak in October, will the Minister of Energy now send this issue to the PUB so the PUB can do an independent inquiry in terms of the prices of oil and perhaps roll them back for the benefit of consumers in this province?

**Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines):** Mr. Speaker, Nova Scotia has price regulation through the PUB, and Nova Scotia also has the highest prices of gasoline in Canada.

### CKY Television Strike Government Position

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Question Period I gave the Government credit for respecting the strike at CKY by not dealing with replacement workers. I spoke too soon, because later that afternoon they changed the policy that this Government has adopted in regard to replacement workers, clearly flip-flopping from their previous position.

Today it is Thursday, one day later. I would like to ask the Premier for his latest position in regard to dealing with replacement workers at CKY.

**Hon. Gary Filmon (Premier):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the Member for Thompson that the Member for Kildonan (Mr. Chomiak) said he admired my stance, as a matter of fact.

This is a very serious matter and it is one that all of us obviously are having a good deal of difficulty dealing with.

As has been indicated in a news story today, we have legal opinion, legal advice that suggest that it is unreasonable and in fact illegal for the Government to deny access to the normal information that is provided for all media in this Legislature. Under that advice I am governing myself accordingly.

**Mr. Ashton:** Mr. Speaker, the only persons who have any difficulty—the only Party is the Conservative Party. We are refusing to deal with replacement workers. We will hold news conferences in our caucus if necessary.

I will ask the Premier: Will he not consider holding news conferences in territory where the strike can be respected, because the impact of what he is now saying is that he will be becoming directly involved in the strike and will be directly affecting the position of the striking workers by dealing with replacement workers?

**Mr. Filmon:** I have said consistently that we will not get involved directly in the strike and we will not take sides in the strike. What we will do is obey the law.

I find it very, very difficult to accept that any Party, for whatever political reasons, would deliberately flout the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which they say they respect and support. They are now suggesting that despite legal opinion to the contrary, they are prepared to flout the Charter of Rights and Freedoms and thumb their noses at it, Mr. Speaker. I think that New Democrats everywhere should hang their heads in shame for that position.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. Time for Oral Questions has expired.

### Committee Changes

**Mr. Edward Helwer (Gimli):** I move, seconded by the Member for Niakwa (Mr. Reimer), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: the Member for Authur-Virden (Mr. Downey) for the Member for Niakwa.

I move, seconded by the Member for Niakwa, that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: the Member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Connelly) for the Member for St. Vital (Mrs. Render); the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) for the Member for Kirkfield Park (Mr. Stefanson).

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

**Mr. George Hickes (Point Douglas):** I move, seconded by the Member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: the Member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar) for the Member for Transcona (Mr. Reid).

Also, Mr. Speaker, I have a committee substitution with regard to the Standing Committee on Law Amendments that took place this morning, December 13, 1990, at 10 a.m. This substitution was done by leave of the committee: the Member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen) for the Member for Selkirk (Mr. Dewar).

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

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Mr. Speaker, with a committee change, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Boniface (Mr. Gaudry), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be amended as follows: Crescentwood (Mr. Carr) for Inkster (Mr. Lamoureux).

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

### NON-POLITICAL STATEMENTS

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** I would like to ask for leave for a non-political statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the Honourable Member for Thompson have unanimous consent to make a non-political statement? Agreed.

**Mr. Ashton:** Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber it is common practice to honour Manitobans who have received recognition, whether it be provincially or nationally.

Today I would like to honour a Manitoban who is also a Member of this House for being recognized as the Newsmaker of the Year, the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper).

Quite apart from the partisan party and thrust we have on a daily basis, quite apart from any of our political differences, I am sure all Members of this

House will join with me in congratulating the Member for Rupertsland on this recognition.

I know in talking to many people over the last number of months that the role that the Member for Rupertsland has played over this past year in significant national events has really become a role model, especially for many aboriginal people. I would join, certainly from our caucus and I am sure for all Members of the Legislature, in congratulating the Member for Rupertsland on being named just today actually as the Newsmaker of the Year.

**Hon. James Downey (Minister of Northern Affairs, responsible for Native Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may have leave to make a non-political statement.

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the Honourable Minister have unanimous consent to make a non-political statement? Agreed.

**Mr. Downey:** Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a privilege to rise as a Member of the Government and recognize the Member for Rupertsland, who has been awarded the Newsmaker of the Year. I am sure that the activities that he carried out in this House were certainly of major magnitude to the country, but I think there were other leaders in this community, in this House as well, who played major roles in the whole of the developments that took place.

Mr. Speaker, I do say congratulations to him and hopefully someday we will get the opportunity to hear one of the speeches that he is passing out throughout the country so that we can hear it here in the Legislature. I would ask for that much in our congratulations.

**Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood):** Mr. Speaker, do I have leave to make a non-political statement?

**Mr. Speaker:** Does the Honourable Member for Crescentwood have unanimous consent to make a non-political statement? Agreed.

**Mr. Carr:** Mr. Speaker, many of us who still sit in this Chamber sat in this very House last June and witnessed history in the making. The recognition of the Member for Rupertsland (Mr. Harper) as Newsmaker of the Year I believe is testimony to the fact that we in this House did make history, history that will be examined, not only by the contemporary journalists of our time, but by those who write Ph.D. theses, Master theses, and look back on a very critical moment in Canadian history.

Those of us who had the opportunity of sharing in that moment, regardless of political stripe, I think will realize that the eloquence and the statesmanship shown by the Member for Rupertsland, particularly when he spoke so eloquently on behalf of his people, is something that we will all, those of us particularly who witnessed it personally, will remember for a very long time.

I, too, join with others in the House for recognizing his achievements and also for realizing that it is not every day when one of our own is recognized as Newsmaker of the Year.

Congratulations.

\* (1420)

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### House Business

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I have a series of instructions. I will try and read them slowly.

First of all, I would like to announce the Standing Committee on Law Amendments will sit at 5:30 p.m. today in the Committee Room 255 to consider Bills 13 and 25.

Secondly, the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations will sit tonight at eight o'clock to continue the considerations of Bills 12 and 23.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, for unanimous consent to waive private Members' hour, also, unanimous consent to waive the 6 p.m. adjournment hour today.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the will of the House to waive private Members' hour? Agreed. Is it the will of the House to waive the 6 p.m. adjournment time? That is agreed. Agreed.

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Speaker, we will go into Estimates this afternoon. Health in the Chamber; and in committee, a long batting list of departments that have not yet received their final reviews: Workers Compensation Board, under the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs; the Canada-Manitoba Agreements; Status of Women; Legislation; Allowance for Losses; Flood Control; Salary; Natural Resources; Housing; Justice.

We will also add to that Environmental Innovations Fund. We believe that is the total list. If not, I know there would be consent to add to that list what might be missing.

We will, Mr. Speaker, bring both sections of committee together in the Chamber at 4:50 p.m. to give vote to all final resolutions and immediately thereafter begin to debate concurrence of the spending Estimates.

**An Honourable Member:** Could you clarify that time?

**Mr. Manness:** Ten to five.

After consideration of the concurrence motion, we will dispose of Bills 6, 18, 20 and 22. After that time, we will call Bill 27, first reading, The Main Appropriation Act; and following that, Bill 26, The Loan Act. Mr. Speaker, we expect to sit no longer this evening than 8 p.m.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there unanimous consent to waive the sequence of departments that are going to be in Estimates? That is agreed? That is agreed.

\* (1430)

**An Honourable Member:** Four fifty or 4:15?

**Mr. Speaker:** Four fifty.

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure, for hopefully the last time, to move this motion.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), 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 agreed to,** and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for St. Norbert (Mr. Laurendeau) in the Chair for the Departments of Workers Compensation, Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote, Status of Women, Legislation, Allowance for Losses and Expenditures Incurred by Crown Corporations and Other Provincial Entities, Flood Control and Emergency Expenditures, General Salary Increases, and Natural Resources; and the Honourable Member for Seine River (Mrs. Daquay) in the Chair for the Department of Health.

## CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY SUPPLY—WORKERS COMPENSATION

**Mr. Deputy Chairman (Marcel Laurendeau):** Order, please. Will the Committee of Supply please come to order.

Today, this section of the Committee of Supply will be considering the remaining Estimates of expenditures for the Province of Manitoba in the

Departments of Workers Compensation in Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Canada-Manitoba Agreement, Status of Women, Legislation, Allowance for Losses, Flood Control, Salaries, Natural Resources, Housing, Justice, and Environmental Innovations Fund.

Does the Honourable Minister have any opening remarks?

**Hon. Edward Connery (Minister responsible for The Workers Compensation Act):** No, I do not, Mr. Deputy Chairman. In light of the short time frame we have I would rather leave that open to questions.

I would just like to introduce Graham Lane, Joe Cotreau, Karn Sandy and Dave Greason, all from the Workers Compensation Board.

Because the time is short, I do not think it would be appropriate to go into a long dialogue.

**Mr. Steve Ashton (Thompson):** I just very briefly want to indicate that we certainly appreciate the opportunity to ask questions on Workers Compensation as part of the Estimates process. It was a change in the previous procedures a number of years ago which gives Members of the Legislature an opportunity to ask direct questions about Workers Compensation.

We will certainly be asking a number of questions in regard to the general trend of Workers Compensation.

We note that the Government is continuing to emphasize below inflation increases in terms of workers compensation rates to employers. The recent announcement that there will be a 1.3 percent increase, obviously at a time when we have 4 percent to 5 percent, has been described as a rate freeze by some business leaders and has created a significant amount of concern to those who are looking to adequate workers compensation protection under the existing system, also those trying to seek additional protection or also those who are seeking a type of protection reinstated. I am referring in that case to firefighters.

I note that the recent information from Workers Compensation indicates there has been an increase in the number of accidents, about 1.9 percent, and an increase in the number of fatalities for the period this year as compared to last year of 27 over 19.

We will be looking forward to some specific information on those trends, how they are going to

impact on the injured workers involved, and how they are going to impact on the system, generally.

Our questions, too, will also deal very quickly with some of the ongoing concerns about the operation of the system. Our bottom-line concern is to ensure that injured workers and their families continue to receive adequate and fair workers compensation benefits and that they not become in any way, shape or form affected by any financial squeeze brought about by those low rate level increases.

I am not saying rates should be increased *per se*, but I do believe that we run the risk of an underfunding of the system. We run the risk also, if one looks historically at workers compensation, of growing through a cyclical process, because when the previous Conservative Government was in, they also did not have rates keep up with the growth in terms of claims and also even the basic inflation rate.

The Minister was very critical when he was in opposition of the New Democratic Party, which increased rates fairly significantly and for good reason. It was brought in to ensure proper funding of the workers compensation system to ensure that injured workers and their families did not become in any way, shape or form victims of any budgetary squeeze.

So those are our general concerns. I do not anticipate that we will have much more than perhaps half an hour in committee on Workers Compensation, so we will be pursuing these concerns certainly in the upcoming Session of the Legislature in other forms as we have in this Session, obviously in Question Period. With that brief opening comment, I am sure the Liberal Critic may have some comments as well.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** We thank the Honourable Member for those opening comments. Does the critic for the Second Opposition Party, the Honourable Member for St. James, have any opening comments?

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I do want to make them brief because of course we have many other departments to get to, but this is a particularly important one I believe in the way that this Government deals with people who are vulnerable.

Workers Compensation is a system that has been plagued at least in my experience, and I do not claim to have lengthy experience, but in my experience as

an elected official, for being user-unfriendly. It has had a very bad reputation, and I personally can say that I probably have more Workers Compensation Board complaints than any other single type of complaint. I sometimes wonder if there is a person in my constituency who has been involved with the Workers Compensation Board whom I have not heard from in abject frustration, having first tried to get some answers and be satisfied within the system. It is usually only after that that they come to me.

I have concerns about the way that the board itself functions in its day-to-day dealings with people. The substance is very important—how much money people get paid, the rates, how they are set and who pays what. That is important and we will get into that, but I do not want to lose sight of the fact that Government serves the people. A big part of that not only is that when push comes to shove, the money is appropriate and is in fact paid, but it is in the way that the system works. I know this Minister has echoed those concerns many times.

I am not convinced yet that we have had enough progress in allowing people easy access to the board, to decision making, to vent their frustrations, have them listened to and responded to appropriately. Not all cases, of course, will end up satisfactorily to the claimant. I realize that, but it still seems to me that there is an alarming rate of frustration amongst workers who have need to go to the board in getting decisions made in a timely fashion, in a friendly fashion and in a way that makes them feel not like they are begging for wages, but give them the due respect they deserve as people who were working and who, in the vast majority of cases, want to keep working but simply because of physical ability cannot.

\* (1440)

I want to harken back, and I realize that we are going to be fairly brief today, to the original deal which saw the creation of Workers Compensation in this country. The deal was twofold. It was that workers gave up the right to sue through the courts for negligence because there were repeated decisions which had in effect taken the old style view of the master-servant relationship and invariably worked to the disadvantage of the worker. They gave up that right and, in return, they got a compensation system which did not include general damages for pain and suffering but, rather, included compensation for wages and wages alone.

I think it is very important to always remember that not only did the workers get something in Workers Compensation, but they gave something up. They gave companies the ability to regularize the amount of payments they would have to make to deal with injured workers. While they have to pay that on a yearly basis and they may not have had to pay anything if the old system had remained where it was, business was given an advantage through Workers Compensation. This is not only a benefit to the workers. This is a benefit to the business community to have an effective Workers Compensation Board system.

I have had so many meetings with Chamber representatives where I have heard harping and harping about this Workers Compensation Board and how difficult it is and how it is another punitive measure for business. That is absolute garbage. It is not. It serves the business community, and I think it is important that they recognize that. We have taken that message to them. I have taken that message to them when I have had the opportunity.

The Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) indicates that the rates could be different; the rates should be higher in certain circumstances. I might agree with that in many circumstances.

We can get into some detail later, but let me also say to the Minister that I agree with him. It is important that the board have a sound fiscal foundation. We cannot have a board that is running deficits which are out of control, and it is not in the best interests of workers to have the board not have its financial house in order. That is in the best interest of both of the partners to the scheme, business and the workers. We agree that the firemen deserve their protection. We have supported that matter. We hope that it comes to fruition, and we look forward to further, more detailed discussions in these Estimates process. Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairperson.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** We thank the Honourable Member.

**Mr. Connery:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, there are a few things that I would like to say in response to both Members. First of all, the comment about inflation—the payroll takes into account inflation. The Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) should know that. Payroll goes up, and he said, you know, the rates do not even take in inflation, but as the wages go up the rates go up, because it is based on

the payroll. There is no financial squeeze on the workers.

I would like to point out—the Member was saying the injuries are up. They were for a period of time. Now, fatalities are up three. There was 29 at this period this year. The same period last year was 26. One fatality is not acceptable in my mind, and in the Government's. I do not think any Member of this Legislature wants to see any fatalities.

Time loss claims—as a matter of fact, as of today are down some 37 claims less than there were last year. The non-time loss claims are up just slightly, so outside of the fatalities actually we are ahead of last year. When we look at the rates, that is the case.

Rates were not set in a whimsical way—and the Member for Thompson raised the question when I was away, and the Premier (Mr. Filmon) answered the question. He was stating that the Government is setting rates. Well, Governments did set rates, and there is no question that Government interfered with rates when they were in power. Since we have been in power I, as the Minister, and nobody from this Government has influenced the rate setting in any way, in any minor iota.

The rates are set independently by Workers Compensation to fully cover the future costs of injuries in this year. They fully cover, unlike what took place where there was a \$20 million surplus in the Workers Compensation Fund when they took office. Today that rate was somewhere around 230 in total to the private side, under \$200 million is the deficit, which the Ombudsman says is illegal.

There was a question put about it being unfriendly. Well, we only have 280 that go to the final appeal that are unhappy with the decision made through the board. This is the final appeals, only 280.

As a matter of fact, I was sitting in the Salisbury House having a hamburger last week waiting to go to the airport to pick up my wife. There was a fellow there sitting with obviously a very badly damaged finger. So I got talking to him and asked him what had happened. It was injured at work; it got badly smashed. So I just said out of curiosity, I guess you are on Workers Compensation, and he said, oh, yes. I said, how were you treated? Oh, he said, real great; I had my cheque within 12 days, the first cheque. So where there is that very obvious ease of determining the injury and that it was work related

and that sort of thing, those are happening very quickly.

There was comment made about unfriendly staff, and I can tell you that if there is one thing I am adamant about, it is having staff that treat the injured worker fairly. That is not saying that does not happen. There is a staff of over 330 people at Workers Compensation, and at some given day somebody maybe is not treated in the way they should be. I dialogue with Graham and the staff on an ongoing basis, and staff will tell you that we have not got Workers Compensation at the point we want to have it. It has come a long way, but we are still having a lot of progress to be done. Maybe we are two-thirds, three-quarters of the way there, but we are not there.

When we took office, the adjudicators were tremendously overloaded. They were working overtime. They were worn out. They were underpaid. We increased the salaries to the adjudicators so that they would stay. We added adjudicators as quickly as we could train them and put them on, and I went to the union leader at Workers Comp to verify that fact and said yes, we are training the new adjudicators as quickly as we can.

I would like to say to the Members that are here that we have appointed a new full-time independent appeals chairman. That has just been done. The appeals started to backlog on us, and we are reviewing the long-term claims that have been there. People who have been on Workers Compensation for a long time—there has been no review of them, and maybe some should not be on Workers Compensation, maybe some should continue. They are reviewing them. There might be more appeals so we have put in a second full-time independent appeals person, accepted by both client groups. Management and labour have both accepted the individual put forth, and that person will be in place within a week.

We also have a shortage of part-time appeals people from the labour side. I have talked to labour and asked them to bring us forth some more names so that we can have a better number of part-time appeals people from labour side. We do not want the appeals to be backlogged. Keep in mind that the final appeal process is a little more in depth. We have got to get more information, doctors. These are ones who are there to determine the extent of the injury, did it really happen at work, were there

pre-existing conditions? These final appeals get very complex and take a lot of time. In fact one person—we attempted initially to solve the problem of appeals by having the Labour Board people work as independent appeals chairmen. There were too many cases for them, but the one woman I was talking to said she could not even lift the file because the file was in one box. She had to get her husband to bring the material inside. That is the kind of in-depth review that is done of some of these long cases. So we do not take them very lightly. We work at it very sincerely to make sure—the firefighters regulation, as you know, was tried to be put in last Session in Bill 56. My comment then was that we were reviewing all of the health in that particular, not just firefighters.

We had to take a look at the health side from the miners, policemen; there are a whole lot of people that could be involved in the very same thing. This does not say the firefighters are excluded from Workers Compensation. Absolutely not. They have the rights to Workers Compensation as any other worker does. What it was, it was a presumption clause that if you were a firefighter, no matter how you died of certain heart attack, organ failure, lung disease, that sort of thing, that automatically you were perceived to be under Workers Compensation. It could be, as I said earlier, your third week of holidays in Florida and you die of a heart attack. Is that really work related?

\* (1450)

Let us keep in mind while it looks like the employers pay the rates of Workers Compensation, initially they do, but as in all the other costs of employers, they are passed on to the consumers. So when we do things that are not fair, then we are saying to other people you are going to pay for this unfairness.

As the Minister, I would resign before taking any legal and appropriate, legitimate rights away from injured workers. That will never happen as long as I am the Minister responsible for Workers Compensation. The system has to be fair to the injured workers and to the people who are paying for the claims, which are the consumers of Manitoba, and that is on all sides.

Now, I see the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) looking at his watch. Our time is short. I will cut off my dialogue and let him ask questions.



**Mr. Ashton:** What I will maybe do is raise some issues. I realize we do not have very much time and would appreciate if the Minister could get back to us. I think probably the Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) will be raising some issues in that context as well.

I just want to run through some of the issues. In terms of the firefighters' legislation, I do believe it needs to be put into place. The Minister talked about some recent contact he had.

I recently spoke to a woman whose husband had died at the age of 42 years old, a firefighter, someone I had known for awhile, actually. She works with the Canadian Airlines. I had seen her many times before and said, hi, talked to her about day-to-day events. Her husband died at the age of 42 years old very suddenly of intestinal cancer.

She is in a situation now with two children to support. The information she has received is unless this regulation is put in place, she has a very difficult time of ever trying to prove direct connection in regard to Workers Compensation. Yet I believe that any just presumption would assume it was related to the workplace. She is not alone. There are other families, other individuals that she is aware of, other firefighters who have died.

I will be pursuing this further. I will be meeting with her lawyer. I will be meeting further with her. I do not intend to raise the specifics of that particular situation here, but I do urge the Minister to consider the fact that it is not the stereotypical firefighter who does die of a heart attack in Florida. This was a young, fit father of two who died at the age of 42.

Now, we are dealing with a widow with two children. She is a very courageous woman, by the way. She will manage, but that is the type of real human side there is to this issue. I say that because I really hope that if the Minister is still going to be reviewing this matter that he will look at it in terms of the upcoming Session. That is one question I would like to put on the record. Perhaps the Minister can respond after, if I can put some other items on as well.

In terms of the review that is ongoing of long-term compensation cases, I would appreciate the rationale behind the review. I do hope it is not intended to somehow get people off compensation, that it is intended only to review the circumstances and ensure that people are being treated

appropriately. So I would appreciate some clarification of the intent of the review.

I want to raise some questions about rehabilitation as well. If the Minister wishes to get back in terms of a detailed response, I would certainly appreciate an analysis. I have received calls from people, some who found the process rather positive. Others, I have received calls actually recently from two 63-year-old individuals, one in particular who is going through the current job search situation, who really found that going through the motions for somebody at the age of 63 was not perhaps as appropriate as it might be for a younger individual and really questioned the degree to which he is required to become part of the job search without any real prospects of rehabilitation. I want to raise that, not criticize the rehabilitation, far from it, but to ensure that rehabilitation is working to its fullest extent.

I want to raise a question in regard to experience rating. I have expressed concerns about this in the past. I know the labour movement certainly has expressed concerns about the danger under this system of employers putting pressure on employees not to report accidents. I am not saying that has not happened previously, it has. I have seen it directly. Personally I have seen it, the pressure on people not to report accidents, the pressure on people to return to work without filing a claim and supposedly having to work at light duty when in fact they were putting their own health at risk. I know that personally. I have seen it personally. It happened to a member of my family who was told that he better get back to work regardless of whether he was injured or not. I do want to indicate that is a concern and also that the experience rating appears to be expanding as well.

There are a number of other issues that we will be raising, and what I will be seeking from the Minister and from the Government is the assurance that the rates will not be on a fixation. It is a question here not just of the current structure, but also even other changes to legislation. I know the Minister talked about bringing in a benefits package, if you like. There have been some proposals that have been raised, not to Members of the Legislature, but to federations of labour, and the bottom line is there is some uncertainty.

As a final question I would like to ask him, and perhaps this is one he can deal with now, when will the Minister bring in the so-called benefits package?

Is it his intention to bring it in in the upcoming Session of the Legislature which will be sitting as of March 7th? With those questions, as I said, I realize they are fairly detailed, if the Minister can respond later with information or in writing I would accept that. I appreciate the opportunity to ask these questions.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I thank the Honourable Member.

**Mr. Connery:** Let me answer the last question first. Legislation has been worked on by a group of people. That legislation will go to the board; the legislation will be reviewed by the board. The board will make recommendations to myself and from there it will go to—the Cabinet of course gives final approval of the legislation as the Member well knows.

At the board level, there is full tripartite between management, labour and the community at large. Both sides will have the full opportunity to discuss it there and be part of the package that was recommended to myself. Whether the whole package is a majority report or a combination of majority and unanimous support for certain things, this I do not know. This we will discuss. After that has come to me there will be sufficient opportunity for both client groups to have input into that legislation before it becomes legislation.

We want to develop a package of legislation that is fair—that opportunity—and I have told that to the labour movement directly. I met with a group committee that I set up representing all labour unions—I should not say all labour unions, there is a composite that basically represents all labour unions—which is the first time in Manitoba that labour unions outside of the MFL umbrella group with this Government have had an opportunity for input into legislation. This was not the case in the past.

Experience rating—the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) is concerned about. Let us put it this way. It is to put fairness into the business community in the sense of those -(interjection)- absolutely, fairness will always be coming from this office and from this Government. As the Member for Lakeside (Mr. Enns) said, you can count on fairness and that is absolutely correct.

\* (1500)

Some people, in some cases some businesses where—in a case of one individual who was paying

a premium of a quarter of a million dollars and experienced losses of \$25,000, now that is not healthy for business. So what experience rating does is assess those with a bad work ethic or higher safety procedures and standards with a higher cost of workers compensation, but hopefully in the long run what that will do is encourage people to have a better safety record.

The goal of the Workers Compensation and the Government and the Workplace Safety and Health Department out of the Department of Labour wants to prevent accidents. That is the main goal of the whole program, to prevent.

Unfortunately, accidents do happen. Fatalities, unfortunately, do happen. We will not likely eliminate all of them. We will hopefully go a long way to reducing, but when they do happen we have to compensate them fairly. The experience rating I think will work. People will look at the rates, and they will say we had better be a little more careful. I walk around construction sites and I see people with running shoes on or grinding without glasses and doing various things, and I get very upset. We hope that will work.

Unfortunately—and I say this because the Member for Thompson (Mr. Ashton) has to go to another committee meeting and will not be here for the remainder. I thank him for his input. Other times if he has questions and wants to meet with me, I would be quite happy to explain or get other information for him. I thank the Member for his participation.

A good number of the claims, 6,100 of those claims, 50 percent of them got their first cheque within 10 days of submitting them, 23 percent within five days, so that period of moving quickly with the claims, because most people work on a two-week paycheque basis—the attempt is to ensure that they can continue on in that way.

Our long-term cases were mentioned by the Member for Thompson, and he said he hopes nobody would be taken off workers compensation who are on long-term claims. Well, part of the problem back three, four, five, six years ago was they were so understaffed and people were not looked after, they were just shunted off into rehabilitation or whatever and left to vegetate.

Some of these people maybe have recovered from their injuries. They do not need to be on workers compensation. Remember I said earlier

that it is the consumers of this province who pay for workers compensation in the long run. If they need proper rehabilitation let us get on with it so they can re-enter the workplace or have a proper and decent life.

We do have—as my CEO says there are more rehab services for many. We have a new building on Portage Avenue. I think maybe some have seen it, a brand new rehab building. It is also a job search location for finding jobs for people who have been injured. We are very concerned that they get back to work. Prior to a couple of years ago a lot of people were just shunted off and left to keep on collecting workers compensation for who knows how long.

The review will be a very fair review. Those who should remain on workers compensation will continue. Those we can help on rehab, will. If it is a job search, we will attempt that, but should those who have fully recovered remain on workers compensation? I think not. It is an insurance program. Once a person has been fully recovered from their injuries, should we continue to pay?

**Mr. Edwards:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I, too, am cognizant of the fact we have very limited time. I will raise a few issues in this brief time and know that the Minister will, of course, outside of this Estimates process, be available for questioning on a more informal basis, as he has in the past.

With respect to the experience rating question, first of all, of course, the major concern was there would be abuse. That was alleged by a number of the labour representatives and the unions that came forward at the time. I certainly took those concerns seriously. I wonder if the Minister can report whether or not any specific allegations of such abuse on the part of employers have come forward since the implementation of the experience rating system.

Let me just maybe go on with a couple of other issues before the Minister responds. I am also interested to know about the medical review panel. The medical review panel, as well, is of course a body of medical expertise which is an alternative to going to the full board hearing. As I understand it, if it is a medical dispute you can go to the review panel. I am interested to know how people become members of that panel, on what criteria they are gauged before they are appointed to that panel, whether or not they are sought out, whether or not there are applications and interviews, et cetera, et cetera.

Thirdly, the permanent partial disability rating is of course an area of some contention—has been in the past in my experience as a lawyer—in how permanent partial disabilities are rated and the basis upon which financial calculations are given. Of course, in those situations oftentimes it is lump sums. I would be interested to know—

**Mr. Connery:** I wonder if the Member would ask two or three questions and let me—you know, there are so many that I am going to forget the first one.

**Mr. Edwards:** This is the third. This is the third I have asked.

**Mr. Connery:** Well, they are very long and protracted, and there is a lot in there.

**Mr. Edwards:** Fine, the Minister can answer the ones—I will keep the rest.

**Mr. Connery:** Yes, as to the experience rating, the board has passed a resolution that they will aggressively investigate allegations that the claims process is interfered with. We have had very few allegations as to that, but I can assure them as a Minister, I would very aggressively go after any business not reporting or not co-operating or trying to interfere with those processing of claims. There is just no way that I would tolerate that for a minute.

The review panels, they are recommended by the College of Physicians and Surgeons. From that panel, the worker can pick one to his choosing or her choosing. So it is a very open one. It is not just a case of us. They are recommended to us. I think those were the two main questions.

**Mr. Edwards:** The last question I was going to ask was about permanent partial disability rating and how the board goes about updating the monetary charts with which they then plug in the permanent partial disability to determine how much a person is paid, because of course in most of those cases often the worker opts for a lump sum payment.

**Mr. Connery:** First of all, it is based on medical advice as to what the injuries are, to the severity of them and then, of course, their adjudicator on the same basis of the other claims. They are also given an opportunity to take a lump sum if they want. Now, in some cases, that might be advantageous for someone who has a partial permanent disability, to take a lump sum and then go into a small business where their injury would accommodate them. So that is an option that the employees can take.

**Mr. Edwards:** At the time that people are offered lump sums and in those special situations where a lump sum is available, are they advised to seek legal counsel to explain what rights they are giving up by taking that lump sum?

**Mr. Connery:** Yes.

**Mr. Edwards:** Last question and, again, there are many others we would ask. I want the Minister to recognize that, and I am sure he does.

My question about permanent partial disability rating was, I realize how it is rated in terms of the disability, the 10 percent or 20 percent disability that a person is under. That is then plugged in to a financial chart and then a certain number comes up. How is that chart reviewed and revised in keeping with the inflation and the fiscal reality of the day?

**Mr. Connery:** It is a percentage of the earnings that are lost, and then it goes up with inflation.

**Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway):** I would just like to ask a few questions. The Honourable Minister, can you tell me what pre-existing condition means?

**Mr. Connery:** If it is pre-existing it is obvious it is something that is existing there before the accident, in a pre-existing condition. A lot of these, I guess, would be spinal, congenital heart defects, you could have lung problems before—yes, you could have a club foot, as the Member said, or you could have something with your back.

**Mr. Santos:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, does that imply when there is a pre-existing condition that the accident cannot be tied to or attributed to the accident itself?

**Mr. Connery:** No. If there was an accident, there was an accident. If there was some pre-existing conditions which might aggravate or whatever, but just because they have a pre-existing condition does not say they will not be given workers compensation. No, that is not part of it.

**Mr. Santos:** I like to do this in a hurry because I am worried about the time. In an investigation, somebody tried to investigate a claimant, and then there was some kind of deception in the sense that—I would like to read on record what the complainant was saying. On February 17, 1988, at 11 to 12 noon—

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Order, please.

**Mr. Connery:** Yes, if the Member has a particular concern—

**Mr. Santos:** Just to put on the record.

**Mr. Connery:** Okay, if you want to put it on record.

\* (1510)

**Mr. Santos:** "I detest the way he conducted this investigation. He deceived me by not telling the truth that I was signing a sworn statement with his own illegible written notes, with his own concoction of facts and distortion. I was not even told to read it first before he told me to sign it. I did not seek that privilege because he told me he was employed by the Workers Compensation Board. I fully trusted him. I was expecting he should give me a copy of said report, but there was none so I proceeded to the Workers Compensation Board and asked for it, and then I found out that it was a sworn statement signed by me, declared by him with his innovative words."

I was saying that in cases of this nature, how could the factual basis of the decision be made when there was some fraud, default in the way they got it?

**Mr. Connery:** Let me say that the way the Member puts that forward is to me despicable. I am not aware of that particular case. You make allegations that somebody has made, and you put it on the record and make reference to staff at the Workers Compensation Board. I say to the Member for Broadway, shame. If you have a problem, we are prepared to investigate it thoroughly, and I can assure you that when I ask the Workers Compensation Board for a report, I get a thorough report. I can assure you that sometimes the allegations made are wrong. There are times when the board has said yes, this case did not get dealt with expediently, or there were some reasons why it was not and is not in the form that we want to have it. For the Member for Broadway to read into the record allegations that are unfounded, from a professor in the University of Manitoba, I think that Member knows better and should apologize to this committee.

**Mr. Santos:** I have no means of saying whether it is founded or not founded. All I am saying is this is the documentation that I got, and it is my duty to make representation for my constituent. Whether it is founded or not is on their conscience, but it is my duty to make it known.

**Mr. Connery:** I have offered full assistance to all Members of this Legislature. The Member wants to come in and put those sorts of allegations, unfounded allegations, on the record, pointing at Members that are doing an awfully hard job to try to

do the best they can for injured workers, then I say that is shameful, despicable, and I would ask the Member for Broadway to withdraw those comments and come and see me personally and I will ensure that he has the full answers. Allegations of just somebody put on the record is not appropriate, and I think that is shameful.

**Mr. Santos:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am not making the allegation myself. I am just reading what had been documented. This case has been closed. He is not interested in anything. All he wants me to do is to make it known that certain things are not right, and I am going to do it regardless of the consequences because it is my duty to make known that all the procedures are correct and the decisions are based on factual information. I have no way of judging this.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Order, please. I am just going to caution the Members that they are starting to use a few words that are non-parliamentary. Shameful is one of the words, and I would caution the Members to please refrain from using those words.

**Mr. Santos:** I did not use it, Mr. Deputy Chairman.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I will caution the Members only once. Is there any further discussion on this matter?

There is no vote on the Workers Compensation Board.

### SUPPLY—CANADA-MANITOBA ENABLING VOTE

**Mr. Deputy Chairman (Marcel Laurendeau):** We will now move forward to the Canada-Manitoba agreement. I believe that is on page 168. Who is the Minister on that? It is the Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote, and I do not know who the Minister is.

Resolution 144: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$6,073,600 for the Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

### SUPPLY—STATUS OF WOMEN

**Mr. Deputy Chairman (Marcel Laurendeau):** We will continue on. We are now moving on to the Status of Women.

We are going to take a couple of minutes recess to wait for the Minister of the Status of Women (Mrs. Mitchelson).

Order, please. We are now dealing with the Status of Women. Does the Honourable Minister have an opening statement?

**Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister responsible for the Status of Women):** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I did have an opening statement, and I would be prepared to read that, but I was wondering if in order to expedite business you would prefer that we forego the opening statement and just get right down to business?

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition):** Perhaps the Minister would like to distribute copies of her opening statement some time in the future so that we just have it on the record?

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Sure.

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** In the interests of being brief, because I know we do not have much time and several other important issues to deal with before leaving, I would like to ask just a couple of general questions of the Minister in this area, and then perhaps ask to meet with her on specific things after the House rises.

A couple of issues that are of incredible importance to the women of Manitoba and the women of Canada that are much in the forefront these days; one is the Bill C-43 in the Parliament, a federal Bill on recriminalization of abortion.

I note that the Advisory Council has done what I think is an excellent job in making presentation to the federal Government on the position of the Advisory Council on Bill C-43. I would strongly recommend—I mean our Party is on record as very much supporting this position, which is to not recriminalize abortion in any way, shape or form.

\* (1520)

Also, that in 1983 the same Advisory Council gave to the then Minister responsible for the Status of Women an excellent report on reproductive health which also stated recommending, and I quote: That the province pressure the federal Government to remove abortions performed by licensed medical practitioners from the Criminal Code, end quote, which is seven years ago the same recommendation.

I would just like to ask the Minister what her response has been to this issue, and what progress she sees having been made, what presentation she herself has made on behalf of the Province of Manitoba to her federal counterpart regarding this important issue?

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** The Advisory Council has done an admirable job as far as trying to get their view known to the Senate, to the federal Government, and it is before the Senate right now. My understanding is that many of the senators did reply to the Advisory Council and asked for some further clarification, asked several questions. I think the Advisory Council to date is just in the midst of preparing for the Senate the responses, and including a copy of the 1983 presentation that was made, and further explanation and clarification on the questions that were asked.

As far as myself, I have not made representation to the federal Government. I believe it is a federal matter, but you know abortion is a matter that is very near and dear to any woman's heart I think throughout the country. I believe there should be freedom of choice, but that choice should be based on information on alternatives to abortion.

First of all, birth control education so that women or young girls are well enough informed to make the right choices before they get into a situation where abortion or adoption or keeping a baby is one of many options that would have to be considered as a result of an unwanted pregnancy.

So my feelings are very strong on the education of birth control.

**Ms. Barrett:** Yes, it is a very complex and broad-ranging issue. I would agree wholeheartedly with the Minister's talking about, and would share with her the importance of, education and prevention wherever possible, and informed choice.

On the specific Bill C-43, is the Minister saying that the advisory council is going to be the only group from Manitoba, the Manitoba Government, that makes presentation to the federal Government on this issue? If that is the case, can the Minister explain why the Government itself—I mean this is an advisory committee and it would appear to me that an additional response to the federal Government based on a provincial Government response would be even stronger.

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I believe we have always remained firm that it is a federal

responsibility, and they are going to have to make that law. There have been many presentations, and they are going to have to make up their mind. We, as a Government, are not going to be making a presentation specifically. The advisory council has.

**Ms. Barrett:** I would just like to have it placed on the record that I regret the Government's decision not to put additional pressure on the federal Government in this regard.

I have a question on another federal issue. Again, I understand it is a federal responsibility, but there is major provincial implications and ramifications. That is dealing with, I believe it is Bill C-80, the gun control legislation that the federal Justice Minister has just sent to a special committee, thereby effectively killing the Bill, if I can use that word, for at least this year and has a potential for it not coming back in any recognizable or useful form in the near future, based on extensive lobbying by very powerful groups in the country even though half a million signatures went forward to this Minister requesting strong gun control legislation. I am wondering what the Minister is planning to do on behalf of the women of Manitoba to make strong presentation to her federal counterparts on this issue.

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** In the overall context of the Pedlar review that has just been commissioned by this Government, that issue will be addressed and as a result of those recommendations, we will be forwarding a position to the federal Government on this legislation.

**Ms. Barrett:** Thank you, I appreciate and am glad to hear that there will be a provincial Government presentation. Has the Government made any statement to the federal Government about the concern about this legislation going to special committee rather than going through to second reading in Parliament, or are you waiting for this Pedlar commission report?

**Ms. Mitchelson:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, we are waiting for the Pedlar report before we make that decision.

**Ms. Barrett:** Thank you, we will be definitely waiting to see what the Pedlar commission report comes up with. It is a very important issue that has, as we all know, incredible ramifications on everybody in Manitoba, but statistically women, I am afraid to say.

I have a couple of specific questions on the Estimates and then I will turn the process over to the

Member for River Heights (Mrs. Carstairs). In the advisory council, the note states that there has been a reduction of \$10,000 for two advisory committee council meetings annually. Number one, how many were there and how many will there be and the rationale for that reduction?

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** The legislation calls for, I believe, six meetings per year. There were nine meetings this last year, and that will be a reduction to seven meetings.

**Ms. Barrett:** So there is still more than the minimal number of meetings. Are these meetings all held in Winnipeg or are they regionalized?

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Up until this point they have all been in Winnipeg.

**Ms. Barrett:** I know I should know the members of the advisory committee. They live throughout the province so they are asked to come to Winnipeg for the meetings, is that correct?

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Yes.

**Ms. Barrett:** Are there any plans this next year or perhaps take the meetings outside the city? Does the council see any reason for that being a positive step?

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, there are members on the Advisory Council from all regions of the province. What we are going to be doing is holding regional meetings in the province. The chairperson of the Advisory Council will be going out to the regions working with the regional representative and meeting with women throughout that region.

**Ms. Barrett:** I think that is an excellent idea. We all need to make sure that we do not get stuck in the perimeter mentality. Just one or two questions on the Women's Directorate then, if I may. There is a substantial, well, not numbers-wise but percentage increase for this next year, and the note states that it is the expanded mandate to provide outreach services and public awareness information. Could the Minister give us some specific details about what those additional activities will be?

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** As a result of the Women's Initiative there were outreach offices established, one in The Pas and one in Portage la Prairie. Those offices are going to be equipped with a new computer system, a hookup so that we can provide Government information to all of the women

throughout Manitoba, so that is the majority of the increase.

**Ms. Barrett:** Mr. Deputy Chair, are those offices staffed full time, and if they are, were they in the staff years for '89-90?

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Yes.

\* (1530)

**Ms. Barrett:** The Minister mentioned the Women's Initiative, and I have the action plan that was done in March of 1990. I found it very interesting reading, and if we would have had more time I had a gazillion questions on each of those items. I am wondering if the Minister can tell us if there will be a next update, and if so, when will it be available?

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Yes, we are planning an update by March 8th of 1991.

**Ms. Barrett:** Thank you, an appropriate day, and I look forward to it and to having, I hope, more time in the next Estimates process to deal with some of the major issues. I would just like to go on record saying that I have kept my comments brief not because I feel that this is an unimportant area, because I definitely do not, but the luck of the draw would have that we were asked to be late in the Estimates process. I will lobby strongly for our having more chance to discuss these issues in greater detail next year. Thank you.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chair, and I congratulate the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) for being here in the Estimates process. It will be a joy to behold when in the Estimates process of Status of Women, we have equal numbers of men and women at the table concerned about the issue of status of women.

Let me begin with some questions specifically on the abortion issue again and C-43. Can the Minister tell us what monitoring if any is going on in her department among the medical fraternity?

We have seen some real horror stories coming out of Ontario, in particular, of doctors consistently saying that if this legislation is passed or even in fact before the legislation is passed, they are restricting their service and therefore, the access of women to abortion. Is there any monitoring going on? Are her staff relatively at peace now? What do they think may transpire if worse comes to worst and this Bill becomes legislation?

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the Women's Health Directorate which has been set up

within the Department of Health will be monitoring that issue very closely and the Women's Directorate per se will be working closely with the Women's Health Directorate.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Well, I am pleased to hear that. I have not myself heard of any specific doctors who have indicated that they will absolutely refuse, although I know a number of them have indicated they are concerned. Let us hope the Senate brings about the kind of changes or decides to not pass the Bill at all. Then we can all rest a little easier as far as access is concerned.

In terms of affirmative action within the Government itself, and I realize that this is within the purview of the Minister responsible for the Civil Service (Mr. Praznik), but we have been on this issue a number of years in the sense that we do not see the co-ordination effort going on in affirmative action. Although we have someone at the table who has made it to the status of Assistant Deputy Minister, we are still only sitting there with two Deputy Ministers. I, like everyone else, would like to see more, as well as all senior management within the Civil Service.

Can the Minister tell us what co-ordination again is going on within the Women's Directorate or the Advisory Council on the Status of Women to ensure that Government, no matter what its political stripe, is advancing the cause of women?

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the audit that was done is to be specifically looking at these issues. We are expecting a report the end of January, and there should be some recommendations that come as a result of the Civil Service audit.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Is that audit going to be available to all Members of the House, or is it going to be considered an internal document?

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, it will be a public document.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** I thank the Minister for that. I look forward to it because I think that we are going to see discrepancies, but I hope we are also going to see recommendations that can alleviate those discrepancies.

In terms of the pay equity issue, I am somewhat dismayed at a press issue that came out just today. Manitoba school divisions are being encouraged to voluntarily provide equal pay for work of equal value by extending pay equity to the non-teaching staff.

This looks like a reduction, it seems to me, in the Government's commitment to pay equity.

It was my understanding that we were indeed going to move, at least in the issues of Government, towards pay equity in a legislative basis. Can the Minister tell us if she has lost the battle in this particular case with Cabinet and if they are unwilling to move into legislated pay equity in the public sector at this time?

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** I think, Mr. Deputy Chairperson, that the news release is quite clear. It does say that we are extending it on a voluntary basis. We have seen that one school division already has implemented pay equity. Another two have already begun to move on it, but there are many more to go. I think by giving them some incentive and indicating that we will provide technical assistance as well as fund 50 percent of the cost wage adjustments by affected employees, is some enhancement for school divisions. We would love to see them all come on stream. I hope that will happen, and the incentive that we have given them will hopefully make that occur.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** It will not surprise the Minister that the larger school division, the one that employs the greatest number of people that would be affected, has not come on side. They have not come on side because of funding. If we are, as a province, funding education and the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach) would tell us it is some 79 percent and we might argue that figure but that is what he says, why are we therefore only prepared to fund as a provincial Government 50 percent of a pay equity proposal? Surely, if our obligation is to fund 79 percent of education costs, then we should also be prepared to fund 79 percent of pay equity costs.

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, this is a decision we have made. We are moving ahead with it. As you indicated, the largest school division has not come on stream yet. I have not had any indication thus far when that might happen or might occur. I guess we need some dialogue with that school division to see what they are prepared to do.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** I just want to stress very strongly to the Minister that the major difficulty is not, I suspect, desire, particularly not on the sad part of Winnipeg School Division No. 1. It is quite frankly a funding issue. I do not think that the women working within Winnipeg School Division No. 1 should be limited in their ability to be treated equally because of funding.



I would ask the Minister to take back the argument to her colleagues that if it is the provincial Government's responsibility to fund at 79 percent of the costs of a school division on average, then they should be prepared to at least fund to 79 percent of a pay equity proposal.

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Yes, I will do that.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** In the discussions of the Manitoba Women's Directorate, they talk specifically about the two outreach programs, one being located in The Pas and one being located in Portage la Prairie. I presume that The Pas was chosen as a centre because as a northern centre it was a viable centre to deal with the North, and just as viable as say, for example, Flin Flon or Thompson. The communications are more or less equal between those communities. Can the Minister tell me why Portage la Prairie was chosen? My own instinct would be that one is so close to Winnipeg, I wonder why the discussion was not made to perhaps locate one in southern Manitoba, a farther distance from Winnipeg, so there might be more access made available to women in this outreach program?

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** It is my understanding that when that decision was made, it was because they were looking at what services were available in rural Manitoba and what centre could best serve the Interlake and southern Manitoba, and the decision was made Portage la Prairie.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Can the Minister tell me if these outreach services—they mention, for example, that there is going to be awareness information. What kinds of information will be available in these outreach centres to the women? Will the information, particularly in the North, be made available in a number of languages? I am thinking specifically of aboriginal languages.

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, the outreach officer who is presently located in The Pas outreach office is of aboriginal background and does speak an aboriginal language. Initially the information will be in English, but the person who is working there right now has the ability to translate. We will make every attempt to provide the information that is requested, translated into aboriginal languages.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** I thank the Minister for that. In terms of the reports, we have a number of them that are coming out in the beginning of next year. First of all,

the action plan will be updated. Secondly, the audit will be ready.

I am prepared, at this point, to pass Status of Women and look forward to a very invigorated debate when we come next into Session, because then there will be some plans of action, hopefully, on the table as to how, together, we can improve the Status of Women in the Province of Manitoba and their reach for equality.

I would just ask if the Women's Directorate can place any more emphasis on the young women, I would urge them to do so. I am particularly concerned with the negative attitudes of young women that have been certainly indicated in the Canadian Teachers' Federation study that has recently been done and some conversations that I have had with young women.

\* (1540)

You know, those of us who feel we have gone forward are hearing the footsteps of our daughters saying we are going backwards. I challenge the directorate in a very positive way to listen very carefully to those young women who are saying no, no, no, I do not want to be known as a feminist, as if the word frightens them to death, and that it simply is a word that says they are equal to their brothers, their uncles, their fathers, and their grandfathers who walk on the surface of the earth. I think that women need to touch those young women of all colours to make them realize they can logically and reasonably ask for equality in Manitoba.

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I appreciate the comments from both critics that have been made. I know we have had a short period of time. I would like to have spent a bit more time getting into some of the issues with both of you and discussing in greater detail. It is a new portfolio for me. I am going through the learning process also, so I think we will probably all be growing through this together. I look forward to the dialogue that will take place once we do have the audit, because I think the recommendations that might come forward might prove to be of some assistance to accomplish greater equality within the Civil Service.

I find the comments that the Leader of the second Opposition made about young women somewhat startling. I do know that I have a young daughter, a 16-year-old at home right now. I am sensing within the group of children she associates with that there

is a stronger sense of feeling of equality and self-confidence and a sense of accomplishment.

I do know that I am having difficulty right now. We just received the first term grades and her math mark is down very considerably. She has a struggle. I will tell you, we are going to get some extra assistance because I believe that if she does not attempt to accomplish and achieve on the mathematics and sciences side of things—I just want her to be able to keep her options open. They may not be her strong areas or her areas of expertise or something that she might want to pursue, but I would hate, at this point in time, for her to not try to strive to achieve to do better and keep her options open for later in life. I think it is so very important that our girls as well as our boys have that equal opportunity. They have to enroll in and take some of the programs and the courses that have been traditional male jobs. As they become educated, and as they strive out and move in that direction, we will accomplish more equality.

**Mrs. Carstairs:** Just to remind the Minister that our daughters are not typical. Our daughters have grown up in families with women who have had professions, and who have had the wherewithal to give them not only inspiration, but provide for them dignity, assurances, courage. Not all daughters, tragically, find themselves the beneficiaries of those kinds of experiences.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** 1. Status of Women (1) Salaries \$152,900—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$116,900—pass.

Item (b) Women's Directorate: (1) Salaries \$435,300—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$252,900—pass.

Resolution 139: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$958,000 for the Status of Women for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

### SUPPLY—CANADA-MANITOBA ENABLING VOTE (Cont'd.)

**Mr. Deputy Chairman (Marcel Laurendeau):** Would it be the wish of the committee to revert back to the one that I inadvertently passed? It is Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote. I notice the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) is here, and I believe the Honourable Member for Concordia (Mr. Doer) had some questions. Is that the wish of the committee?

Would the Honourable Minister have any opening comments?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** None at all, Mr. Deputy Chairman. Let us get right to it.

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Yes, I have a few. I know time is short with the number of other departments. A few questions to the Minister—can the Minister advise the House, and through this committee, how much money we have received from Ottawa as part of our submission for 50 percent of the damages, or a minimum of 50 percent if not all the money, for the 1989 forest fire?

**Mr. Manness:** In a cash sense, none.

**Mr. Doer:** Are there any negotiated settlements or tentative settlements?

**Mr. Manness:** Tentative can mean a lot of different things. Certainly we have come to a range. This is very much a hard-fought political problem, one that will require a political resolution, one that is outside of the bounds of the formula in place, so much so that it will probably—I do not know for sure—draw the Provincial Auditor's comment when he reports to the Legislature.

To answer the question, we still at this point do not have a satisfactory agreement to the Province of Manitoba.

**Mr. Doer:** Can the Minister advise us, as people who are all collectively accountable to the Provincial Auditor, what areas is the province contemplating rather than cash settlement, some other settlement in kind?

**Mr. Manness:** No, not at all.

**Mr. Doer:** Can the Minister advise us in what ways—you are not going to put something in the fiscal stabilization again, some phony—no, I would not think the Minister would. He has already been cited and embarrassed once by his action. Can the Minister advise us in what way, shape or form is this outside of the Auditor's directions to this Legislature?

**Mr. Manness:** I have now given the Member an opportunity to pose a question tomorrow in Question Period and that is fine.

I believe that when we closed the books for last year we were expecting this situation would be resolved by now, that a political decision would have been made in Ottawa and an agreement entered into. We indicated in closing the books we were

expecting so much money to—or at least a hard agreement to be in place at a certain figure or better.

That has not occurred, so we have not been honest—honest is not the right word. We have not been correct in our assumptions at the year end, closing the books. I think that is why the Provincial Auditor may want to draw note of it. Let me assure the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Doer) that this takes on very much symbolic presence as far as discussions between Ottawa and ourselves. Until we are satisfied, we are not agreeing to accept any portion of the payment.

**Mr. Doer:** There have been offers on the table, though.

\* (1550)

**Mr. Manness:** Correct, yes, there have been.

**Mr. Doer:** Now, as I recall the figure in the books last year was \$19 million. Can the Minister correct me?

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, the formula number is \$11 million to \$12 million, and I think we had put a number at least twice that size in the books. I do not know where the \$19 million comes from with certainty.

**Mr. Doer:** Okay, maybe that was your position. I have three numbers I know of, and I just want to make sure I know where we are going.

Can the Minister advise us if any of these federal-provincial negotiations tied up with the unresolved issue of the tax revenue issue with Ottawa that took five hours this Tuesday, as the Minister has confirmed?

**Mr. Manness:** Not yet. If the Member is talking about the fires and is relating that to the outstanding issues on the GST, no. No, as I sit here, but you never know how these matters tend to all of a sudden creep together.

**Mr. Doer:** Well, I am surprised the Minister would say that. He is still on record as concluding that Michael Wilson is the best and most honest Finance Minister this country ever had. His words ring out like a neon sign in Hansard, Mr. Deputy Chairman.

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have never heard a neon sign ring, but maybe there is new technology.

**Mr. Doer:** It rings when it flashes on and off.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Order, please; order, please.

**Mr. Doer:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, we are very concerned about the relationship with the Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote. This reflects cash flow—many of them agreements, by the way, that were achieved by former Governments.

In fact the cash flow into the Manitoba budget situation, the Minister well knows, most of these—Tourism Agreement, Northern Development Agreement, Core Area Agreement, Special ARDA Agreement, Mineral Development Agreement, Forest Renewal Agreement, Culture, Transportation, Urban Bus, Soil Conservation—in fact were negotiated by a previous Government.

Can the Minister indicate now that many of these now are just cash flows from previous agreements, that most of these agreements have not been renegotiated by this Government, and therefore we are going to lose major amounts of revenues if we look at the '91-92 fiscal situation and the '92-93 fiscal situation?

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition is half correct and half wrong, as he tends to be.

Let me say firstly, Agri-Food Agreement, certainly there is not yet another agreement. Tourism Agreement, at this point there is not yet another agreement. Winnipeg Core Area Renewed Agreement, at this point there is not yet an agreement. Soil Conservation Agreement, there is a new agreement. Partnership Agreement on Municipal Water Infrastructure, known as SDI, there is a new agreement there. Program for Older Worker Adjustment, there is a new program and a commitment there.

So the Member is half correct. If he wants more detail as to the present state of negotiations in some of these areas, I am probably the wrong Minister. I am not the lead Minister as far as the negotiations, although I am the signing Minister as far as the transfer of funds.

**Mr. Doer:** Let us look at accuracy of numbers. I have just now been advised by the Liberal Party Leader (Mrs. Carstairs) of the figure in the book of \$19 million in the Flood Control and Emergency Expenditures line for that number. That is where I was referring to. I want to get into a question—I mean accuracy, we have no time to dispute accuracies right now—we have only time to ask questions.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, will the Minister admit that the strategy on the Core Area Agreement that his Government has now articulated in proposing a one-year extension is indeed a lessening of federal money to the City of Winnipeg through the province in the tripartite agreement? Obviously, if you extend a five-year agreement to be a six-year agreement, even though the sixth and seventh year was always contemplated for cash flow, that it is in essence lessening the amount of contribution to the province by extending the years and therefore is suspect as a strategy dealing with the federal Government in terms of its contributions to our major urban centre.

(Mr. Jack Reimer, Acting Chairman, in the Chair)

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Acting Chairman, I guess again it depends how you look at it. If you had never been spending the funds basically on a five-year cycle and now you are adding a sixth year which allows you to spend to the same extent that you were, on the same cash flow basis that you were for the first—over the last three or four, really there should be no difference. In the sense that you had spent virtually all of the funds in the first five years, and you had virtually none left to spend, but you did spend those in the sixth year and had no other funds to supplement that smaller amount, then the Member would be right. I do not know which way one wants to look at it. I think the total funds spent in the sixth year will be no different than the total funds spent in the years previous.

**Mr. Doer:** That sounds very much like Orwellian newspeak for "You are getting less money from the federal Government." They contribute on average \$7 million per year to the City of Winnipeg through the Core Area Agreement. As a person who was involved in negotiating before, when you take a five-year agreement at about \$33 million to \$35 million a year from the federal Government in basic money, and you extend it to six years, you obviously go down from close to \$7 million to quite a bit less. The Minister knows that. I understand why the position of the federal Government is to extend this agreement one year. I do not understand why the provincial Government is proposing that as their position.

**Mr. Manness:** I am not going to involve myself in too much of this debate. I am certainly not intimate with the whole situation, but as far as what appears to be, if you are standing along a spectrum, and you are standing before the first year, what the Member says is right. If you are standing at the end of the

fifth year into the sixth, and you look at it from my perspective, the answer I gave previously is also correct. It depends where one is looking at the issue, at what point in time.

As far as the provincial Government, I think that we, too, are wanting to do some evaluations. Yet if the federal Government with its veto is insisting in moving along one way, I do not know how it is that we would unilaterally as one of the partners be able to change that.

**Mr. Doer:** Will the Minister please tell us, it is my understanding from the Minister of Urban Affairs (Mr. Ducharme) it is the Province of Manitoba's position. Let us not talk about the federal Government's position for a minute. It is the Province of Manitoba's position to extend it for one year. Is that not correct?

**Mr. Manness:** I will not answer that because I do not know what the Minister of Urban Affairs has put on the record. Sorry, I am not the proper person to answer that question.

**Mr. Doer:** I could go on a long time. I believe this Government on the Canada-Manitoba Enabling Vote—this is the symptom of a very poor record of federal-provincial discussions. We will continue to disagree with this Government on this, the strategy, the developments that this Government is undertaking with the federal Government. Almost on a daily basis these issues arise. We have commented on them. That is why we sit on different sides of the House.

We could ask a lot of other questions here, but I know we have half an hour to deal with six lines so I will leave it to the Liberals. We are prepared to pass that—it has already been passed, so we are prepared to move to Legislation right away, which is also with the Minister.

**Mr. Manness:** Are you prepared to do Allowances for Losses too, after Legislation?

**Mr. Doer:** Yes.

**Mr. Manness:** It is a little bit out of the order, I think.

\* (1600)

**Mr. Doer:** We can just go right through here. Read the lists. We were told before we could not do that. I just want to put on the record that any group that has to deal with 57 politicians from three Parties deserves our unqualified respect and support. I thank them for all their support and advice to keep us putting all our things in the right pigeon hole as

required by the LAMC and other rules of Government. We thank you very much for that and all your indulgences with us.

**Mrs. Sharon Carstairs (Leader of the Second Opposition):** I will add my thanks to the staff particularly. They do it without ever losing their temper. I think it is amazing.

## SUPPLY—LEGISLATION

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Reimer):** We are now moving on to Legislation.

Item 1. Indemnities (Statutory) (a) Members \$2,392,000—pass; (b) Speaker's, Deputy Speaker's and Deputy Chairman's additional Indemnity and Speaker's Intersessional Payment \$21,500—pass; (c) Opposition House Leader, Party Whips \$7,500—pass.

Item 2. Retirement Allowances (Statutory) (a) Allowances and Refunds \$1,277,900—pass.

Resolution 1: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,782,000 for Legislation, Other Assembly Expenditures for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 2: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,811,500 for Legislation, Provincial Auditor's Office for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Item 3. Members' Allowances (Statutory) \$3,278,900 (a) Access and Constituency Allowance. Is there agreement to pass the whole line? Pass the whole department?

(a) \$1,542,800; (b) \$408,300; (c) \$31,200; (d) \$238,100; (e) 100,600; (f) \$335,400; (g) \$3,000; (h) \$500; (j) \$233,000; (k) \$386,000—pass.

Item 4. Other Assembly Expenditures \$3,782,000 (a) Leader of the Official Opposition Party \$164,700—pass; (b) Leader of the Second Opposition Party \$15,600—pass; (c) Salaries \$1,743,200—pass; (d) Other Expenditures \$1,039,900—pass; (e) Hansard \$818,600—pass.

Item 5. Provincial Auditor's Office \$2,811,500 (a) Salaries \$2,630,900—pass; (b) Other Expenditures \$180,600—pass.

Item 6. Ombudsman \$682,100 (a) Salaries \$603,500—pass; (b) Other Expenditures \$78,600—pass.

Resolution 3: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$682,100 for Legislation, Ombudsman for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Item 7. Elections Manitoba \$6,959,300 (a) \$720,400—

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** Was there any consideration of the Manitoba public and taxpayers with the Government calling an early and unnecessary election this year?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** As a matter of fact, there was. That was the prime reason of calling the election early. I mean, we wanted to save harmless the taxpayers from this continual overspending that maybe occurs through minority Governments. The safeguard was provided in this year's budget, where there was no increase in personal income tax. Certainly, it was keeping in mind the interest of Manitoba's taxpayers.

**Mr. Doer:** I think the Government has wasted \$7 million of taxpayers' money. I want the record to show that. Clearly, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) knows that. I will end that and pass it.

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Reimer):** Item 7.(a) Salaries \$720,400—pass; (b) Other Expenditures \$6,238,900—pass.

Resolution 4: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$6,959,300 for Legislation, Elections Manitoba for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

## SUPPLY—EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Reimer):** Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,409,200 for Executive Council—pass.

## SUPPLY—ALLOWANCE FOR LOSSES AND EXPENDITURES INCURRED BY CROWN CORPORATIONS AND OTHER PROVINCIAL ENTITIES

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Reimer):** We are now moving to page 170. Allowance for Losses and Expenditures Incurred by Crown Corporations 1. \$5,600,000—pass. Total Allowances \$5,600,000—pass.

Resolution 145: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$5,600,000 for Allowance for Losses and

Expenditures Incurred by Crown Corporations and Other Provincial Entities for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

### SUPPLY—FLOOD CONTROL AND EMERGENCY EXPENDITURES

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Reimer):** Page 173, Flood Control and Emergency Expenditures 1. \$2,500,000—pass.

Resolution 148: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,500,000 for Flood Control and Emergency Expenditures for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

### SUPPLY—GENERAL SALARY INCREASES

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Reimer):** Page 174, General Salary Increases \$5,000,000.00.

**Mr. Gary Doer (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). He obviously knows that represents about a quarter of 1 percent of the pay, although in the direct public service that would be about 1 percent. Does the Minister feel that some of the other negotiations that he has arrived at through public sector bargaining, i.e., the Workers Compensation, et cetera, where there is COLA clauses in 1991-92, have prejudiced the amount of money that the Minister has placed in this line?

\* (1610)

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Short answer, no.

**Mr. Doer:** So the Minister accepts that COLA is the patterned settlement for '91-92?

**Mr. Manness:** The answer is no.

**Mr. Doer:** Given that many of the bargaining in 1991-92 have arbitration, and given that arbitration potentially utilizes other patterns, i.e., doctors, Civil Service, et cetera, how does the Minister think that will not prejudice his position, given that it is a Crown corporation with Cabinet Ministers? Obviously, Cabinet would authorize those figures.

(Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair)

**Mr. Manness:** The Member and Manitobans will be apprised of the Government's views and its approach to general public sector wage funding in due course.

**Mr. Doer:** Is the Minister putting out guidelines for public sector negotiations for '91 and '92 next week and after the House rises? How does that fit with the settlements the Government has already reached? I can name settlements in St. Boniface College at 5 percent. I can name COLA settlements. How does it fit to have a certain set of settlements or guidelines being established by the Government next week when, in fact, they have already made settlements in the public sector?

**Mr. Manness:** I would ask the Member to stand closely by over the next—not hours, not days, not weeks. Obviously there are a number of major contracts that are open for negotiation. We will try to be pretty open with the public and try to present our methodology and, indeed, our approach as to how we are going to try and deal fairly with all.

**Mr. Doer:** I am prepared to pass the item, recognizing that it is placed in as a token amount of money. We recognize that.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Item 1. General Salary Increases \$5,000,000—pass.

Resolution No. 149: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$5,000,000 for General Salary Increases for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

### SUPPLY—NATURAL RESOURCES

**Mr. Deputy Chairman (Marcel Laurendeau):** Would it be the wish of the committee that we start with the Opposition Member asking the questions?

**Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River):** Are we on Regional Services? Is that where we are?

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** We are on Natural Resources, and we will deal through as one unit.

**Hon. Harry Enns (Minister of Natural Resources):** I would suggest, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that due to time constraints, the Member feel free to discuss any aspect of the department. We were on Regional Services, to answer your question specifically, but I think you could—

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Just deal with any—okay.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Just to maybe accommodate—the Minister is quite willing to be very flexible. I wonder if maybe we could pass all the resolutions, get up to the Minister's Salary, and then feel free to ask questions at that point.

**Mr. Enns:** The Member makes an appropriate suggestion with the kind of—I may or may not have staff here, so I am prepared to deal with any questions in general and accept any critical comments that Members may wish to have, so it might be appropriate, which is usually done on the Minister's Salary.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** What is the wish of the committee?

Item 1. Administration and Finance (b) Executive Support: (1) Salaries \$252,100—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$107,700—pass.

(c) Resource Integration—

**Mr. Enns:** I hate to interrupt you, but that can take up all the time that we have. Would you not consider passing the main motions? In the main motions, pass the ones in the indelible—

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** I will just read it all quickly. Item (c) Resource Integration: (1) Salaries \$624,300—(pass); (2) Other Expenditures \$55,500—(pass).

Item (d) Financial Services: (1) Salaries \$941,300—(pass); (2) Other Expenditures \$220,500—(pass).

Item (e) Human Resource Management: (1) Salaries \$977,900—(pass); (2) Other Expenditures \$169,400—(pass).

Item (f) Computer Services: (1) Salaries \$267,600—(pass); (2) Other Expenditures \$40,600—(pass).

Item (g) Administrative Services: (1) Salaries \$747,100—(pass); (2) Other Expenditures \$122,400—(pass).

Item (h) Internal Audit: (1) Salaries \$159,400—(pass); (2) Other Expenditures \$9,400—(pass).

Item (j) Venture Manitoba Tours Ltd. \$75,000—(pass).

Item 2. Regional Services (a) Administration: (1) Salaries \$1,285,500—(pass); (2) Other Expenditures \$917,900—(pass); (3) Problem Wildlife Control \$204,600—(pass).

Item (b) Northwest Region: (1) Salaries \$1,242,700—(pass); (2) Other Expenditures \$397,500—(pass).

Is it the will of the committee that we pass one resolution at a time, complete resolutions? If we have agreement of the committee, we can do it.

I will pass all the resolutions except for 108 at this time.

Resolution 109: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$35,934,100 for Natural Resources, Regional Services for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 110: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$7,022,000 for Natural Resources, Engineering and Construction for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 111: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$9,049,300 for Natural Resources, Water Resources for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 112: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$15,163,800 for Natural Resources, Parks for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 113: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,915,000 for Natural Resources, Lands for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 114: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$13,155,800 for Natural Resources, Forestry for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 115: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,619,700 for Natural Resources, Fisheries for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 116: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$5,711,500 for Natural Resources, Wildlife for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

\* (1620)

Resolution 117: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,467,400 for Natural Resources, Surveys and Mapping for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 118: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$430,400 for Natural Resources, Resource Support Programs for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 119: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$8,589,400 for Natural Resources, Expenditures Related to Capital for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 120: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$500,000 for Natural Resources, Lotteries Funded Programs for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

#### Minister's Salary—

**Ms. Wowchuk:** There are several areas that I would like to cover, but in view of the time I will just touch on a few of them and perhaps the Minister will allow us to discuss them at another time.

The first question I would like to ask is on a position for an assistant water resource manager that was allocated for Dauphin. It was discussed a couple of years ago. There was a need for a position after the study on Lake Dauphin was started up. That position has not been filled to this point; and, as I understand, when the position is going to be filled, it is going to be in Roblin instead of in Dauphin.

Can the Minister comment on that position as to when it will be filled?

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, I can inform the Honourable Member that we have assigned, if you like, a special person to co-ordinate the efforts of the department on Lake Dauphin. The name of the person is Mr. John Towle, who is, among other things, co-ordinating the rather encouraging events that are taking place in a—he is the support staff for the Lake Dauphin Advisory Committee that is dealing with the very important issue of trying to bring about improvements to the water quality in the lake, not only in the lake but in the contributory streams and creeks. With that full-time designation of Mr. Towle to the Dauphin Lake situation—who is also I understand a resident in Dauphin—the position that the Honourable Member refers to has been scheduled to be moved to Roblin as part of the department's contribution to the Decentralization Program. So that position that she specifically refers to will not be filled in Dauphin.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, I understand that position will go to Roblin. I question the Minister in that decision because the bulk of the work that is to be done by the assistant water resource manager is in Swan River area and The Pas area. I also understand that there is no office space in Roblin. This will mean extra cost for office space but also a lot of extra travel cost if the position is going to be in Roblin but the work is in another area. I just question the Minister on the decision for it being in Roblin when that is not where the work is needed.

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, there have been some difficulties encountered by the department in attempting to meet, in a rational way, those requests from those in charge of the Decentralization Program to move certain departmental employees to different rural communities throughout Manitoba. Undoubtedly, there will be instances that create some of the problems that the Honourable Member just described. I am not at this moment prepared to indicate, however, that those functions of the assistant water manager cannot be carried out from Roblin. It is large area that the Member is familiar with, reaching up to Swan River valley area and south as well that the Member will be engaged in.

The move has not taken place, I might say to the Honourable Member at this point in time. If, in fact, it proves difficult for us to make the necessary arrangements, then obviously we will be reconsidering it.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Can the Minister indicate when this position will be filled? Have the necessary forms been signed to allow the position to be advertised?

**Mr. Enns:** I would suspect that a number of these positions, as indeed is the experience of other departments, as is the experience within my own department of services that have been targeted for decentralization where in some instances incumbent staff members, particularly if it involves staff in the city of Winnipeg who, for one reason or another, are finding it difficult or reluctant to make the move to rural Manitoba are indicating their decision to us and to the Decentralization Committee.

In some instances there will be fairly significant numbers of opportunities, as I describe them, for rural residents within the area to apply for new openings as they arise. They will, of course, have to



have the necessary qualifications for the positions so being advertised.

I cannot specifically indicate as to when this specific position will be advertised. We are not—and I do not know if the Honourable Member has had the opportunity. My understanding is that decentralization in general was questioned at some length by my colleague, the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), who is responsible for the Decentralization Program on behalf of the Government.

I know that within my department we are allowing ourselves ample time, 18 months, two years, to effect some of these changes, so that they be done in a prudent manner where existing lease, rental arrangements in existing buildings in fact expire allowing Government Services to find appropriate office facilities in those areas that are expecting to receive additional public service staff.

The Member mentioned a little while ago that the facilities in Roblin have not yet been identified, or are not there, and that may well prove to be an obstacle that may or may not be overcome, depending on how diligent my colleague, the Minister of Government Services (Mr. Driedger) does his job in that respect and, of course, whether or not the arrangements are satisfactory, satisfactory to us in terms of a dollars and cents point of view and we get the people into that area.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** I would just like to mention to the Minister that this position was identified over two years ago, similar to a position in the Interlake. There is a need for these services. There is a lag behind in services from this department and a real concern to the municipalities. I would hope that the Minister would not use the excuse of decentralization to fill these positions when we knew that position was needed long before decentralization was even announced. I urge the Minister to fill it because of the need for the service in the northern area.

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, I do not take unkindly to the comments of the Honourable Member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk). I am always pleased to know that services that my department has mandated for are indeed required, are indeed appreciated in different parts of the province.

I quite frankly welcome her expressions of support in that sense because I have said privately,

and I say it publicly, that a department like mine has a tendency to be underestimated in terms of its importance to rural people. We tend to, understandably I suppose, have other issues of greater priority, particularly here in this Legislature and as a new Member, she has experienced at this Session that so much of our time is taken up with matters concerning the Health Department, the Justice Department, and the Education Department.

\* (1630)

Those of us who live in rural Manitoba understand that such mundane things like drainage, water sourcing, fisheries, are very important to many of the people that she represents and I might say many of the people that I represent. So I accept those comments.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** I will not pursue that any further in view of the fact that we are just about out of time. The other area that I would like to raise with the Minister is the Lake Winnipegosis fishermen. I know I have raised this question in the House, and I just do not seem to get the answer that I want when the Minister tells me that he cannot do anything about it.

I want to ask the Minister if he would seriously consider a review of Lake Winnipegosis to look at diversifying that economy. Will he consider meeting with those fishermen in that area who are going to be shut down? They are going to be on welfare, and that is a disappointment. People do not like to go on welfare, but they do not have any other opportunity in that area right now. Will you consider meeting with the fishermen and dealing with that?

**Mr. Enns:** I will do more than consider that. I am asking for a full review of just how the season ended. I know it was a disappointment to the fishermen engaged in it. I would like to have some further biological data as to what can be expected or best guesstimate of what the future seasons on Lake Winnipegosis hold for the fishermen in question.

The Member is aware that this Government did put some substantial dollars into the area. We paid out the quota in excess of \$250,000.00. I also indicated to the Honourable Member in the House, I have other colleagues, other departments, in Government that share this responsibility in helping—I believe the Member is right. The lake will only carry so many people. If there is a general problem in the commercial fisheries in Manitoba, it

is that we have too many people chasing too few fish.

It is not easy to contract the number of licences, but in hard economic terms, that likely is what has to happen. There may be only a living in commercial fishing for X number of fishermen in that fisheries, period. Other people will have to find other forms of activity in terms of their future livelihood.

I genuinely invite the Honourable Member to help me in searching out other opportunities. I would suggest that her care would not be misdirected at some of my colleagues in Government, whether it is the Minister of Industry and small business development (Mr. Ernst), whether it is the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach), or indeed the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Penner), that would help us to put the entire network of the Government programming available to those people that she is talking about in the Winnipegosis area. I look forward to debating this matter with the Honourable Member in the future.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** I thank the Minister for that answer, and I will be coming forward with some suggestions as I am meeting with the people in that area. They have some suggestions on diversification which I feel must happen.

I also would like to ask the Minister if he would be willing to share the results of the studies on the lake, once you get some results of what the fishing season is turning out to be.

**Mr. Enns:** I will be more than prepared to share the statistical data that is currently being collated with respect to the overall results of this past summer's fisheries on Lake Winnipegosis, the number of people engaged in it, and indeed what the prognosis is for the future.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** I will move off Lake Winnipegosis. I have a different area that I would like to talk about, and that is the cutting area. With the change in the Repap boundaries and the cutting area and the change of role of the Natural Resources officers versus the Repap officers, would the Minister care to explain to us how the role of the officers has changed versus Repap? The reason I raise the question is that some people who are small quota holders are seeming to get a runaround from the Repap office to the Natural Resources office, back and forth, as to who is in charge of the issuing of licenses and quotas and things like that.

**Mr. Enns:** I suppose anytime a change takes place it takes some time for people to adjust to it. The change in this case is substantial in the sense that, for the past 18 years, the major forestry operator in that area was, of course, a Government-run operation under Manfor. I suppose the relationship between the independent operator, that she is now speaking on behalf of, and the big operator in the area was somewhat closer.

It is an area that I have directed just recently for a coming-together of the regional resource officers in that area along with officials from the Repap organization to help overcome some of those difficulties. My understanding of the agreement struck with the province and the Repap organization is that similar cutting rights, similar accommodation to the independent operators who have been in that area prior to the agreement having been entered into, are essentially the same.

There are, of course, different players involved and, in some instances, the independent operator has not become accustomed to changing his calling address. He should, in many cases, be sitting down with Mr. Jonas from the Repap people and working out arrangements. He intends to still come to the forestry office. I appreciate some of that runaround is being caused because of that.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** I want to make it clear to the Minister that it is not the operator who is causing the runaround by going to the wrong office. The runaround he is getting is when he goes to the Repap office. They tell him, no, go to Natural Resources. When he gets to Natural Resources, it is, go to the Repap office. So the operators are getting the runaround from the people in the offices, and it is a concern.

Just on the cutting and the changes, I want to make the Minister aware that there are some changes that are taking place that are not the way they used to be as far as cutting. In particular, one quota holder who has called, who has a quota for white spruce, is now being told that he has to cut the black spruce in the area. He has to clear cut. No matter what size the trees are, he has to clean the area.

I, myself, am concerned about clear cutting, particularly in the mountains, because of the runoff of water off the mountain that happens in the spring. The Minister is aware what can happen with that. What is the Minister's position on clear cutting and

the idea that they have to cut no matter what there is there? Whether they have a quota for white spruce—if they cut the black spruce, they cannot sell it, but they are told they have to cut it anyway.

**Mr. Enns:** I invite the Honourable Member to bring that to my attention and, more specifically, to the appropriate forestry people in my branch to answer specifically to issues that she raises. The question of forest management overall and the issues of clear cutting and the like are currently under very active review.

The Sustainable Development Unit of Government has targeted forests for this kind of a review. Public meetings have been held throughout the province. Documents with respect to future strategy that will, to a large extent, guide my department as to how we apply those strategies to future forest management plans and certainly affect the operations of the likes of Abitibi-Price and Repap.

Those new management practices are under very active review at this time, and I suspect that I will be able to have something to table when next we meet, perhaps in March or in April, and would ask the Member to raise those issues with me at that time.

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Mr. Deputy Chairman, I was disturbed to learn that the Government was considering allowing logging rights in Nopiming Provincial Park. Nopiming Provincial Park, of course, is a beautiful area. I have canoed in the area. Manigotagan, in particular, is an area that I know well, and I was concerned to learn that the Government was considering granting Abitibi-Price those logging rights.

Can the Minister report on two things: Firstly, that specific issue of logging rights in the Manigotagan area of Nopiming Provincial Park; secondly, whether or not he and his Government are prepared to consider bans on logging in provincial parks, which we have done for many years and which I personally find regretful?

\* (1640)

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, under careful and controlled conditions, there is currently a practice in place that permits limited extraction of resources from some of our provincial parks. Particularly, I cite the Grass River Park up in the North in the Flin Flon area, where there is some limited mining taking place.

The Honourable Member refers to some logging that takes place in some of our parks. That and other policies are under review, both in the forestry review that I referred to a little while ago. The Member will also be aware that the Government is committed to a very substantial updating and review of our overall park policy. It has to do with our commitment to the Endangered Spaces Program. I suspect that in answer to the Honourable Member's questions, they will be more clearly defined in the next four or five months.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** I had not quite finished asking my questions on the cutting rights in the Duck Mountain area, but I will bring to the Minister's attention the specific case that I have and a few of the frustrations that small operators are feeling in that area.

I am not sure if this comes under the Minister's department, but we have had much discussion on the cutting area that Repap was given. Does the Minister have any influence in the cutting area, and is there any chance that cutting area can be renegotiated to take the Duck Mountain out of the Repap deal so that small operators in that area have more flexibility than they have right now?

**Mr. Enns:** Cutting areas are generally prescribed in a contractual arrangement that the Government of the Day arrived at. The Government arrived at a very substantial cutting area for the Manfor operation many years ago. That was somewhat altered and some of what we refer to the southern forests were taken when the Repap deal was structured.

Cutting areas are not carved in stone. The Honourable Member for St. James (Mr. Edwards) asked the question with respect to Abitibi. Part of the reason why some additional cutting rights for Abitibi are being considered is because of the very substantial losses in their area during last year's horrendous forest fires. It places an obligation on the Government to find some alternative timber for them. The questions are very severe. We believe that prudent and sustainable commercial harvest of our forests is a policy that this Government adopts. To do otherwise is to talk about putting many thousands of people out of work. I remind Honourable Members some 10,000 Manitobans find their gainful employment from the forestry industry.

**Mr. Edwards:** I appreciate the Minister's candidness, but I also bring to his attention that the theory behind provincial parks is to preserve them

for the benefit of all and preserve their natural beauty. That is the reasoning behind the designation of a provincial park. To allow mining and logging as well as other commercial ventures in those provincial parks has always seemed to me to be inconsistent, and I believe that we are out of step, not only with the times, but with many of the other provinces in this country, and certainly out of step with the Green Plan and the things that are being put forward federally.

Mr. Deputy Chairperson, my question specifically, back to the Abitibi-Price application in Nopiming Park, it seems to me to be a prime example of an area that needs to be preserved. There are lots of Manitobans who enjoy that area. Will logging permits be granted to Abitibi-Price in that area? What is the status of that application?

**Mr. Enns:** It is my understanding that negotiations have taken and are taking place at Abitibi-Price to grant them some cutting rights in that area.

**Mr. Edwards:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, that, I believe, is regretful, and I simply point that out to the Minister. Obviously, it is within his department's authority, but I certainly find that a regressive move.

Is there presently a plan in the department to come up with a new Parks Act which, I believe, we need in this province?

**Mr. Enns:** Yes, Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Parks Act is under total review. There will be an opportunity for substantial public discussion with respect to how Manitobans view their park system, whether or not a multitiered park system should be considered. There are those who believe that we have made a terrible mess of the Whiteshell, for instance, because we have let people into the park. So there is a question of whether we tier the park system that says: in these kinds of parks we allow this kind of activity taking place; in other parks we preserve them in their natural state. Atikaki, by the way, is such a park where we would not allow any resource extraction.

I believe that we in Manitoba are fortunate that we have the luxury of doing that, that we can use those resources in a cautious and a prudent and responsible manner that provides economic opportunities for the province and, at the same time, have substantial areas and regions of our province preserved into future generations in their wilderness state.

We are talking about some exciting possibilities with the federal Government in the Churchill area, which would be a combination marine, tundra and natural park. We are talking about further expansions of a Manitoba lowland park, perhaps even a park such as Hecla would be of interest to the federal Government's Canada Parks System for consideration.

In other words, there is, in my estimation, room for considerable debate on the question, and I think we are extremely fortunate that in Manitoba we can offer a variety of park experiences to our Manitobans and to the increasing number of visitors that come to our parks. Some six million visitors visit our park system every year.

**Mr. Edwards:** Mr. Deputy Chairperson, moving to another topic because time is short. Resource officers in this province have in the past made requests for handguns, and that issue was under debate, I know, in the last Session, in the last Legislature. I wonder if the Minister can give us an update on what the department's position is with respect to arming resource officers, and whether the resource officers themselves are continuing to ask for that additional weaponry.

**Mr. Enns:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, I was hoping the Member might ask me about ducks, but with respect to resource officers wishing to wear sidearms. Resource officers have had a long and continuing debate on that question. It is my understanding that it is only in the last year or two that they have passed formal resolutions in a majority within their officer association, which comprises some 180 officers, that they have made that request officially to myself as Minister and to the Government. I have rejected the request on the basis that it is not my belief that adding additional weapons onto the scene necessarily will be the answer.

I say this with a great deal of understanding for what the resource officers face, often alone in the wilderness areas, often at night in the bush. Some statistics, as my resource officers point out to me, a resource officer in my department has a chance four times greater of being killed on duty than does a police officer in the City of Winnipeg, for instance. There is reason to seriously examine the issues. We provide situations where officers, knowing that they are going into dangerous situations, do have access to firearms. They have the permission to have a firearm available to them in their vehicle under

certain circumstances, and they are in fact used under certain circumstances.

To answer your question, the policy of the Government, the policy of the department is, at this point, very clear and very firm. We have no intention of arming our resource officers with sidearms.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** There is a couple of questions that I want to get in before we finish this. One of them that I want to ask deals with the Duck Mountain Park. A lot of work has been done in the Wellman Lake area by the previous administration to make that area more accessible and a better place. There are a lot of requests from the people at the south end of the park in the Singuish/Blue Lake area to have hydro brought in there so that area can be developed. Is the department looking at bringing in hydro and providing more services in the Singuish/Blue Lake area of the park?

\* (1650)

**Mr. Enns:** Yes, I think I can say that in a positive way. I happen to share the view that when you look at the overall expenditures for recreational parks purposes in the Province of Manitoba, in the past number of years, past several decades, a disproportionate share of it has gone to the eastern side of the province. I say that even of my region of the Interlake, when I look at the monies that have been spent on such facilities like Hecla Provincial Park, the resort, and along Winnipeg Beach.

It is understandable that much of the prime recreational area is in the eastern part of the province, the Whiteshell, and so forth, so that we should understand that. I believe very, very strongly that greater emphasis should be placed on those—

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Order, please.

**Mr. Enns:**—those facilities that we have in the area that the Honourable Member mentions it. She has my assurances that they will get that attention.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** I look forward to discussing it.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** Order, please. Shall we pass the last resolution?

Resolution 108: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,790,800 for Natural Resources, Administration and Finance for the financial year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

The committee will now go back to the Chamber and complete the remaining Estimates there.

This portion of the committee shall rise.

## SUPPLY—HEALTH

**Madam Chairman (Louise Dacquay):** This section of the Committee of Supply will continue to consider the Estimates of the Department of Health. Would the Minister's staff please enter the Chamber?

We are on item 1. Administration and Finance (f) Administration and Financial Services, page 89 of the Estimates book. (1) Salaries \$1,126,000—pass; 1.(f)(2) Other Expenditures \$61,400—pass.

Item 1.(g) Human Resource Management: (1) Salaries \$619,200.00.

**Mr. Gulzar Cheema (The Maples):** Madam Chairman, can the Minister tell us if there are any positions vacant in that department? The light is still on.

**Hon. Donald Orchard (Minister of Health):** Madam Chairman, the date of the sheet that my honourable friend has showed no vacancies, but since then there is one vacancy.

(Mr. Eric Stefanson, Acting Chairman, in the Chair)

**Mr. Cheema:** Can the Minister give us some information on Mr. Kaufman's legal fees?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Acting Chairman, we really got jammed up from 12:30 till now. My deputy has not got that, but we will get that for you and give it to you before we get out this afternoon. When the information comes in, if I have the agreement of both my Opposition critics, I will just simply provide it as an answer.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Acting Chairman, I do not have any further questions on the same issue. Could we go to the next page? Pass.

(Mr. Ben Sveinson, Acting Chairman, in the Chair)

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Sveinson):** Item 1.(g)(1) Salaries \$619,200—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$62,700—pass.

Item 1.(h) Internal Audit: (1) Salaries \$163,400—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$14,700—pass.

Item 2. Community Health Services (Programs) (a) Program and Operation Support: (1) Salaries \$1,227,500—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$174,300—pass.

Item 2.(b) Communicable Disease Control: (1) Salaries \$812,700—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$4,981,800—pass; 2.(b)(3) External Agencies \$307,100—pass.

Item 2.(c) Women's Health Directorate: (1) Salaries \$419,300.00.

**Ms. Judy Wasylycia-Lels (St. Johns):** I notice from the discussion paper that was circulated last year, pertaining to the role of the Women's Health Directorate, that one of the areas it has some responsibility for is reproductive technologies. I am wondering if the Minister can fill us in, in terms of the work that is being done with respect to this very difficult issue. Let me start by asking if the province made any kind of representation to the Royal Commission on new reproductive technology when that commission was in Winnipeg this past October?

**Mr. Orchard:** Yes, that presentation was made by Government. It was a combination of the Women's Directorate and the Women's Health Directorate of my ministry.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** I am wondering if the Minister could table that report or provide copies to us of that presentation?

**Mr. Orchard:** Yes, Mr. Acting Chairman, we will make that available.

\* (1440)

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Thank you. While we are waiting for that, could the Minister give us a rough idea of the views presented by the Government of Manitoba to this Royal Commission on Reproductive Technologies?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Acting Chairman, basically we try to provide, I guess you might say, the perspective that Governments face in the challenge of coming to grips with, not only policy directive, which then has implications on requests for funding and new directions in funding, but also there is a fair degree of debate around the ethics of very rapidly changing technology. I guess what we tried to present, and my honourable friend would see this evident when she receives the report, the brief that we presented, what we have tried to do is provide an open-minded approach to the issue, because many things change rapidly as technology drives the health care system in general and reproductive technologies in particular. I guess our overriding principle on it was we were urging caution on those who may wish to establish directions and national guidelines and policies to proceed with as much knowledge, understanding and caution as is able to be done.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** We all agree this is a very complex, difficult issue and that we should all be proceeding slowly, cautiously, carefully and

thoughtfully in light of that, in light of, as well, the fact that women's input, advice and voice need to be heard loud and clear on these issues. Given the recommendation by several of the organizations which appeared before the Royal Commission on Reproductive Technologies, will this Minister ensure that adequate resources are in place for women's organizations to develop a comprehensive approach to this very difficult issue and to ensure that a higher priority is placed on research in areas pertaining to women's health.

**Mr. Orchard:** You know, in many ways, that is exactly why we established the Women's Health Directorate, in order to provide a Government focus, if you will, on issues of health in women in the Province of Manitoba. Now that directorate, I think, already has had, by its establishment and the very background as to why we establish it, to put focus and input on the issues, to provide the forum for discussion, to provide a focal point in Government, has already served a pretty significant purpose.

Now we have not developed all of the answers, and we have not developed all of the programs, and should I be so honest as to admit that probably never will have within Government. My friend's specific request I believe was, will we provide funding to outside groups so they can develop their position on issues which may challenge women in this province and across Canada.

We have considered those and have provided some funding to differing organizations in the past, and will continue to do that, but I cannot answer yes or no to my honourable friend in terms of anticipated requests of this ministry or this Government, because each one of them will be considered on its merits and in light of available resources and decisions made accordingly as to what is being asked for, what is being pursued, and whether in fact we have the resources available to do that or can reallocate if we think the proposition is important enough to Government.

I simply close this answer by saying that the Government of Manitoba, up until a year ago, did not have a Women's Health Directorate that focused on women's health issues. Yes, we had maternal child and health which dealt with primarily the issues of childbirth, et cetera, and family, but this directorate has that responsibility plus the wider range of issues that are now facing women via advancements in technology and other areas, particularly like reproductive health.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** I think in most of the briefs presented to the royal commission, the organizations mentioned how it is so imperative that research was recognized and have respect for the physical integrity of women. I would hope that would be a theme of the Women's Health Directorate and the Minister's own thinking.

I would ask him, in light of that and given that the Supreme Court ruling of January 1988 struck down the criminal code provisions regarding abortion, on the grounds that it violated the physical integrity of women, why the Minister chose to make a significant change in policy and announced on June 3, 1988, that regulations under The Health Services Insurance Act were amended so that therapeutic abortion would be considered an insured service only when the procedure is performed in a hospital, that change in policy making Manitoba the only western province that does not pay physician fees whether in hospital or out of hospital, whether in province or out of province? Even the federal Government pays physician fees and facility fees in areas for which it has jurisdiction.

(Madam Chairman in the Chair)

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, my honourable friend and I will, first of all, agree to disagree, because I do not concur with her philosophy of abortion on demand, however, I respect the right as provided by The Canada Health Act to pay for, as part of the medicare program, therapeutic abortions in the hospital facilities. Contrary to the statement made by my honourable friend, physicians get paid their fee for service when they perform therapeutic abortions in the hospitals. She indicated they did not. That is not accurate.

I, in this Government, made the decision—and I have explained this time and time again, and I will explain it again to my honourable friend—to put in place the regulation which does not pay the physician fee outside of a hospital. That was done in consultation with the guiding principles of the College of Physicians and Surgeons which revolved around the issue of safety of the woman. That is what guided us in that regulation. We believe that regulation is not only appropriate, we believe that, within the Manitoba health care system, access is available. It has denied no one the access to the needed procedure, and it is working very, very well.

You know, I simply say to my honourable friend, that was one of the first things we dealt with as a

new Government in the Ministry of Health, where we provided the service in a safe environment in the hospitals of Manitoba that performed that procedure. We did not, as the first act and public policy of my honourable friend's confreres in Ontario, make abortion available on demand at clinics throughout the length and breadth of the Province of Ontario. There is a significant contrast between the two policies. That is not our policy. That is the Ontario New Democratic Party policy, one that my honourable friend adheres to, and I appreciate that. I disagree with it. We are providing a service. There is no inability to access the service, and it is paid for under medicare.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** It is difficult, Madam Chairperson, to understand the Minister's reasoning for excluding therapeutic abortions from being covered under our medicare system when performed in a clinic, especially when medicare here in this province does cover fees in freestanding private clinics dealing with plastic surgery and eye surgery. I am still not very clear on the Minister's reason for making this very serious change in policy in June of 1988.

I would ask him, since he says the system is working well when in fact it is not, the combination of the Minister's change in policy regarding medicare coverage of therapeutic abortions performed in clinics with the federal law, Bill C-43, although it is not law, is having a serious impact on availability of therapeutic abortion services in hospitals. I believe the Minister knows that a number of doctors are refusing to perform therapeutic abortions in hospitals for fear of criminal prosecution because of Bill C-43.

I would ask the Minister if he can provide us with any statistics in terms of numbers of doctors who refuse to do therapeutic abortions in hospitals and the statistics pertaining to women who are now forced to leave the province because access is just not here.

\* (1450)

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, let us not let my honourable friend try to confuse the issue of new federal legislation with our regulations of how the procedure is paid for under medicare. My honourable friend makes the allegation that we pay for outpatient in private clinic or freestanding clinic procedures. She uses plastic surgery and cataract surgery as examples. Well, she is correct. The

difference is that the College of Physicians and Surgeons, who licensed those as well as licensed the Morgentaler Clinic, did not say in the case of a freestanding plastic surgery clinic or a freestanding eye clinic that the physician had to have admitting privileges to a hospital. They did in the case of Morgentaler's clinic; hence the safety issue that I referred to. Let my honourable friend not try to make that quick and easy analogy.

I also want to tell my honourable friend that this Government has not disallowed the operation of the Morgentaler Clinic. That is a change between Governments, a significant change.

Second, my honourable friend is confusing legislation not yet proclaimed in terms of our regulation of provision of service in Manitoba. The two do not connect or correlate because, if it did, then my honourable friend would then say that doctors performing therapeutic abortions refuse to do so in the hospitals because of the federal law, because the federal law is wrong, I presume, from her standpoint and her argument, but then they would proceed to perform those very same procedures with the federal law in existence if only they could get into freestanding clinics.

Now if the law is preventing the procedure from being undertaken by a physician, I fail to see her argument that the hospital versus the freestanding clinic is going to make the service any more available. I submit to you that the hospital setting, as decided by this Government, is the safest environment. That is why the provision was put there.

I do not concur with my honourable friend's allegation that a yet unproclaimed law is going to prevent someone from providing a service in a hospital which, if I take her argument full circle, that physician would provide in a freestanding clinic. If the law federally, which has yet to be proclaimed, is going to prevent the physician from that practice, does it matter where the physician practises? No. It is not an argument with intellectual capacity that my honourable friend is making.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** I think the Minister has either not seen the connection or has chosen to not make the linkages between the regressive policies of this Government when it comes to therapeutic abortions and the very regressive policies of this Government's counterparts in Ottawa.

It is clear that we have two measures that both work to restrict access, forcing more women to go to other jurisdictions for therapeutic abortions which, of course, results in a system available only to those who can afford it and, in fact, is resulting in more women turning to very unsafe procedures in the back streets of the towns and cities of this country.

I want to ask the Minister on another matter, since I have a pretty good understanding of where he is coming from on that issue. -(interjection)- Madam Chairperson, perhaps, since he is asking for some evidence, some documentation of the serious issues facing women as a result of a growing lack of access to reproductive health services, particularly therapeutic abortions, I would refer him, for example, to the paper delivered recently by Dr. Richard Boroditsky, who will tell you that doctors right now here in Manitoba are refusing to do therapeutic abortions in hospitals because of the fear of criminal prosecutions.

**Madam Chairman:** The Honourable Minister of Health, on a point of order?

**Mr. Orchard:** No. I want to answer the question.

Madam Chairman, I asked for some evidence that—my honourable friend said in her second last answer that there were growing numbers of therapeutic abortions in the back streets, in the back alleys of towns in this province. I would like her to say where that is happening, so we can bring the full force of the law against those kinds of illegal operations.

You cannot make those kinds of accusations to make an argument of philosophical approach. I mean, goodness gracious, have you no more dignity in this House than to bring those kinds of accusations here that you cannot substantiate? If you can substantiate it, do it today.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** The Minister has a very selective memory when it comes to questions posed on this side of the House. I said very clearly that the regressive nature of Bill C-43 was causing very serious problems with respect to access and forcing women to turn to unsafe procedures in the back streets of our towns and cities across this country.

I did not say that we had received any information about deaths or serious health problems in Manitoba as a result of turning to unsafe procedures but, Madam Chairperson, the Minister should keep up with the news of this country and realize that there have been deaths in this country recently as



a result of these change in policies and this regressive legislation that has restricted access.

Now, Madam Chairperson, I would like to ask the Minister a final question pertaining to the Women's Health Directorate since this discussion paper of the Women's Health Directorate does talk about following up some of the presentations made to the Women's Initiative, so-called plan of action by this Government beginning in 1988.

In the presentations to the hearings held by the Women's Initiative, a number of organizations and facilities made presentations and recommendations for a hospital advocacy program. They made specific recommendations about protocol for identification of victims of violence of domestic abuse. I noticed that none of those presentations—although there were many—made it into the final report of the Women's Initiative. I hope that those reports are still under active consideration.

I am wondering what work has been done to put in place such a protocol to ensure that we have a more responsive, sensitive system in place in all of our health care facilities for the identification and detection of victims of family violence and domestic abuse.

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, I simply indicate to my honourable friend that issue has been primarily under the purview for policy development by my colleague, the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), in terms of the issue of family abuse. I would ask her to pursue the matter with him. We have other initiatives in terms of patient and employee abuse within the institutions and the development of what we hope are somewhat consistent guidelines to guide management on how to handle the circumstances within our funded institutions.

\* (1500)

I want to say to my honourable friend that again, as I said, she put a scenario on the record saying that there were, in terms of the therapeutic abortion process, that I do not believe are worthy of an Honourable Member's comment, because they are unsubstantiable. She did not provide any information except lay out this old rhetorical argument. That is hardly conducive to reasoned discussion in this Chamber.

I know my honourable friend's philosophical approach to the abortion issue. I know where she is

coming from. We believe that our policy is appropriate, protects the health of women in the Province of Manitoba and has done so. She is talking theoretically in the future laying out fears and concerns and allegations about a law that is not even proclaimed and passed yet. I do not think that she serves herself well coming here with unsubstantiated allegations, spinning them off as if they are a matter of fact, and they happened just a couple of blocks away. That is not correct, Madam Chairman.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, I just want to ask a couple of questions on the same issue on the Women's Health Directorate.

Can the Minister tell us what the Government's position is now on the reinstatement of the In Vitro Fertilization Program?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, we have not had a request from the Health Sciences Centre to reinstate the In Vitro Fertilization Program, so it is not under consideration by Government.

**Mr. Cheema:** Can the Minister provide information of how many couples have requested the In Vitro Fertilization Program through the Health Services Commission and seek treatment outside Manitoba?

**Mr. Orchard:** We do not have that figure because we do not provide the service as an insured service. The only thing I could do is, over the next several days, ask to see how many times there has been an inquiry and the Commission has forwarded it on. We do not keep a formal record. I would have to do an informal request because it is not an insured service in the province.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, in 1988 and 1989 during the Estimates process, I did ask the Minister a specific question of how much money was spent on the whole program. There were some allegations in the program that there was money which was not wisely spent, and why the program failed after even eight or nine months of operation.

Can the Minister tell us if they have any information on the question I asked last year?

**Mr. Orchard:** I do not know whether we have or not. Basically the decision was made by the Health Sciences Centre management board that—you have to appreciate the program was never funded by the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

The decision to terminate the program, as I understood it, and I recall—and I am going by

memory here—was a decision by board and management of Health Sciences Centre based on the fact that achievable goals did not appear to be met, and that there were increasing financial demands that were unanticipated causing the program to run at a fairly significant deficit.

I realize at the time that the decision was made there was some substantial discussion publicly about whether the program ought to continue. There were people, supporters of the program saying that it would be in a break-even position in a short while, et cetera. I respect that opinion. It was made by those who were involved in the program.

I would only caution my honourable friend in the fact that I would suspect that that same case was made that the program would have been at break even, et cetera, when the board and the executive of HSC originally decided to fund it. The original projections apparently did not materialize, and hence, given the only track record they had to analyze, they being the management board of HSC, I suspect they probably erred on the side of caution and discontinued the program.

It may well be that they anticipated further losses from the program that, quite frankly, without having Government funds, took away from other programs within the hospital, because the hospital is on global budgeting and any dollars running in excess of program costs, that program running at a deficit, come out of surgery or any other activity that the Health Sciences Centre had and was actually, if you get right down to it, probably denying Manitobans other services.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, can the Minister tell us what is the role the Women's Health Directorate has played so far in the policy development for midwifery?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, the Women's Health Directorate actually received the report that had come in, the discussion paper from the Manitoba Advisory Council on the Status of Women. They have put together information in terms of how the issue of midwifery is handled in other provinces and indeed have compiled information about what other nations do in terms of the use of midwifery within their health care systems respectively.

They have compiled that information and they are looking forward to the receipt of the College of Physicians and Surgeons-Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses report, and I will be relying on

them to provide me advice upon receipt of that report as part of the advice that I will take into consideration in terms of trying to decide policy for midwifery in the Province of Manitoba.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, can the Minister give us an approximate time frame for the final policy development on the issue?

**Mr. Orchard:** I am informed that the college-MARN joint discussion paper should be ready early in the new year. Right now, and this is not mature thinking process, but my first sense would be that there is a great deal of interest, particularly among women's organizations and groups, that I think we would want to have a fairly wide distribution of that paper so we can invite feedback from groups who are interested to see where they think there are strengths in the suggestions of the two professional organizations and where there are weaknesses so that the Women's Directorate has fairly full advice in terms of developing a potential position that this Government might take in dealing with the midwifery issue.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, can the Minister tell us, are they planning a training program in the meantime for midwifery? If you are going to have legislation in place and have provisions, then we need people who are properly trained. I just want the Minister to know that if they are at any stage of development for a particular program.

**Mr. Orchard:** No, there are no training programs in the Province of Manitoba. To the best of my knowledge, I do not think any are contemplated at this time. I think most people are waiting for Government's decision.

\* (1510)

I say this, not only in Manitoba, but right across the nation, because there are very few provinces, I do not think there are any that actually have—well, Ontario has enabling legislation, but I am not sure whether there is a great availability of midwifery yet in that province. I think most provinces, most professionals are sitting back and waiting to see what sort of decisions are made around the issue before they pursue professional careers.

I do know though, as my honourable friend does, that there are training programs that are available—none in Canada, but offshore, that are very excellent in terms of their training capabilities. They may well offer a reasoned interim step if midwifery should become a service provided in

Canada. That is the other issue too, that I think will be dealt with by the College-MARN paper and that is of course in terms of what sort of qualifications ought to be recognized to be, if you will, able to practise as a midwife in the Province of Manitoba.

You know, my honourable friend is probably fully aware of some pretty controversial cases that have happened recently in the last couple, three years and really were the genesis behind bringing this whole issue to a discussion paper and to a head. They revolve around the qualifications and ability to practise midwifery.

(Mr. Ben Sveinson, Acting Chairman, in the Chair)

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** A moment ago the Minister asked for some evidence of the serious impact that Bill C-43 and other regressive provisions are having on women when it comes to therapeutic abortions.

I will cite for him a 20-year-old Toronto woman died on June 11, 1990, from loss of blood following an attempt to carry out an abortion on herself. This is the first reported death of a woman from self-induced abortion in Canada since 1974.

On June 2, 1990, a 48-year-old Kitchener man was charged with performing an illegal abortion on a 16-year-old girl in his apartment. We do not want such deaths to happen in Winnipeg, and we are worried that we are headed in that direction because of the lack of access.

I report to the Minister, I ask him for more up-to-date statistics, but I report to him now what we have been able to determine in terms of doctors performing therapeutic abortions in hospitals. On May 29, three Winnipeg doctors indicated that they would no longer be performing abortions as a result of the impact of Bill C-43. Four other doctors said they would also cease performing the operation if the Bill passed. My question to the Minister is simply, will he appeal to his counterparts in Ottawa to let Bill C-43 die on the Order Paper?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Acting Chairman, that is exactly what I told my honourable friend earlier on is that she ought not to combine our policy in Manitoba which does not restrict access with the current proposal in federal legislation. You cannot have that confusion. We have to be guided by the federal law in this province, and we have always said we would be guided by the federal legislation passed by the federal Parliament. We adhered to that prior to its striking down. We adhered to it post striking down. Access is available in Manitoba. Now I cannot

speculate as to what the impact of any federal law might be in Manitoba, because this is one of the most publicly controversial issues that the nation has dealt with outside of probably language issues. The people that my honourable friend quotes have an interest in no law, and I would naturally understand them making that position. In the absence of a law one cannot anticipate how the availability of a therapeutic abortion, what it will be in the Province of Manitoba. I cannot at this stage of the game speculate as to the outcome.

What I can tell my honourable friend is that within our health care system we do provide, as is required under the Canada Health Act, provisions for therapeutic abortions where the health of the woman is endangered. Those procedures are undertaken at a number of hospitals in the Province of Manitoba, Winnipeg, rural and northern.

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Sveinson):** Item 2.(c)(1) Salaries \$419,300—pass; 2.(c)(2) Other Expenditures \$555,600—pass; 2.(c)(3) External Agencies \$562,500—pass.

Item 2.(d) Health Promotion: (1) Salaries \$536,800.00.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** I note that there has been a reduction of three staff from the Estimates that were approved last year. Could the Minister explain that?

**Mr. Orchard:** Those positions were in Health Promotion and were focused on issues revolving around seniors and promotion of health and programs for seniors. Those positions were moved laterally within the Department of Gerontology.

**The Acting Chairman (Mr. Sveinson):** Item 2.(d) Health Promotion: (1) Salaries \$536,800—pass; 2.(d)(2) Other Expenditures \$430,000—pass; 2.(d)(3) External Agencies \$588,800—pass.

Item 2.(e) Hearing Conservation: (1) Salaries \$111,700—pass; 2.(e)(2) Other Expenditures \$191,100—pass; 2.(e)(3) External Agencies \$47,700—pass.

Item 2.(f) Gerontology: (1) Salaries \$267,600.00.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, I will be asking questions on this section in the area of Continuing Care if that is possible. Is there a shortage of time?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Acting Chairman, how be we deal with all the issues on this page at once and then we will just pass it at the end of the discussion? That would be fair with me. We will discuss this whole

page, and after questions are answered we will just pass them when the two Opposition Critics are ready.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, if the Minister would like to have his staff from the Continuing Care Department here—are they here already?

**Mr. Orchard:** They will be down shortly. Carry on.

**Mr. Cheema:** Okay.

Can the Minister tell us now how much money was underspent last year in the Department of Continuing Care?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Acting Chairman, I neglected at the start of Estimates to introduce Betty Havens, ADM in Community Services.

Underexpenditures were down \$5.6 million from the voted amount last year.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, can the Minister tell us, in the budget of '88 and '90 how much money was underspent?

**Mr. Orchard:** I think that was about \$5.1 million, I believe, in the '88-89 fiscal year.

**Mr. Cheema:** Can the Minister tell us, in his views what are the reasons for the underspending in the Department of Continuing Care?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Acting Chairman, this was the subject of a substantial amount of debate because, if my honourable friend might recall, the accusations were made by certain Members of the House who will remain unmentioned at this stage of the game that there were cutbacks, there was change to the criteria for entry, none of which was accurate.

We took a very serious look at what was happening in continuous care, because the Continuing Care Program had a very interesting history. In something like 14 or 15 years, it has grown from a modest start of about \$1 million to well over \$40 million.

\* (1520)

Basically there were a number of reasons why the Continuing Care Program was underspent for two years in a row. The program had undergone some substantial growth curves, so there were a lot of people going on the program for varying lengths of time and for varying needs.

What happened starting about 1987, prior to our coming into office, was a levelling off of the number of people who were admitted to the Continuing Care Program. In 1987, we were not Government, but I

am told that the criteria for entry were the same, but there was a levelling off of those being accepted into the program.

The reason was that we were reaching somewhere in the neighbourhood of 20-plus thousand clients on the program per year. We did a number of analyses. For instance, we tried to determine through the number applying for home care and the number having services approved to see whether there was a difference in 1987 and '88-89 as to the number applying and the number being approved for home care. There were consistent numbers throughout. Roughly 13 percent, is my memory, were not deemed to be eligible in all of those years.

So obviously the criteria were being applied fairly. There was not a change year over year, et cetera. It basically came down to a levelling off of care. One would expect that. One would expect that on a program where the criteria are there to provide essential services in the home, to provide services for seniors to support their independent living in the home.

The other thing that happened I think which was good, and we are currently in the process of analyzing that, but about 1985 the previous administration started what I think was one of the more progressive programs that they brought in. That was the Support Services to Seniors Program wherein a number of community-based organizations wanting to support seniors through a variety of programs that are not available through Government, that would not be funded through Government, like home visiting and any number of other ancillary services—the then Government approved a program of funding basically for salary support co-ordinator of those Support Services to Seniors Programs in the different communities.

Those services are available in a goodly number of communities now, a tremendous uptake of the program in rural Manitoba, where a lot of communities have Support Services to Seniors projects. These are providing, at a very economic cost to Government, some support services to seniors which I believe are impacting positively on their health, their ability to function independently and their necessity that they experienced previously to access formal programs of Government. We have that Support Services to Seniors Program under review right now to test and prove that theory that in fact it is really intervening in a very positive way on

the health and the independent lifestyles of seniors in Manitoba.

So in summary, spending of \$32.2 million in '86-87 fiscal year; spending of \$35.6 million in '87-88; spending of \$39 million in '88-89; spending of \$42.2 million in '89-90; and we anticipate full expenditures of this year's budget allocation of \$48.4 million. Each and every year more money was spent on home care and more services were provided, because what we tended to find in some areas, particularly in Winnipeg with the shortage of personal care homes, which we are moving to resolve, we often had more intensive needs met so that the individuals were receiving a more intensive level of care.

Basically every year spending, as I indicated, in actual dollars and a levelling off of the program, we see a slight increase in the program demand this year. We do not know whether that is another trend kicking off or whether it is a temporary aberration in the access to the system. We will know that as experience dictates. I have no doubt in my mind that the Support Services to Seniors Program had a pretty positive impact in general on both this and the Personal Care Home Program.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, it is widely acknowledged that Manitoba does have the best Continuing Care Program in the whole country, in fact in the whole of North America. That is the best program. We still hear a lot of complaints in terms of the money being underspent, and the Minister has clearly indicated. At the same time, there are people who are waiting for the home care services.

Can he tell me in simple terms what is the minimum or the maximum waiting period if somebody would apply today for home care services?

**Mr. Orchard:** Staff tell me that there could be up to two weeks waiting time from time of application to provision of service. A lot depends on the urgency, the assessed urgency of the situation because quite often service is provided the next day or within a day or two depending on the circumstance as well.

I want to deal with the issue of the complaints because I know that the complaints have focused I think a lot of negative attention on a very good program. I concur with my honourable friend. We are viewed as having the best program in Canada and probably the best program in North America.

I had the opportunity to attend over a meal with a group of professionals from North Carolina just I guess about a year ago now. They were up taking a look on behalf of the State of North Carolina as to how we operate our program because it has that kind of international reputation.

I am going to be very direct to my honourable friend in the New Democratic Party. For very narrowed political reasons my honourable friends decided that they were going to try to target the home care program and try to create the illusion of cutbacks, change of policy, and all of the things they alleged back two years ago. They were not doing that to assist seniors to receive quality care. They were doing it for narrowed political purposes of a defeated Government in Opposition wanting to try and inflict political pain on a minority Government. I took those accusations very seriously. We did the complete investigation of the circumstances behind those allegations because I was troubled with some of the complaints they were bringing forward.

I want to tell my honourable friend that the investigation we did indicated no change in the way home care was approached or accessed by this Government versus the previous Government, that the levelling-off trend had started in '86-87 and it continued on, so that if there was to be some fault with the levelling off of people going on it, it started under the previous Government. I never made that accusation because I know that they were trying to provide the same service as we are trying to provide.

The issue of complaints, I will deal with that very directly. Continuing Care Program provides services to approximately 23,000 Manitobans each year. The concerns, and these are on the complaint side, come from—we had approximately 120 complaints. That is less than one-half of a percent of the number of people that are on the home care program.

I want to tell you what some of the complaints were. Some of the complaints were as a result of a taxpayer paid political mailing, the franking piece that was sent out by the New Democratic Party targeted to a number of their ridings and to a number of ridings in north end Winnipeg held by then Liberal Members.

They said, do you have concerns, and they listed several items. One of them was the Continuing Care Program and if you ticked off the Continuing Care Program, sent it into the New Democratic Party

Caucus Room, they would then create a letter and send it over to us saying, this person has a complaint about home care. We received a number of them, and when we investigated them we found a couple of people who said, how did you get our name? We do not want you investigating us. We have no complaints here.

Therefore, I had those little chats with my honourable friends in the New Democratic Party, particularly the then Leader. I tried to find out whether it was really worth the scare-tactic approach of the New Democratic Party to try to put fear in every senior's mind across Manitoba that this home care program, with increased spending every single year, provision of service to the tune of \$42.2 million, and probably \$48 million this year, that they would live under the fear that it was a program being cut back, dismantled and torn asunder by a new Government. It was an absolutely political agenda of the New Democratic Party. It had some success at the time, but the moment we started getting these ticked off complaints, complaints from the alleged complainers as to why we were even visiting them and asking them what their problem was, we uncovered the kind of shallow political gain that the NDP were playing at the time.

\* (1530)

Mr. Acting Chairman, I simply indicate to you that was the genesis of some of the complaints. I will tell you straight out that any complaint that we received we investigated. We ordered a reassessment. I have to say that in the majority of the complaints the original decision of assessment of service is maintained. It is agreed to, and although it may not be satisfactory to the individual, I have to unfortunately concur with my professional staff. There are cases where a new assessment of the client's circumstances have indicated that an improper assessment was made and something was overlooked. We have reinstated or changed the service pattern and satisfied the individual that way.

It is not by any means a perfect program, because as my honourable friend expects, there are individuals who go out and make assessments for service and they do the best job they can. It certainly is not going to be 100 percent perfect every single time, but where complaints come in we investigate, treat them very seriously. If they are legitimate we certainly resolve them because we have had the ability to do that in terms of the budget, and we will continue to have that ability.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, can the Minister tell us which part of the city they were receiving the most complaints? Also, can he give us how many people are waiting for the home care program right now?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Acting Chairman, I cannot provide the kind of "how many people are waiting" statistic because the program is continuously entering people and people are going off the program so that there is a significant changeover. I just can indicate that the maximum waiting time for service is about two weeks.

To answer the first question of my honourable friend, the majority of complaints did come out of the north end of Winnipeg where coincidentally my honourable friends, the New Democratic Party, had their rump of seats back in 1988. Certainly the north end Winnipeg seats that were taken by the Liberal Party in the 1988 election were targeted by the kind of mailers and fear campaign so that it did raise a fear of citizens in that area, and those citizens responded accordingly. In terms of complaints across the province, there was no significant increase or decrease in complaints. Where the direct mail was targeted by the New Democratic Party, yes, there was a preponderance of complaints from that area.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, can the Minister tell us why the ADM was fired, or she resigned? What were the reasons, and was there any settlement package?

**Mr. Orchard:** Well, no, I do not want my honourable friend to use language like he started using. The former Assistant Deputy Minister resigned her position and is now in the employ of the Community Medicine Department at the Faculty of Medicine. There was no severance pay or anything. As a matter of fact, the last time I talked to her there was—she is part and parcel of the recent Healthy Heart Survey in the Province of Manitoba. So she is very much a part of the ongoing advice and planning that this Government is receiving.

**Mr. Cheema:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, can the Minister tell us if there is any person on call after five o'clock for home care services over the weekend? If anyone calls, how many people are on call on average?

**Mr. Orchard:** There are three avenues for emergency access. I know what my honourable friend is going to get at next, because our care

co-ordinators in the regional offices are not there on—they are not regularly staffed Saturday and Sunday, but there are several forms of emergency response. There is the Home Orderly Service, VON, and an emergency night number that is available.

I am going to give my honourable friend an approximate number here, because we probably are not finished with dealing with this legal bill on the HKL & Associates contract, which we terminated June 30. We have a legal bill of approximately \$2,000, which all taxpayers are going to have to pay to extract the province from that obscene NDP contract.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, the first question I would like to ask the Minister in this area is whether or not this Government has restricted access to the homemaking or housekeeping program as part of Continuing Care?

**Mr. Orchard:** No, Mr. Acting Chairman.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** How is it possible on the one hand for the Minister to say he has been able to achieve lower caseloads, fewer clients, using the overall program because of programs, non-profit cleaning services available in the communities, the Support Services to Seniors initiatives, caseload reviews, clarification of service guidelines, in order to achieve those kinds of reductions, and then say there has been no reduction and no cutback?

**Mr. Orchard:** Mr. Acting Chairman, because there has not been any cutback, there has not been any change in the eligibility criteria.

When the Support Services to Seniors Program came into being in 1987, when my honourable friend sat in Cabinet with the then Health Minister, and the not-for-profit services were made available, new clients would be referred to them.

That policy was established, the Support Services to Seniors, as a funding initiative which I give my honourable friends, the New Democratic Party, full credit for. It is a very innovative program. I give them full credit for it. That was the policy of that undertaking of Support Services to Seniors. That policy was continued under our Government because it makes sense.

You would not have Government pay for a service that can be made available in the community through a not-for-profit Support Services to Seniors organization.

Now, my honourable friend talked about how can you reduce the case load. I have indicated to my honourable friend we have not. Case loads have levelled off and remained relatively constant. We are serving the same number of clients, approximately, per month for the last three years. There has not been, as my honourable friend alleged—and she full well knows, because I have answered this question time and time and time again.

She still uses the word "cutback" when, as I read to her just a few minutes ago—and I will try to find them again so my honourable friend has them fully at her disposal—the numbers of the dollars that we have spent. I have lost them now, but they have gone up every single year by approximately \$3 million to \$4 million per year.

\* (1540)

Now, my honourable friend calls that a cutback in the NDP rhetoric, which means that all during the years that they were Government and the funding went up every year it obviously would have to have been called a cutback, because that is what she calls increased funding now.

I just want to share with my honourable friend some information: A comparison between year to date, July 1990-91, and the same period of '89-90—and I want my honourable friend to listen very carefully—shows an increase of 10.4 percent in the units of home care services, that means 10.4 percent more service, not less, as my honourable friend alleges, not a cutback, as my honourable friend alleges; a 3.1 percent increase in home support work units, that is more service, not less, as my honourable friend alleges, not a cutback as my honourable friend alleges; a 7.3 percent increase in the number of units provided by registered services, that is more service provided by registered nurses, not less, as my honourable friend alleges, and not a cutback—increased services.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Mr. Acting Chairperson, I appreciate the Minister giving me that information. I wonder how that jives with the information provided in his own detailed Estimates report, where he indicates that approximately 23,000 Manitobans will receive service from the home care program in the fiscal year 1990-91. That is down from 25,000 in '89-90.

It seems to me we see a trend line going in the opposite direction to that which our senior citizen

population is going in. I am not sure. I do not understand how we can see a substantial underspending in this area at a time when the senior citizen population is growing. I do not understand how we can see minimal increases in the home care budget when substantial increase in our senior population are occurring. I do not understand how I can account for the dozens of individuals who come to our attention having felt the impact of a change in policy, not cases that we have concocted, not fictitious situations, but serious situations brought to our attention day in and day out.

(Madam Chairman in the Chair)

I have mentioned to the Minister before, some of those cases. He tries to suggest we have created a concern in the north end of Winnipeg of our own doing. I do not know how he can say that when we have constituents such as the one I have referred to the Minister before, who had gone to a hospital outside of the north end because that is where the original placement of home care for her parents took place and was told by a staff member that if her father had lived in their catchment area, some help could have been attained. To me that is a pretty clear indication of a change in policy, a policy of reduced services that began in the north end of Winnipeg.

I do not know what to say to that individual who writes about her father who has emphysema, difficulties in catching his breath, quadruple heart by-pass, extreme pain in his left shoulder joint, great difficulty in walking, medication for depression, and most recently that he had cancer of the prostate, and was told that he was not eligible for assistance because he was still able to drive a car. That is another example, Madam Chairperson.

I do not know how to fit what the Minister is saying with the call I just got yesterday from an individual in Stony Mountain whose wife has multiple illnesses, needed some extra hours of home care and was told by a member of the Minister's department in the region that due to reduced resources more hours could not be found for her. The solution then recommended was that she go to hospital, that she go and get a service that costs many, many times the cost of home care.

I do not know how to jibe what the Minister is saying with the fact that there has been in his own Estimates or overviews a reduced number of clients receiving homemaker service. I would like to ask the

Minister, since we cannot seem to get any clarification on just what this change of policy is, is anyone being accepted into the Continuing Care Program who only requires homemaking or housekeeping service and does not at this point require any expensive, professional service as well as the homemaking service?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, I cannot make my honourable friend honest. I mean, I have tried this before. Again she put on the record that there was a change in policy. I have told her for three successive years now that the policy is exactly as it was when we came into Government in May 1988.

I know my honourable friend does not want to believe that because my honourable friend has a political agenda, not a people agenda, not caring for people, not making sure the program works, but a political agenda. She simply repeats what outside observers outside this Chamber, not constrained by the parliamentary rules, would describe as a baldfaced lie, Madam Chairman.

#### Point of Order

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** On a point of order, I hope you will call the Member in order and ask him to retract what he is saying, because he is obviously imputing motive. He is suggesting that nothing but the truth has been placed on the record. I would like him to explain that to these constituents who have been told by his staff in the field that there are budget cutbacks, that there are not resources to go around, that there has been a change in policy.

**Mr. Orchard:** We are going to deal with that. Madam Chairman, I did not make that allegation of my honourable friend. I simply indicated to her that those outside this Chamber might make the observation that I put on the record as to what my honourable friend said. I do not. I am simply telling her that she is not being accurate. She is not being truthful when she makes the allegation that the policy has changed.

\*\*\*

**Mr. Orchard:** Now, Madam Chairman, I want my honourable friend, if she has the information and she can give it to me today on or off the record, give me the individual's name who was told by this someone in my department that they could not be provided with more services because of reduced funding. I want two things. I want the name of the client and I want the name of the individual who



made that statement, who allegedly, accordingly to my honourable friend, is a staffperson of the Ministry of Health.

You know why I want the staffperson's name, Madam Chairman? Because that information is not accurate. I can take my honourable friend through the amount of spending per year. There has been no reduction in resources. That is not a reason that could be used in that one single case which was accurate.

Now if I have a staffperson out there who is saying that, I want to know that, because that is an inaccurate information that staffperson is alleged to have made to that client as the information my honourable friend for three successive years has put on the record that we have changed the policy. Both are false statements, Madam Chairman.

Will my honourable friend agree to provide me the name of the client and the name of the staffperson who made the alleged statement that there are reduced resources and that is why that person cannot be provided with more service? Will she provide me with those two names and that individual's case, either on or off the record, so we can investigate it? My honourable friend has not done that to date. She has only stood up and made these accusations hoping to get some headline in the newspaper and not solve the individual's problem. If she has them, give me those names, and I will investigate as we always have when those complaints reach my desk.

\* (1550)

**Ms. Wasylcia-Lels:** Madam Chairperson, it is clear that the Minister would like to totally, politically, manage his change in policy. I say that not only on the basis of the cases that I have brought forward that I have personally dealt with, but on the basis of situations experienced by some of my other colleagues. I make this comment particularly in light of the fact that my colleague the Member for Transcona (Mr. Reid) tried to act on behalf of some constituents to get some help, not even get some help, to get an overview from staff about what actually was the situation and whether or not he should be pursuing the matter any further on behalf of his constituents. What was he told by staff in the office? That it all had to go through the Minister. Deal with the Minister. Obviously the Minister has decided to manage his way out of this cutback. It is not working because too many people have been

affected. Too many lives, the health of too many lives is at stake here, Madam Chairperson.

I do not have to refer him to any of these specific cases. I can refer to the Minister's own correspondence back to me on case after case that I have forwarded to his attention. The message is clear. The message is, the original intention of the program is no longer being adhered to. The original intention of the program was to provide service to ensure that people were able to stay in their homes, live in their communities, be as independent as possible with supports around them so that they did not become sick as to require other kinds of care.

What the Minister is telling me in all of his correspondence and what he is telling us today in the House, is that the intention of the program is changed. It has moved away from the incredible forward-looking position of being a family support program, of being a preventative program, to becoming a hospital model.

In effect, what we are moving toward is a system of a mini-hospital model at the community level. Rather than a program that helps families support each other, rather than helping individuals to be independent, people in every kind of community across the Province of Manitoba—because it has now spread from the north end of Winnipeg to all parts of the Province of Manitoba—are being denied access to service which was part of the original intentions of the Continuing Care Program.

I ask the Minister again the question I just asked him. Are any new clients who are requesting the homemaking service being accepted into the program if they do not require other professional services in their homes?

**Mr. Orchard:** I am really going to disappoint my honourable friend with this answer because I do not know how she is going to distort it. The answer is yes. I want the record to show to my honourable friend and for all those Manitobans who might want to read it, that this afternoon we have had one of the most cowardly attacks on a good program that I have ever seen.

I asked my honourable friend to do two things. Give me the names of both the client and the staffperson who is alleged by an Honourable Member of this House to have said to a client, you cannot have service, increased service, because there are budget cutbacks. My honourable friend has refused to do that. She is just going to want to

glide over it and leave this allegation out there of this person suffering because of some alleged statement by staff which she will not confirm to me so I can investigate.

That means one of two things. Either my honourable friend is not presenting a truthful circumstance to this House and is merely dealing in shadows to create an aura of reduced spending when, in fact, it is not the truth, or my honourable friend simply wants to have a political issue, and she does not want to help that individual.

If there is an individual who needs care, I want to know. I want the person's name so I can investigate it. If the circumstance my honourable friend says is correct, that the individual needs more service, we will provide it. If my honourable friend does not present me with the name, I can only conclude one of two things. The person does not exist and it is another one of these phantom complaints, or my honourable friend does not want to solve the problem and wants someone to suffer when we can provide them service. Hardly either one of them are appropriate for someone who claims to be a Member of the caring, sharing Party of New Democrats.

Either the truth, or else tell me the name of the person and the individual because I will solve the problem, as we have. The reason I will say we have is because in '86-87—let me do the numbers for you again—\$32.2 million in spending; '87-88, \$35.6 million in spending; '88-89, \$39 million in spending.

Do you know that was a \$3.3 million increase under the New Democrats and a \$3.4 million increase under the Conservatives? Is that not something else? It is not cut back as my honourable friend says. Then we go to '89-90, there is \$42.2 million spent. That is a \$3.2 million increase. Then this year we estimate we are going to spend over \$48 million on this program—say, \$48.2 million. That is a \$6 million increase, all the time while my honourable friend persists in bringing phantom cases in here, for which she refuses to provide names so I can follow up and introduce the service, or else she is simply not giving us factual information in the House.

It is one of the two, and if she has an individual who is alleged to be suffering and will not give me the name, then she wants that person to suffer. It is one of the two because I am here with the budget to solve the problems. Just try to be a little more

honest. There is no policy change. You have insisted on saying that for the last three times. There are no cutbacks, and you insist on using that language all the time. Just try a little honesty. I urged that on your Leader at the first week of this Session. I urge it on you in the dying days of this one.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** I am not going to give the Minister names of constituents on my own without consulting with them. I will advise them—(interjection)—the Minister has had dozens of letters from MLAs pertaining to constituents who have felt the impact of the change in his policies.

We do not need to stand here and hear this nonsense over and over again, his denials of a change in policy when we feel it every day. Some of us probably get more calls about home care and continuing care problems than any other area of policy and department in the Province of Manitoba.

Madam Chairperson, I am not going to give him names of staff. It is not the staff that are doing anything wrong here. It is the policies and direction that are coming from the Minister's office that are putting staff in the most horrible, difficult position, well-intentioned, good-serving people who want to carry out their jobs and are not being allowed to do so because the Minister has very nicely managed a scenario whereby suddenly there is less demand and that produces less need to budget so much. That means the vicious circle just repeats itself—interesting political management.

I am asking the Minister to take this issue a little more seriously. Let me ask him how many case co-ordinators there are now in the Province of Manitoba, give me that comparison over the last couple of years, and tell me how often individual cases are being reassessed and reviewed on a regular basis.

**Mr. Orchard:** Now we have the ultimate flip-flop, cut and run, that I have ever seen in the House. Now my honourable friend says there are people out there who are suffering, they are phoning them every day, every day. Now that means them; that means there are several in caucus every day getting phone calls about complaints on home care, but yet those names cannot be used to help the individual. Now is that not funny? How can you be so heartless as to not want to help those people?

Let me repeat to my honourable friend, in the Province of Manitoba last year, 120 complaints; 70 in Winnipeg. Now if one goes to 52 weeks and

divides that up, that means in the City of Winnipeg there would have been a little over one complaint per week.

Here we have my honourable friend the Opposition Health Critic in charge of fear and fearmongering saying, every day we, the caucus Members, get these calls. That would mean on an individual basis, five per week per Member, so speculate on two or three Members, that would be 10 or 15 calls per week. Multiply that by 52 weeks, that would be 600 or 700 calls alone for my honourable friend's caucus, if I believe what she says, but we have only had 120 complaints entirely.

If those complaints come in the number she says, why is she not trying to help those people by forwarding the names on to me, as they used to do, for investigation and in statement of service, et cetera. My honourable friend does not do that.

Now I can only conclude one of two things, as I concluded before, that my honourable friend is being a little bit liberal. I hate to use that, and I am not using it as an offensive word to my honourable friend the Member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema), a little liberal in her comments and certainly not very accurate in them or else she simply does not care about people who believe they need more services. If she sent those names in, the investigation would take place.

\* (1600)

I suspect my honourable friend has been caught a little bit in her own excited rhetoric. She cannot verify one single case, and I am not asking her to verify that on the record. I do not want her to put that individual's name on the record. Send me a letter of the individual who was told by a staff member that there is no more resource and that individual client cannot get the service. Do that by letter, because by making the accusation that some staffperson has made that accusation, she is blackballing all staff in the Department of Continuing Care, because every single staffperson, if we believe my honourable friend, had that kind of complaint laid to her by a client.

Without knowing who that staff person is, we have to suspect everybody is giving false information. You know what, Madam Chairman, I know that is not right, because the staff in the Continuing Care Program are working very diligently to deliver service. By making this accusation that a staffperson said there is reduced funding in the

program, my dear friend the Member for St. Johns is casting aspersions on every single staffperson in Continuing Care. That is disgraceful, and all to harness some politics for the New Democratic Party, because if she cared about the individual clients, she would provide me with the name. She cannot, she will not, because she either does not have it or she does not care.

I will guarantee you, Madam Chairman, as I am standing here closing off my remarks on this issue, I will never receive from my honourable friend the name of this alleged staffperson in the Department of Health who made the statement because—you know why, Madam Chairman?—that staffperson does not exist and never made that statement. It is another subterfuge of my honourable friend from St. Johns on the narrow political agenda of the New Democratic Party to cast doubt on a very, very good, functioning and operational program called Continuing Care.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lets:** Madam Chairperson, it is precisely because of that vindictive nature of the Minister of Health that people in the field are afraid to deal with cases that MLAs bring forward. Why else would we have offices suddenly saying, we cannot help you, go through the Minister's office?

That is a pretty unusual situation. I do not know when that has ever happened before, to suddenly try to follow a normal procedure through an office in terms of finding assistance and you are told at the very start that you have to go through the Minister. If that is not political management of a change in policy, I do not know what is.

I ask the Minister just for some basic information for my own interest's sake, and that is: How many case co-ordinators are there in the field across the province? Could he break that down for the last several years?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, there are two case co-ordinators in the Thompson Region. There are five case co-ordinators in the Norman Region. There are 12 case co-ordinators in the Eastman Region. There are 11 case co-ordinators in the Interlake Region. There are 12 case co-ordinators in the Parkland Region. There are 17 case co-ordinators in the Westman Region. There are 12 case co-ordinators in the Central Region. There are 20 case co-ordinators in Winnipeg North. There are 18 in Winnipeg West Central and 20 in Winnipeg South. That is current.

I will provide my honourable friend as quickly as I can with what they were three years ago.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** The totals would be fine. It is too much work to break it down.

Could the Minister tell me how often individual cases are reviewed to determine if level of service is appropriate?

**Mr. Orchard:** In long-term provision of services to long-term clients, once a year is the reassessment target and it is primarily met.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** The Minister is saying basically only once a year cases are reviewed to determine if appropriate care is being provided or whether or not care is overserved or underserved or whatever -(interjection)- I am just trying to double-check that.

Case co-ordinators are able only to see their clients once a year in terms of reviewing the situation and keeping in touch and assessing the situations?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, my honourable friend asked the question, how often. I said that it happens once a year as a minimum on long-term care. Depending on the circumstances of the individual, it can happen as often as weekly. It varies significantly, but once a year there is a review of every individual's case plan. It is primarily undertaken—there may be the odd missed case that is not reviewed on at least an annual basis; many are reviewed much more frequently, depending on the nature of the case, the complexity of the needs and the service delivery methods that are provided to that individual.

**Madam Chairman:** Item 2.(f) Gerontology: (1) Salaries \$267,600—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$122,900—pass; (3) External Agencies \$2,581,100—pass; (4) Respite Care \$125,000—pass.

Item 2.(g) Continuing Care: (1) Salaries \$498,600—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$194,700—pass; (3) Home Care Assistance \$48,425,000—pass; (4) External Agencies \$616,000—pass.

Item 2.(h) Home Care Equipment and Supplies.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, I just have one question, and I did discuss it with the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard)—that was about four or five weeks ago. Right now, with the children on 24-hour ventilator support, if something goes wrong with a

ventilator, the ventilator has to be taken to a hospital to get it fixed; but for the adult population you do not have to do the same thing, you could just go to the house and get it fixed. I think it is just causing a lot of disservice for the family, and I think it is a wasting of taxpayers' dollars.

The argument has been given that the respiratory people are not covered outside the hospital system, so if we could extend the coverage for RTs outside the hospital system, this ventilator repair system could be fixed up, and I think it would save money in the long run. I just wanted to put that suggestion on the record, because I do have a constituent who has a two-year old son and has had a number of problems. He works for the department and has been a very good worker, and he brought this matter to my attention just for a suggestion so that we can save money.

**Madam Chairman:** Item 2.(h) Home Care Equipment and Supplies: (1) Salaries \$763,100—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$2,825,600—pass; (3) External Agencies \$770,500—pass.

Item 2.(j) Dental Health: (1) Salaries \$2,443,600—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$2,263,600—pass; (3) External Agencies \$176,600—pass.

\*(1610)

Item 2.(k) Environmental Health: (1) Salaries \$229,900—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$15,500—pass.

Item 2.(m) Health Information Resources: (1) Salaries \$262,100—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$228,500—pass.

Resolution 71: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$73,756,800 for Health, Community Health Services (Programs) \$73,756,800 for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Item 3. Community Health Services (Operations) \$32,188,900 (a) Regional Services: (1) Salaries \$28,379,300—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$3,809,600—pass.

Resolution 72: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$32,188,900 for Health, Community Health Services (Operations) \$32,188,900 for the fiscal year ending 31st day of March, 1991—(pass).

4. Mental Health (a) Mental Health Administration.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, if the Minister would like to have the staff from the Mental Health.

Madam Chairperson, can the Minister tell us—although some improvement has been made in this area and we have no problems with that, but in the present budget, now this year—even during the campaign there was a definite commitment made in terms of moving away from the institutional model and going to a community-based model—in this budget we have not seen even a single phase, because without funds you cannot move one system from the other. The community-based care would need some funding. With the present funding of 13 percent or 14 percent of the total Mental Health budget, can the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) tell us how he is going to do it over a period of four years, because I would like to see his real plan of first year, second year, third year and fourth year?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, I am very mindful of the clock, so I am not going to take a great deal of time. I simply want to say, as I said last year, that I appreciate the kind of support from my Opposition critic, my honourable friend the Member for The Maples (Mr. Cheema). We have not discussed it formally with the current New Democratic Party Critic, but I am fully assuming that the direction that they believe we should be going in has not changed and that they would accede to and endorse the direction that we have, as Government, and the policy we have, as Government, in terms of moving away from the institutional model and providing more community-based services.

That solves a number of problems, in our estimation, in that we believe that the community-based model of service and services closer to home, if you will, for Manitobans can be much more cost-effective in the long run and much more effective in terms of the quality of service they provide. Granted, within this year's Estimates, there are no dramatic shifts between the institution and into the community. There are two reasons for that—and I am not making an apology for our approach, or the pace with which we are approaching it—previous Governments have identified and articulated a community-based model in mental health and have not made any dent in the system; in fact, the institutional side continued to grow. That happened when we were Government '77-81; it has happened already in my current term because the institutional model, because of the very

nature of the beast, if you will, tends to grow with annual increments, et cetera.

The reason that I do not think anybody seriously tackled the issue previously in Manitoba is that there was not a substantial enough understanding in the community of what the issues were, nor was there necessarily substantial enough support in the communities to undertake those kinds of change. I want to tell my honourable friend, and he well knows this, that there is going to be resistance to change. People who are currently in adherence to the institutional side of mental health care are threatened any time you may lessen the importance of that system in Government. There is no question that current funding is going to people employed in the institutional side. Over a several-year period, I hope to have some ability to make changes; we are going to see reductions in employment and budgets to institutions.

Those are going to be difficult decisions. I suspect that we may test the willingness of both my Opposition critics and their respective Parties in terms of whether they still support what really we mean by moving toward community-based institutions, because we are not talking about adding on community-based costs on existing institutional systems, we are talking about fundamentally changing and reallocating dollars, budget, resources, personnel from institutions to community-based services within the envelope of funding of approximately \$225 million in Mental Health. Those are going to be tough decisions.

I know my honourable friends' support in general. I hope their support continues because I want to tell you that the will is out there in the community, the support is out there in the community, to move in that direction. One of the reasons why there is a greater understanding out there in the community and a greater comfort with where we are going is due, I think, in no small part, to my Deputy Minister, Mr. Maynard, and the Assistant Deputy Minister of Mental Health, Mr. Reg Toews, who has been on staff now for better than a year.

We have a vision for Manitoba in terms of community-based mental health, and we are going to get there within the mandate, the four-year expected mandate of this Government. We are going to see a significantly changed mental health system. I wish we had more time in these current Estimates because I know my honourable friend has a lot of things that he would share with me and a lot

of advice to give, because we are going to make mistakes as we move through this. I mean you do not fundamentally reform a \$200 million-plus system without making some judgment errors, some policy errors, et cetera, et cetera.

What we are going to do, we can do, because I believe the process to date, starting out with the very first reform paper I put out, that being the Mental Health Discussion Paper, we have been on an agenda of reform and change, reinforced by pilot projects that we are doing, funded by the Manitoba Health Services Development Fund. If my honourable friend wishes to, we can get into that briefly.

The whole intent of the department is to move towards a more community-based system of mental health delivery, and we will get there. We will get there, I know, with my honourable friend's support.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairman, we are well aware of some of the achievements. There were a number of times we had private as well as general public discussions about achievements which have been made because of many factors. First of all, the public understanding is more there for mental health than ever before. I think that is the most important issue here, secondly, the political will of the three major Parties.

I think, during the last Session, major progress was made, and we kept our commitment even though we took some negative political—a price was paid because we made the Minister look very good in mental health, but I think it is the sensible thing to do. Certainly we will encourage him, but I just want to see the plan. I mean, we do not have time today. We want to see how much you are going to spend over a period of four years on community-based care versus the institutional care and how you are going to transform the system.

\* (1620)

Now you have a plan. You have your vision from your Government's point of view, and community-based, they have their own vision. It is going to be very difficult. We are not saying it is going to be very easy, but four years of majority Government is enough time, and it is about time that \$220 million is wisely spent.

I am not saying the money is being thrown right away, but right now, things are not the way they should be. Everyone knows it, but no Minister was ready to touch this aspect. It was tried in 1986, but

without having a future way. Just patchwork was done, but it was tried. It had good intentions. I am not saying the previous Minister did not have good intentions, but the political and the community will was not there.

What we would like to see—because during this budget, we had a frank discussion with the Deputy Minister and some of his Cabinet colleagues and the Manitoba Mental Health Association. I am sure the Minister has the same brief as we have, and the same questions and answers.

Rather than going through some of them, I am concerned, if you look at the last page of the presentation, it clearly shows that there is going to be a significant amount of increase at the staff level at the Health Sciences Centre. They are concerned; they have a valid concern. They want to see how we are going to move, and we know we do not have extra funds to give.

The funds have to be diversified, and there is going to be a gray zone for a period of a year or two when difficulties are going to come. I want to see, from the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), a firm commitment that in the next provincial budget we must see a definite plan. Can the Minister give us a commitment today?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, yes, I can give you that commitment. Here is the anticipated sort of critical path in terms of getting the reform agenda fully out there for public discussion. We kicked the process off September of 1988 with our discussion paper. I hope to follow up. The only thing I cannot answer for my honourable friend is whether I am going to be able to achieve this before we next reconvene in the Legislature here, because that is less than three months away.

The idea is to have a Phase 2 discussion paper which will have a fair bit more substance of actual direction of change than the conceptual reorganization paper that we first put out. I am hopeful that I can have that discussion paper up and out for public discussion with the attached direction of Government contained therein.

I know the Canadian Mental Health Association has significant concerns over the new psychiatry building at the Health Sciences Centre. There are new beds that are going in there, which is of significant concern to them. The new beds are intermediate security forensic beds, because you know, from time to time Government has been

criticized by outside observers for not having secure facilities for the forensic individuals in Manitoba. We are trying to come to grips in part with that through the reconstruction at the Health Sciences Centre.

I know and I share their concerns because I have to be very careful too as a Minister planning for the future. Every time I put significant dollars into bricks and mortar, I have ongoing operating costs that far exceed the capital costs that are originally invested. So, when it comes to creating new capacity in beds in the health care system, any time we do it, we attach significant operating costs. I am aware of that and was aware of that when I made the approval at the Health Sciences Centre.

I think we have agreed with the information. I am not saying, by any means, that the Canadian Mental Health Association - Manitoba Division is satisfied or happy with the direction we took. I am not going to speak for them, but at least they understand that the increased capacity is forensic beds and not general-admission, acute psychiatry beds.

In terms of trying to bring the system more in focus, yes, I think we will see far fewer acute care beds or psychiatric beds throughout the province at the end of our four-year time. Now they may not be actually taken out of service by then, but certainly all the groundwork and the introduction into community of people able to provide support in the community will be well under way. I simply indicate that to my honourable friend as a direction Government is serious about.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairman, due to the shortage of time, I will be again very brief. I just want the Minister to be of one caution here. I think it is very important that the consultation must be on a broad base, not only of one special group. We are not advocating this for one group. I think we are concerned about all the groups. All the players must sit around the table.

This could be the Minister of Health's (Mr. Orchard) major achievement for the next four years, and I want him to be very careful, because when the beds are closed there is going to be a lot of noise made. It could be that sometimes it is not very wise, but as far as we are concerned from our Party, I want to give to him a commitment today that we will support him as long as all the players are involved and we could see a plan.

Also, I want to ask him that the plan from the Drysdale Report and from their own staff—everyone

should have a plan for western Manitoba too, because we do not want to do a system where it should be one thing here and next year we are going to look after Brandon and Selkirk. I think the plan has to be on a broad base so that the public would understand, because I think a number of issues are going to come in terms of job losses. If you have a plan for the Selkirk or the Brandon hospitals, how are they going to implement the recommendations? Some of them are very positive and have to be made over a period of time.

I just want the Minister to be very careful and have consultation with all the players so that, for a narrow, political gain, we should not be doing a disservice to the people of Manitoba, which is very important. The public of Manitoba must know where mental health is going to, because I think this is the only place right now in this country which could take and lead. Some of them, you will not find co-operation in any part of this country the way you are going to get it from this House and outside. It is a chance for you to do it.

I will just end my remarks without further questioning. Thank you.

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, I appreciate my honourable friend's remarks, and I take very seriously his advice about making sure that all people are part of the consultation process. As we establish our resource allocation committee under the reorganization of the Mental Health division, we are attempting to do just that by having a diverse group of key players involved in that resource allocation group. I think, when that is announced, my honourable friend will see that we have acceded to his advice. It only makes good sense, and it is common sense.

You know, one of the greatest fears is going to be in terms of potential job losses as institutions reduce their capacities. Clearly, part of the process of a change has to evolve around how those staff can be retrained, redeployed and made effective partners of the reform of mental health. That is all part of the planning, the discussions and sort of the envisagement of where we are going.

I tell my honourable friend, I very much appreciate his support on this and his Party's support on it, because when I sat in Opposition as early as 1985 and '86, I made these kinds of suggestions. I would have supported that, and as an Opposition Party, we would have supported this reform system. I

appreciate it makes the job achievable if we have that kind of co-operation.

As my honourable friend knows, I make no bones about it. Whenever we have a function where my honourable friend is there representing his Party, I acknowledge the kind of support you have been, because it is an apolitical issue. It is an issue of common-sense, practical, pragmatic, Government policy, and with the support I have enjoyed to date, I think we will achieve it.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Madam Chairperson, it is very unfortunate that time does not permit a lengthy dialogue on this very important policy area, mental health issues. We will have to carry on this dialogue outside of the House and in other ways, but I would like to ask a few questions.

\* (1630)

The Minister has sent very clear signals, over a number of years, that he is very serious about moving our mental health system from one that is institutional based to one that is community based, and I think we all support that initiative. The problem I have with this budget is that there is no clue in this budget, there is no signal, that the Minister is serious about moving in that direction. One would have thought that we would have started to see, in this budget, a little bit of movement in that direction, a beginning, some initial steps being taken towards moving away from an institutional-based system.

I would ask the Minister why he has reallocated some staff from the mental health field to his own offices, Executive Support, Financial and Administration Services, a Communication office, rather than set apart those staff years or the dollars from those staff years towards a major initiative in terms of a community-based mental health service delivery?

Why, also, are there significant reductions in several of the lines under Mental Health from last year's Estimates? I think of down one staff under Mental Health Promotion; down three and a half staff under Mental Health Rehabilitation; down four staff under Mental Health Clinical.

If it was seen that efficiencies could be found in those areas, why were those staff years, or the dollars associated with those years, not put towards at some special community-based initiative to begin this very difficult and long and costly process towards a community-based system?

**Mr. Orchard:** I fully concur that my honourable friend could make the case she just made, but I just give the simple assurance that it is not an accurate analogy of where we are going. First of all, the staff that ended up in our Planning and Policy Directorate out of the institutions were not direct care delivery staff. They were management staff. There was a lateral transfer of management function. You do not reform the system unless you have the ability to analyze and to plan appropriately. Outcome analysis is a very important initiative, and that is where one of the staff positions out of the institution ended up with over in the department.

In terms of changes within the reorganization of the Department of Health under the Assistant Deputy Minister of Mental Health, yes, there are changes. It is a moving target, because we are learning as we move into this reform process that certain things need to be changed and rearranged. We are going to do that. As long as we have the end goal of effective program delivery at the end of our rainbow, if you will, I think that those flexible changes in staff reflect directions as we see them in a very changing circumstance.

This has not been done before. Nobody has tackled mental health in the way that I have tackled mental health within this ministry. It was fractioned four ways, you have heard the story. It is now under one umbrella. We are going to see changes like my honourable friend has mentioned. The changes are going to be changes that we think, with good advice and experience, are appropriate in achieving the reform of the mental health system.

Now, my honourable friend, I do wish we did have more time for the Estimates. We would be spending some considerable time in the Lotteries Funded Programs, which is the last appropriation of the department. We are bringing our expenditures under Lotteries in here and specifying them in the ministry so I can explain them to you, and account for them. Three of them are just the kind of reform programs in Mental Health which are community-based in their nature. There is additional care and support for Mental Health demonstration projects in Brandon and Winnipeg. There is Self Help in Action Mental Health Project and employment project, that is sponsored under the Manitoba Health Services Development Fund, as demonstration projects on employment opportunities and other services for mentally ill Manitobans in the community. Those are contained



in the funding of line 8(d). I would love to get into more detail and explain them to you, because not all of what is happening in Mental Health is happening solely and exclusively within the division we are debating right now.

We are using the bridge money of the Health Services Development Fund to create, well, to build a better mousetrap, to put it bluntly. I appreciate that there is not the opportunity to debate it in depth, but that is where some of the reform projects are currently housed. I say that for my honourable friend from The Maples (Mr. Cheema) as well.

**Ms. Wasylcia-Lels:** My final question, I just should say I do not really understand still why one would reduce in areas that clearly have some bearing on community-based services, if one is intending to move in that direction down the road, because the Minister has lost resources in some very fundamental areas. All the emphasis in his budget seems to be on the institutional side, which really is my other question right now. That is, why proceed with this new psychiatric building? Has there been a thorough consultation with the community? Is it too late to stop this whole project? Is that not the way you begin to move from an institutional-based system to a community-based system?

You do not, at the start of such an initiative, invest millions into a new facility. You begin at that point. So I guess I ask the Minister if it is not too late for this whole idea to be reconsidered as part of his plans to move to a community-based system?

**Mr. Orchard:** My honourable friend asks a very important question. What I am doing is resolving, if I can be so blunt, and I do not want to provoke argument, yet another problem inherited from the previous Government. There was no capital commitment to renewed facilities under the previous administration. They had a plan, 1981, a multiphase development at the Health Sciences Centre. They finished one phase of the plan, namely the Children's Hospital, which was initiated in construction in 1980, I believe.

The psychiatric facilities at the Health Sciences Centre were not appropriate. They are very inappropriate. The faculty was unable to, I believe this is a reasonable approach, guarantee accreditation of the faculty under the old, existing—and those are all problems that were presented to my honourable friend when she was last in Cabinet and were not acted upon. My

honourable friend knows full well, because you have passed from time to time, Lieutenant-Governor Orders-in-Council of Lieutenant-Governor warrants, for the forensic incarceration. This facility provides an intermediate security forensic facility to properly provide accommodation for those individuals that need the secure environment as well as the assistance to hopefully overcome their mental problems.

All of those were demands that were there in the system and, to put it bluntly, ignored by the previous administration. We proceeded to do that even though there is a debate, and I will be very blunt. There are those who say we should not have any psychiatrists, because we do not need them in the mental health system. There are those who say that the mental health system should be run only by psychiatrists. Well, neither extremes are true. We have need of psychiatrists and their trained professionalism in the mental health system. When your faculty environment is so out of date that your program and the quality of your program is endangered, Government has to act. We did, the same as we did in the Faculty of Dentistry out there, and we will in other areas as well.

I know that there is a concern with the community-based advocates that we are spending too much money at Health Sciences Centre under new construction. I know that, and we have had those discussions, but there was more than simply acute bed capacity that was dealt with in that construction project. It met many other needs, intermediate security forensic beds, the Faculty of Teaching, as well as acute care psychiatric beds.

**Madam Chairman:** Item 4. Mental Health (a) Mental Health Administration: (1) Salaries \$350,000—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$137,900—pass.

4.(b) Chief Provincial Psychiatrist: (1) Salaries \$162,000—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$39,700—pass.

4.(c) Mental Health Programs: (1) Salaries \$150,400—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$129,500—pass; (3) External Agencies \$1,889,000—pass.

\* (1640)

4.(d) Mental Health Promotion: (1) Salaries \$160,000—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$26,000—pass.

4.(e) Mental Health Rehabilitation: (1) Salaries \$130,900—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$833,200—pass.

4.(f) Mental Health Clinical: (1) Salaries \$215,900—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$151,200—pass.

4.(g) Mental Health Services: (1) Salaries \$407,700—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$226,100—pass.

4.(h) -(interjection)- Order, please.

4.(h) Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services: (1) Salaries \$894,000—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$161,200—pass.

4.(j) Brandon Mental Health Centre: (1) Salaries \$19,132,200—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$3,025,200—pass; (3) Less: Recoverable from Other Appropriations \$2,611,900—pass.

4.(k) Selkirk Mental Health Centre: (1) Salaries \$15,105,800—pass; (2) Other Expenditures \$2,558,500—pass.

Resolution 73: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$43,274,500 for Health, Mental Health for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Item 5. The Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba, Board of Governors and Executive \$209,000—pass; Personnel and Finance \$704,000—pass; Drug and Alcohol Awareness and Information Directorate \$626,400—pass; Program Delivery Directorate \$8,200,300—pass; Funded Agencies \$1,921,500—pass; Less Recoveries \$1,019,500—pass.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, we are going at a speed of 120 miles an hour. I just wanted to ask one question to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard). We did ask him the same question in 1988 and '89 about having access to the federal program for the drug and alcohol abuse program. Can he give us an update of whether they have secured any funding or not?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, I will answer as quickly as I can. The new construction of the 12-bed women's adolescent treatment centre at St. Norbert Foundation, we will be accessing the 50-50 cost-shared program there. We do not expect any difficulty in achieving that kind of funding.

**Madam Chairman:** Resolution 74: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$10,641,700 for Health, The Alcoholism

Foundation of Manitoba for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Item 6. Manitoba Health Services Commission \$1,446,104,400, Administration \$20,739,900.00.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Just while staff are settling in, I just want to remind the Minister that he had promised, at this point in the Estimates, to provide me with a list of vacant nursing positions. I am wondering if I could have that in short order so that I might ask some questions from that information.

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, maybe I could take the opportunity to introduce the two staff people: Mr. Frank DeCock, Executive Director, Manitoba Health Services Commission; Ernie Moore in Admin and Finance out of the Manitoba Health Services Commission.

We will dig that information up for my honourable friend, because my filing system has kind of failed me this afternoon.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, we just have 10 minutes, so I will be asking only a few questions. Can the Minister of Health tell us what funds are available to rural hospitals for the replacement of ambulance services beyond the regular hospital budget?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, I will just quickly answer that because I know there are lots of other questions. We greatly increased the Ambulance funding Program. Part of the funding component of that \$6.4 million is an allocation on a formula according to eligibility for when an Ambulance Services' ambulance is no longer serviceable. They can access, in part, capital support for the replacement cost of that ambulance. That would be part of the \$6.435 million of Ambulance Program funding.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, can the Minister of Health tell us if in this year's capital expenditure the Gimli hospital is going to get the money for the roof repairs?

**Mr. Orchard:** I am very, very, very pleased to answer to my honourable friend in the affirmative to that question. It is part of the contingency fund and one of the many wonderful things that we do in the Commission.

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, it looks like the Minister is having the great day of his life, he is having all the fun, and in 10 minutes we will be passing \$1 billion. Can the Minister tell us—the St.

Boniface and the Health Sciences Centre appear to have access to the Lotteries funds—can he give us the update of how much money is being given to that other hospital out of the Lotteries funds for research purposes?

**Mr. Orchard:** Well, out of Lotteries funds for research purposes, when I came into office in 1988 there was just a little over \$980,000.00. If my honourable friend follows item 8.(c) Manitoba Health Research Council you will find that there is a \$1,947,300 commitment to the Manitoba Health Research Council. That is all Lotteries dollars that are there to promote research in Manitoba, as guided by decisions by the Manitoba Health Research Council. There is some direct money going to St. Boniface from the department which is taxpayer dollars, not Lotteries money, to support the World Health Organization collaborative study.

**Mr. Cheema:** My question was specifically for the rural hospitals. For the smaller hospitals, how much money has been made available for those hospitals out of the Lotteries funding?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, I cannot answer that because I do not know where the \$1.947 million as dispersed by the Manitoba Health Research Council goes to assist research. My sense is it is primarily in Winnipeg, but if there are worthwhile research projects outside of Winnipeg that meet their qualifications and criteria they could access it.

\* (1650)

**Mr. Cheema:** Madam Chairperson, under this administration's Decentralization plan, how many emergency positions have been decentralized?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, 23 positions on completion.

**Mr. Cheema:** Can the Minister tell us when is the deadline to have the Manitoba Health Services Commission and the Manitoba Health Department to be one department, as was promised in the 1988 election campaign by this Government?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, April for the one decentralization, September for the other, of next year. Let me tell my honourable friend that I have a large complement of SYs, but the Department of Health is one of the most decentralized departments already in terms of regional services throughout the length and breadth of Manitoba, so that we had to select carefully some candidates for decentralization and there may be a little more difficulty in terms of moving whole units, et cetera,

et cetera, and we are already substantially decentralized.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** In five minutes? I will have to focus in on just a few issues, there are so many. I am wondering, is the list of facilities by vacancies coming? Okay. Are we getting a capital breakdown?

**Mr. Orchard:** Yes.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Pertaining to capital, I would like to ask the Minister about some capital projects close to home.

**Madam Chairman:** Order, please; order, please. The Honourable Minister is experiencing difficulty in hearing the question.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** How many dollars went into the Manitou health facility, how much was that facility?

**Mr. Orchard:** I think in Manitou the facility cost approximately \$4.3 million. It would have been an awful lot less capital dollars if the project had not been cancelled for six successive capital budgets by the previous Government; we would have built it for a lot less money.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** I understand there is to be a sod turning soon for a facility at Altona. Could the Minister tell me how much that facility is projected to cost?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, I stand corrected. Manitou was \$3.6 million.

We have not got architectural plans ready to go to tender yet in Altona so I cannot give my honourable friend an idea of sod turning, but it is certainly the intention of this Government to renew that acute care facility.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Can the Minister give me any estimates for that facility?

**Mr. Orchard:** No.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Can the Minister tell me if he is proceeding with the notion of a facility in between Morden and Winkler?

**Mr. Orchard:** Yes.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Lels:** Could he tell us the projected cost for that facility?

**Mr. Orchard:** No, I cannot, Madam Chairman, because the stage we are at right now is functional programming. It involves a new structure replacing an existing hospital in Winkler and an existing hospital in Morden, a concept that, with some credit—I even have to indicate that the previous

Government supported—there was some concern about how quickly they were proceeding with it, but nevertheless they had bought into the concept. The next plan, we have money set aside in last year's capital budget whereby, should the functional design be approved by the commission, we can move to architectural drawings.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Leis:** How many health care facilities have reduced operating room time or are planning to reduce operating time? Could he give us a breakdown?

**Mr. Orchard:** If my honourable friend is referring to Winnipeg, none, but if my honourable friend is referring to facilities in rural Manitoba, I would certainly have to undertake a complete survey to provide that information. I simply do not have that information at my disposal.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Leis:** I have a letter indicating there has been a reduction in operating room time at the Health Sciences Centre. Can the Minister indicate whether or not that is the case?

**Mr. Orchard:** Maybe if my honourable friend could share with me this letter again, because in fact this year's budget provisions provides for 20 additional hours of operating time per week.

**Madam Chairman:** Item 6. Manitoba Health Services Commission, Administration \$20,739,900—pass; Pharmacare Program \$51,117,900.00.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Leis:** We would just like assurances that before the end of Estimates, or before six o'clock today then, if he needs some time, I will have a list of the vacancies of nursing positions.

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, I tell my honourable friend we will have the number of vacancies for her before six o'clock. We had it the other day, but the individual had it left and I neglected to put it on. I also want to tell my honourable friend that the Capital Program will be tabled immediately. It is supposed to be here right now, but given the time constraints that we are under, we have not been able to get it out ahead of time. I would have liked to have had it out some time ago, because it is simply full of good news.

Well, I mean, we did quite an announcement in June in the City of Winnipeg, but basically, we have approved a number of projects in St. Pierre, Thompson, Ste. Rose, Elkhorn, Shoal Lake, Virden, Concordia, Winnipeg, Winnipeg Municipal Hospital, Victoria Hospital as attempting to bring some new

and modern facilities for the provision of health care in the system. I know my honourable friends will be most anxious to compliment Government when they read the tremendous list of capital projects that we have put before you for your approval.

Madam Chairman, I know my honourable friends are most anxious to approve that capital budget.

**Madam Chairman:** Item 6. Pharmacare Program \$51,117,900—pass; Ambulance Program \$6,435,200—pass; Air Ambulance Program \$2,438,900—pass; Northern Patient Transportation Program \$2,725,200—pass; Hospital Program \$868,749,100—pass.

**Mr. Cheema:** We have no copies. I mean how can we approve something without having a look at it?

**Mr. Orchard:** Madam Chairman, I am desperately trying to get—it is supposed to be down here. I am going to have to severely discipline someone for not having the Capital Program here because it is such a good news document. I know we will all want to unanimously approve it. I have asked and have asked and have asked, table the Capital documents.

We have got some right here, right here. Saved by staff.

**Ms. Wasylycia-Leis:** This is a rather difficult and bizarre set of turn of events. We get a capital budget in 30 seconds before we are supposed to approve the Estimates for the Department of Health. I do not know why the Minister could not have tabled this today in the House. Yesterday, the day before yesterday, why he could not have tabled this so we could have at least been reviewing it and then made a reasoned decision on the basis of that. For us to be placed in this situation is almost untenable.

**Madam Chairman:** Order, please. In the interest of expediency, I would appreciate the co-operation of all Honourable Members in this House returning to their seats and continuing the debate on the Estimates of Health.

**Mr. Orchard:** We just started at the whole thing a few minutes ago.

\* (1700)

**Mr. John Plozman (Dauphin):** You could have tabled this a few minutes ago.

**Madam Chairman:** Order, please. Item 6. Manitoba Health Services Commission, Personal Care Home Program \$217,968,100—pass; Medical Program

\$282,399,400—pass; Less: Recoveries \$6,469,300—pass.

Resolution 75: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,446,104,400 for Health, Manitoba Health Services Commission for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

\* \* \*

**Madam Chairman:** Order, please. As previously agreed, the Committee of Supply will now proceed to vote on all outstanding Estimates Resolutions.

Resolution 76: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$48,535,500 for Health, Expenditures Related to Capital - Manitoba Health Services Commission for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 77: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$12,988,900 for Health, Lotteries Funded Programs for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 70: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$3,957,600 for Health, Administration and Finance for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 86: HOUSING: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,886,000, General Administration for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 88: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$11,569,600 for Housing, Operations for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 89: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$31,878,500 for Housing, Transfer Payments to the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 90: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$500,000 for Housing, Expenditures Related to Capital for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 99: JUSTICE: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,056,900 for Justice, Administration and Finance for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 100: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$53,097,200 for Justice, Public Prosecutions for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 101: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$4,990,800 for Justice, Justice for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1991—pass.

Resolution 102: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$45,795,000 for Justice, Corrections for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 103: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$22,378,900 for Justice, Courts for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 104: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$21,911,800 for Justice, Protection of Individual and Property Rights for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

Resolution 147: RESOLVED that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,371,000 for Environmental Innovations Fund for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1991—pass.

\* (1710)

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Madam Chairman, I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), that the Committee of Supply concur on all Supply Resolutions relating to the Estimates of Expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, which have been adopted at this Session by the two sections of the Committee of Supply sitting separately and by the full committee.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** Madam Chairperson, now we are on the concurrence motion, which is a motion providing an opportunity for all Members of the Legislature to talk in general about the spending of this Government, and indeed the waterfront is available to our colleagues, particularly on the Opposition side who may have questions in Transportation, perhaps Environment, Housing, Agriculture, Urban Affairs, Justice or whatever, so this does give the Opposition an opportunity to have perhaps what might be called

the last kick of the can in order to bring up some pressing matters that they may have prior to passing a lot of money, a lot of expenditure involving a lot of taxation on the part of the people of Manitoba.

I just want to say in general, Madam Chairperson, about these Estimates, and that is, really these are the Estimates that have been created, that were initiated, in times of a minority Government. This set of Estimates came out and were prepared back in early 1990 while this Government was still in a minority position, and it reflects that minority position. I believe that, come next year when we are into the Estimates and when we are into the budget, we are going to be in a completely different ball game. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has already warned us time in and time out that we should tighten our belts, that people, organizations and groups that depend on Government for funding should be prepared for tough times. I believe that they should heed the Minister's warning because the fact is that this Minister and this Government are determined to trim spending or certainly to trim increases in spending.

So I believe that next year's Estimates are going to be much more debatable in many ways - (interjection) - more revealing, as my colleague from Dauphin (Mr. Plohman) says. They are going to be a set of Estimates that are going to cause a great many people in Manitoba to be upset, and there is going to be a lot of consternation on the part of the people of Manitoba with the Estimates and with the budget.

So I say, particularly for all the new Members here, that they will have their work cut out for them next year when we will see the results of a majority Conservative Government. We will have in operation in this province two majority Conservative Governments. The people will have a majority Conservative Government still in Ottawa, and a majority Conservative Government with Estimates and a budget reflecting a majority position.

Members opposite like to have it both ways. On the one hand, they complain about lack of spending by the previous Government and brag that they have done better. Look, we have spent more on Family Services, or we have spent more on Highways, or we have spent more on Agriculture than the previous Government; then, in the next breath, complain about the debt that was incurred by the previous Government. Well, you cannot have

it both ways. You cannot pretend that you are outspending the—

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

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** You are pretending—you are making the case that you have outspent the previous New Democratic Party Government, and then in the next breath complain about all the debt, about all the overspending. You are trying to have it both ways, and the fact is that this Government has not really tempered the rate of spending increase. This Government has more or less maintained a level of spending which does reflect a very weak position that they were in as a minority for the past couple of years, from early 1988, April, May of 1988 when they became Government, up until this past election.

The fact that this Government has really not revealed a true Tory agenda yet, in my judgment, has caused the debt of this province to rise even further, and for all of the Members opposite who complain about the debt from the NDP, I would point out that this Government across the way has caused the debt per capita to be higher than it ever was before. You did not lower the debt, you raised the debt. You have got the highest debt per Manitoba man, woman and child in the history of this province under the Filmon Government.

We have got spending that has not been tapered off so that, therefore, you have put us in a position where we have the highest debt that we have ever had in the experience of this province.

So, Madam Chairperson, the Members opposite cannot have it both ways. I am a little tired of them getting up, using envelope No. 1, saying that they have much better programs than us, that they are spending more. We only spent X dollars, and they are spending X plus Y dollars, and then as I have said, in the next breath start complaining about the debt that they inherited.

We will see as I said next year what happens with the budget, what happens with taxes, and what happens to the spending situation.

Another comment before I yield the floor to some of my colleagues who may wish to participate in debate, is about the economy. Regrettably this Government and this Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has its head in the sands with regard to the economic recession that we are now experiencing.

The Members of the Opposition have raised the signals, have pointed to economic indicators that show a very weak economy, and no matter how hard we try, how many figures we reveal, and they are all figures based on official surveys of Statistics Canada, the Minister of Finance, the Premier in particular say, oh, no, things are not that bad, and they wrestle out a few numbers. They try to pretend that Manitoba is not that bad and, therefore, there is no need to do anything.

Well, Madam Chairperson, this Government is failing the people of Manitoba because we have a weakness in all of the goods-producing sectors pretty well in this province. The figures that we have from the latest labour force survey show that the goods-producing sector in Manitoba, which includes manufacturing, agriculture production, mining, other primary construction, taken as a group, the goods-producing sector in this province for this year of 1990—well the first 11 months, but that is a good indication of what is going to happen this year—is down by 5.9 percent. In other words, there are 5.9 percent fewer people employed in total in goods-producing sectors in Manitoba.

I know that the Premier (Mr. Filmon) is always comparing this to Canada as a whole, but in Canada as a whole, yes there has been a reduction, but it is only 2.8 percent.

So the rate of reduction in goods-producing services in Manitoba is twice that of Canada as a whole, whether you look at agriculture or manufacturing or other primary manufacturing in particular is very serious, and there are other figures that we could reveal and quote to the Members opposite. I do not think it will do much good, however.

The fact is the biggest failure that I can see then in these Estimates from my perspective in terms of the lack of employment, lack of job opportunities, lack of business opportunities, is the failure of these Estimates, and indeed the budget, to address the question of slow economic growth, the question of insufficient jobs, the question of continued out-migration, and that to me is a major failure. This Government has a very, very Reaganite view of the economy. They are following—(interjection)—Do you like that? They are following in the footsteps of Ronald Reagan, although I must qualify that because Ronald Reagan, while they cut back on social services, he did spend a lot more for war, for

military, and to that extent stimulated the American economy.

Frankly, Madam Chairperson, we need a set of economic policies that are going to focus in on the lack of industrialization in this province, that are going to focus in on the lack of employment opportunities, that are going to focus in and work with the labour sector, work with the business sector, work with the farming sector, together work with all Manitobans actively and aggressively to address these problems. Instead we get a laid-back view, a head-in-the-sand approach; everything is fine; we will just go toddle along.

Well, Madam Chairperson, that is not good enough and, as I indicated, next year I do not expect any change in terms of the policy approach of this Government and, ultimately and finally, this Government will pay the political price.

\* (1720)

So, having made those few remarks, Madam Chairperson, I would like to yield the floor to some of my colleagues who may wish to talk about some specific issues they may have on Family Services or Urban Affairs or Health or Agriculture, or what have you. Thank you.

**Mr. John Plohman (Dauphin):** Madam Chairman, as my colleague, the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans), has stated, this is the last set of Estimates of the minority Government that was in place for two and a half years and it reflects some moderation on the part of the Conservative Government in the province because of the reality of minority Government, but in fact it means that there is going to be a major change as we move to the next set of Estimates.

I think it is well though, it marks the end of a very short period of time where the Government has been able to govern in an atmosphere or environment that was not reflective of the kinds of circumstances that faced Government during the 1980s, and that was because of the tax windfall that they inherited from the previous New Democratic Government in this province. Because of the windfall from the federal Government in transfer payments that occurred, they have not had to deal with reality and we could say really, at this point in time, welcome to the real world of reality insofar as governing is concerned.

I know the Member for Lakeside, the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns), realizes that

because he experienced that during his time in Government during the Sterling Lyon period of time when the rather buoyant economy of the '70s changed over to a recession in the late '70s, early '80s and in fact the Government had to deal with some very serious difficulties.

Of course, that continued on after the made-in-Manitoba recession that occurred during the Sterling Lyon Government, and the acute protracted restraint threw Manitoba into a recession way ahead of the rest of the country. The New Democratic Government at that time—it came into Government in 1981—had to deal in a pro-active way with that recession.

Now this Government is going to find over the next year as it moves into the next set of Estimates that it will be preparing hopefully during this period in time that we are recessed, adjourned from the House, from January to March, they are going to find some very difficult decisions. They will have no more windfalls. They are going to have no more buoyant economy that was left for them in 1988 from the New Democrats. That is no longer there for them. They have in fact a legacy of their own two and a half years in Government. That is what they have. They are reaping what they sowed over those two and a half years.

Now they are going to see the results of their lack of effort, if I could put it that way, their lack of leadership and initiative during that period of time.

We are going to see I believe some very difficult times for Manitobans, particularly in light of the offloading by the federal Conservatives, their federal cousins in Ottawa. They are doing it in many different areas, in economic development, the Economic Regional Development Agreements, they are doing it in Agriculture, and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) knows that. He is having to pick up more and more federal offloading, whether it be in crop insurance, whether it be in the safety net discussions that are taking place, tripartite, or whatever it might be.

The federal Government is offloading its responsibilities onto the provinces. They are doing it with the RCMP, and they are doing it in economic development, as I said earlier.

So really we are going to see even greater difficulties. We are going to see a ballooning deficit, as we have seen this year, by this group of managers, this group of Conservatives who call

themselves managers of the economy, a ballooning deficit. They talk about the deficit and they are finding that in fact they are adding to the per capita deficit of Manitobans in a similar way that Grant Devine did in Saskatchewan, and Getty and Lougheed did in Alberta. They are not in fact managing this economy well. Their rhetoric was much more effective and much louder than their action over the last number of years.

You can see it in their borrowing, and the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Enns) knows that. They have increased their borrowing. The Loan Act we will be discussing soon in this Legislature in another very short period of time—\$158 million increase in their borrowing under The Loan Act that they are asking for.

We see the results of their mismanagement in the first two and a half years of the economy of Manitoba, housing starts down, loss of manufacturing jobs and 12,000 jobs in the last year. The plant closures that have taken place, the farm crisis, the fact there is no contingency plan in place. They say they are working on a safety net, but there is no announcement for deficiency payments in early next year, and we do have this per capita debt which is now higher, \$10,151 per capita, higher than it has ever been in this province, and this is the dubious distinction of this Filmon Conservative Government in this province.

As they go along they no longer can continue to blame the New Democratic Government, they have to take the blame. They are now the previous Government in this province. It is no longer the New Democratic Government that is the previous administration, it is themselves and they find themselves catching themselves as they speak now because they cannot blame the previous Government. They realize they are blaming themselves.

So I say to the Members of this Government, when we get into the next Session of this Legislature, and the Estimates that you are preparing right at this time, this Opposition will be dealing with your Estimates in a very aggressive way and pointing out the shortcomings that we know are going to be there to an even greater degree than we have seen up to this point in time, because indeed this is the final set of Estimates and budget of a Government that was a minority in this province for two and a half years and had the fortunate situation of inheriting a good fiscal situation from the



previous Government, a buoyant economy, good increasing tax revenue and, of course, the increased transfer payments at that time from the federal Government.

So I say to the Members opposite, you have been able to get through these Estimates in a rather short period of time because in fact we were dealing with Estimates that were half spent already anyway because of the timing of the election and so on. We were in fact not able to scrutinize the Government spending prior to it taking place as we will be able to do next spring when we come back into this House. We are anxious to get back onto that cycle, to see the actions and the proposals of the Government before, indeed, they take place in this province, rather than after the fact. We will have to say to the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) that he no longer will be able to wait six or nine months after the start of the fiscal year to table his Capital Program for health facilities in this province. He will have to table it early in the fiscal year. So if he says he was pressed for time getting in nine months after the start of the fiscal year, then he is going to be desperately pressed for time next spring when he has to bring it in.

I want to also say to the Minister of Health there is no rule anywhere that says you cannot table your Capital Program before you go into Estimates. You could have tabled this with no dollar amounts in it anyway. You could have tabled this for us in September or October, shortly after the election, but, no, he waited until the Legislature actually got to the Health Estimates. Then he has the nerve to attack our critics and say, well, we did not get into the Health Estimates so naturally we could not table the program. How absurd.

\* (1730)

Highways always tables their Capital Program ahead of time before they get into the Estimates, and let the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) finally get into the 1990s here and realize he cannot pull that kind of joke on us again. It is two years in a row now that the Legislature has allowed this Minister—two years—to bring in the Capital Program after the Estimates have been completed, and one year it was not even brought in before the Session adjourned. That was just last year or the year before—last year I believe. Even before the Legislature adjourned, he could not get them into the House.

So that kind of slipshod management is not going to be tolerated and the Government is going to realize that they have a fight on their hands as we move into the next Session.

**Mr. Conrad Santos (Broadway):** Madam Chairman, thank you very much for this opportunity. In 1981 the then Premier of Manitoba, the Honourable Sterling Lyon, said the Tories are the best breeders in the world. I agreed with him and thought that the Progressive Conservatives are really the best breeders in the world. Yes, Madam Chairperson, they are the best breeders of unemployment in Manitoba.

We have lost in this province—I like to prove what I said. In the manufacturing jobs in this province, we have lost some 10,000 jobs. There are about 4,500 federal jobs that we have lost, including the 1,300 jobs in the military.

Not only is this Government the best breeder of unemployment, but they are also the best breeders of business bankruptcies. There are a number of bankruptcies in this province, and it is on the increase. When processing plants are closed, and people are laid off at work, then they start to leave the province. When they leave the province, they seek better opportunities elsewhere.

All this shows is that this Government does not know how to manage the economy, because we are losing jobs and employment opportunities in this province. While the inflation rate is over 4 percent, they increase the spending by less than the rate of inflation. Home care was said to have increased by 1.9 percent, but we have an inflation rate of 4.2 percent. There is a net decline of 2.3 percent.

If this Government is committed to a community-based health delivery system, how come we still train our nurses and our doctors in the old institutional way? How come they are not being trained and educated in the decentralized, community-based delivery system of health care in this province?

This is an inconsistency. If we are to go into a community-based delivery health care system, then even the educational system of nurses and doctors has to be changed, and has to be reformed, so that their attitudes and their working habits will be consistent with the community-based kind of health delivery system.

How can this be made possible? This is not possible because all of the professional groups in

this province are self-governing groups. The medical profession, the lawyers, the nurses, the dentists, they are all self-governing groups. They regulate their own professional conduct. The Government, the province has practically abrogated all regulatory powers and given the power of self-government to this professional group. Therefore, this Government is losing leadership in order to reform the attitudes and ways and practices, and systemic ways of doing things by these professional organizations.

I have observed the actual living conditions of patients and citizens in some of the seniors homes. In the Central Park Lodge, for example, I myself went there and observed. The director there even prohibited me from going up and looking at the conditions of the patients there. I have seen with my very own eyes some of the old senior citizens in their wheelchairs, who are crying for help and nobody is paying any attention to them. The nurses are so busy doing so many things; there were so few of them. They were complaining about lack of this attention and lack of facilities. Because of this tax in the health care spending, these people are suffering tremendously in our institutions.

Very recently, I have a constituent who used to live here in Winnipeg. She is now living in Toronto. I would like to be concrete about this; I am giving you specific facts. She came here to Winnipeg; she is the daughter of an 89-year-old mother who lives in Central Park Lodge. The mother happened to fall and she broke her hips in the hospital. She observed, also, the deficient attention that was being paid to patients in there. There were only three laundry workers there, and five people have left the place. She said it is not really the work of the workers, that these patients are suffering. It is because of the lack of supplies and lack of budget, that they cannot do anything to care for the senior citizens. She was frustrated and angry, and this is terribly upsetting to her mother, who is 89 years old. The bedpans were thrown. There was so much waste she observed in the food in there. I do not know, I must confess, who owns the building, whether it is public or private. Nevertheless, these are the programs that are being subsidized by the Government.

There are now so many economic hardships facing the workers of this province. I have constituents who have been working in some of the candy factories downtown. The husband had been

there for five years, the wife had been there for 15 years. They were working together when suddenly the plant closed and moved somewhere else, and they both lost their jobs. They have mortgages to pay and things to pay for their family—they have children. These are simply economic hard times. Tory times are tough times. Tory times are bad economic times.

No wonder this Government is trying to say that they are trying to cut the deficit. In principle, it is very difficult to argue with someone who wants to cut out public spending in the interests of more economic efficiency. When it is done at the price of human values and human sufferings of, especially, our senior citizens, I think you have to weigh our values and our priorities. Is efficiency a higher value than human sentiments and human welfare? Are the material things, the conservation of money, more important than the happiness of the golden years of our senior citizens?

This is again this eternal contest between the material things of the world and the eternal values that we treasure as human beings. I think the health and condition and welfare of our senior citizens are more important than any saving that you can ever make.

This report, it came at the last minute. How can any intelligent body of decision make a study of this report when there is no more time? Now I am speaking, yet the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) said, How much time, Conrad? Of course we need more time and that is the reason why I have due consideration, but I have had my say, and I will give the chance to other Members of the Legislature.

\* (1740)

**Ms. Becky Barrett (Wellington):** Madam Chair, I would like to share and I am glad of the opportunity to speak just a few more minutes one more time on the Estimates, the budget, and the plan of this Government.

I think for all of us in this House, particularly the new Members on both sides of the House, this has been a very illuminating experience since October 11 when we first came in. We have spent the vast majority of our time, since that time, in dealing with the budget, the plan of this Government and the actual bones, flesh and sinew of the budget which is the Estimates process.

In a way, for those of us who are new to this process and are new to the House, it has been a good learning experience. What I believe we learned, as Members of the House, is how in fact Conservative ideology gets translated into budgets, plans and Estimates.

I can speak personally, from my experience in Family Services and from listening in the House to other Members in the other Estimates departments, how the Conservative plan for Manitoba is going to unfold, not so much for this year because as other of my colleagues have expressed, we are three-quarters of the way through this fiscal year by the time we get through with the Estimates for the year.

I think it is a very strong harbinger of things to come next spring, and I wish I could say that I felt it would be a positive spring and a spring full of flowers, birds, sweet smells, and happiness for the people of Manitoba. However, I think just the opposite is going to be the case. I think we are in for some very serious difficulties as people in Manitoba due to the choices that I think are becoming clearer by the day on the part of this Government.

The Government continues to say, not only in Question Period, but in every Estimates that I have heard and particularly in the areas of social spending, spending on services for people, we have no more money; we have no more money. We have no more money either because of the bad management of the previous Government, we have no more money because of the bad management of the federal Government, or we have no more money because of something another province or another country has done.

Well, Madam Chair, the Members on this side have not bought that argument, and I am convinced that the people of Manitoba will not buy that argument. This Government has been in power in a minority situation and now a majority situation for two and a half years. They have produced three budgets.

We know what the next budget is going to look like. We may not know the details, but we certainly are aware of the outlines and outlines are not at all positive for the people of Manitoba. There is going to be a continued and an increased reliance on one criterion and one criterion only and that is the criterion of the bottom line.

Anyone who peruses Hansard—and I have talked to many people who have paid attention to the questions and answers in Hansard this Session, which I am surprised at because I had heard that nobody outside of this Legislature ever paid any attention to what was going on in Hansard—has noticed the lines, the two or three lines, that this Government has shared with us in their responses to questions from the Opposition benches and they are very concerned because there is not a single person in this province, or in this country, or in this world who pays any attention to the geopolitical and economic realities who is not aware that we are in for economic hard times. No one, specifically on this of the House, has ever stated that was not the case, although responses from Government Ministers often consist of nothing more than saying that is what we are stating.

We categorically have put on record time after time that we are definitely aware that we are in for difficult economic times. We may be in for a longer and a deeper recession than Mr. Wilson would allow us to believe. I for one believe we are in for a very long period of economic constriction.

I think what is going to happen in next spring's budget is that we are going to see the true Conservative agenda, and it is not going to be a pretty picture for the people of Manitoba. It is going to be a very desolate picture for the people of Manitoba, in particular the people of Manitoba who can least afford, who have the least resources to deal with those external economic realities.

People who are poor are not poor by choice. People who are in trouble either in their own lives or whose families are in difficulty are not in trouble by their own choice. The vast majority of those people are unable through their own resources to get themselves out of trouble. It is incumbent upon Governments and societies as a whole to help those people out of those difficulties, which become exacerbated as we have more difficult economic times. Every single social problem is going to become even more difficult in the days, weeks and months ahead. I am very much afraid, and I am hearing from people and organizations that I talk to, they are very much afraid that this Government is not going to help them in any meaningful way, is only going to make the situation worse.

I wish I could be more positive, but I think every indication is that we will be in for harder times than we need to be. If we just had a slightly different

perspective, I think people are going to become more aware of what a Conservative majority Government provincially can provide, and they are going to begin to see the similarity between this provincial Government and the federal Government in Ottawa.

I share with others of my colleagues who have stated that the people of Manitoba have spoken in the past and they will speak in the future. I am convinced that the wisdom of the people will prevail and that Conservative ideology will be turned out, as it should be.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

**Madam Chairman:** Is the committee ready for the question? The question is that the Committee of Supply concur in all Supply resolutions relating to the Estimates of expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991, which have been adopted at this Session by the two sections of the Committee of Supply sitting separately and by the full committee. Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

## IN SESSION

### INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I would like to draw the attention of Honourable Members to the loge to my left where we have with us this afternoon Mr. Allan Patterson, the former Member for Radisson.

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

### COMMITTEE REPORT

**Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Chairman of Committees):** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has adopted certain resolutions and has adopted the concurrence motion, requests me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

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

**Motion agreed to.**

\* \* \*

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Environment (Mr. Cummings), that this House concur the report of the Committee of Supply

respecting concurrence and all Supply resolutions relating to the Estimates of expenditure for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1991.

**Motion agreed to.**

\* (1750)

## REPORT STAGE

### BILL 6—THE BUSINESS PRACTICES ACT

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Connery), I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), that Bill 6, The Business Practices Act; Loi sur les pratiques commerciales, as amended and reported from the Standing Committee on Law Amendments be concurred in.

**Motion agreed to.**

### BILL 18—THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT (RE-ENACTED STATUTES) ACT

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness), that Bill 18, The Statute Law Amendment (Re-enacted Statutes) Act; Loi de 1990 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives (Lois readoptées), as amended and reported from the Committee of the Whole, be concurred in.

**Motion agreed to.**

### BILL 20—THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT (TAXATION) ACT, 1990

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment to Bill 20.

I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae),

THAT Bill 20 be amended in Section 12 by striking out the word "does" where it appears for the second time.

(French version)

Il est proposé que la version anglaise de l'article 12 soit amendée par suppression de "does", à la seconde occurrence.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) probably anticipated that I would have some additional comments on this particular Bill, in particular -(interjection)- no, the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment that we are referring to, or I am concerned about, is of course the amendment that we referenced last night. I want to indicate to the Minister of Finance that since our discussion last night, I have had correspondence from the Core Area Business Association, the Flin Flon Chamber of Commerce, indicating that all of the 343 businesses in Flin Flon oppose the amendments that are included in Bill 20 with respect to The Retail Sales Tax Act.

Mr. Speaker, as I did when the Minister responsible for Manitoba Telephone System (Mr. Findlay) tried to indicate that somehow I was not representing something other than my own or the New Democratic Party interest in this matter, I want to indicate that this issue is extremely serious for many northern communities, not just the community of Flin Flon.

It perhaps has some exceptional implications for the community of Flin Flon, but the fact of the matter is that this legislation is going to affect detrimentally many, many businesses in the Flin Flon area.

I think the Minister of Finance has perhaps mistaken my objections for being strictly partisan objections. I want to assure him that the objections that I bring to this Chamber with respect to this amendment to The Retail Sales Tax Act are genuine, that the implications are serious for many, many businesses in the community of Flin Flon. I add parenthetically that the implications on this legislation go far beyond the community of Flin Flon, that my colleague, the MLA for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) has raised the concerns about this amendment.

This amendment will affect many communities, certainly those who have cross-border traffic, particularly the Saskatchewan border, but also those for whom status Indians are a significant portion of the business activity in a particular area.

Mr. Speaker, I promised my community, I promised the businesses in Flin Flon and those individuals to whom I spoke directly that I would raise this objection, that I wanted it on the record that the Conservatives, who continue to pretend that

they consult, they support small businesses, have failed and failed miserably at this opportunity.

I gave the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) an opportunity to delay the implementation of this Act for a year while we study its repercussions more directly with the businesses involved. The Government, the Conservatives in their wisdom have decided to ignore that advice and the advice of many in my area who represent business in my area.

Mr. Speaker, I want to put on the record as well that the implications of this Bill are going to ripple through Manitoba's economy in a very disastrous way for small businesses. The fact is that many communities, the communities of Arborg, Interlake communities, many of the communities in the Swan River-Dauphin area as well as northern communities are going to be negatively affected by this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, what is most disconcerting about the insistence of the Government that this piece of legislation pass, that this amendment pass, is the inability of the Government to tell us in a concrete way what the rationale for this amendment is in particular.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) has not been able to tell us, tell the House, tell myself, tell the businesses in Flin Flon, in any specific way what this amendment or lack of passing this amendment will cost the province. He tells us that the refusal provisions in The Retail Sales Tax Act are costing the province money, that we are seeing a dramatic increase in the number of refusals, but that amount of money seemingly cannot be quantified at this time. That is of major concern.

Mr. Speaker, I want it also on the record that neither I, nor the New Democratic Party, nor the businesses that I represent here today from Flin Flon and other communities are insensitive to lost revenue. If there is a loophole in The Retail Sales Tax Act that is being abused, we want it stopped, clearly, but we want it stopped in a way that recognizes the differences between communities, that recognizes that Flin Flon and the problems that we have as a border community are not the same as those of a Steinbach or a Morden in the centre of Manitoba far removed from the Saskatchewan border.

They are not the same, the problems in Flin Flon when it comes to dealing with communities as

remote as Pukatawagan or Sherridon, as the problems that face other communities that have no reserves in their immediate vicinity or do not receive a large portion of their businesses from status Indians, Indians who live on reserve, Mr. Speaker. There are some legitimate problems. I think they are understandable problems.

\* (1800)

I am disappointed that the Government has chosen not to listen to the business community, has chosen not to attempt to come to some resolution of this problem other than using what my colleague suggested the other day is a sledge hammer to kill a mosquito.

For the Member for Steinbach (Mr. Driedger), this is not good Government. It is not what Manitobans want from this Government, and quite ironically, Mr. Speaker, this Government is disappointing those who have tended to be their supporters and that is the business community, certainly in Flin Flon. The people who I am representing today include former Conservative candidates, so that tells me that there is a legitimate concern. I am disappointed that the Government has chosen not to deal with it in a more direct and rational way.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

**An Honourable Member:** On division.

**Mr. Speaker:** On division. Let the record show on division.

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), that Bill 20, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1990 (Loi de 1990 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives en matière de fiscalité), as amended and reported from the Committee of the Whole, be concurred in.

**Motion agreed to.**

### BILL 22—THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1990-91

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) that Bill 22, The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1990-91 (Loi de 1990-1991 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives), as reported from the Committee of the Whole, be concurred in.

**Motion agreed to.**

### THIRD READINGS

#### BILL 6—THE BUSINESS PRACTICES ACT

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, by leave (on behalf of the Minister of Co-operative, Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Connery), I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), that Bill 6, The Business Practices Act (Loi sur les pratiques commerciales), be now read a third time and passed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave for third reading of Bill 6? Agreed? Agreed.

**Motion agreed to.**

#### BILL 18—THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT (RE-ENACTED STATUTES) ACT

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), I move, seconded by the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), that Bill 18, The Statute Law Amendment (Re-Enacted Statutes) Act; (Loi de 1990 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives (lois réadoptées), be now read a third time and passed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave for third reading of Bill 18? Agreed? Agreed.

**Motion agreed to.**

#### BILL 20—THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT (TAXATION) ACT, 1990

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Culture, Heritage, and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson), that Bill 20, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1990 (Loi de 1990 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives en matière de fiscalité), be now read a third time and passed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave for third reading of Bill 20? Agreed? Agreed.

**Motion agreed to.**

**BILL 22—THE STATUTE LAW  
AMENDMENT ACT, 1990-91**

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways and Transportation (Mr. Driedger), that Bill 22, The Statute Law Amendment Act, 1990-91, (Loi de 1990-1991 modifiant diverses dispositions législatives), be now read a third time and passed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave for third reading of Bill 22? Agreed? It is agreed.

**Motion presented.**

**Mr. Paul Edwards (St. James):** Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to have this opportunity to speak to this Bill on third reading. I realize that it is generally a fairly regulatory matter that does not usually provoke much debate. However, I do think that it is important to put some comments on the record, because I do see some substantive changes in this Bill, at least one of which gives me some concern. It is specific to an area that the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae) has no small amount of experience in himself.

This Act further provides for the repeals of Subsections 2(2) and 7(2) of The Law Fees Act. Now that is specific to the issue of court reporting and receiving transcripts of court proceedings, which are very important, Mr. Speaker. These amendments mean that these will now be done by Government staff and not by court reporters in their personal capacity and that fees for transcripts may be required of any person requesting it.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister well knows there have been a lot of complaints about court reporting both from the court reporters and from the members of the profession who utilize their services in receiving court transcripts and, indeed, the members of the Criminal Prosecutions Branch. The concern of course of the reporters is with respect to their pay and how they were paid.

We are having a tough time, and I know the Minister appreciates this, in keeping court reporters in this province and recruiting them to this province. One of the main problems is that we do not have a training facility here. Manitobans who want to practise this profession have to go elsewhere, as the Minister did himself, and many find that there are greener pastures financially in other provinces. That

is a problem. I think that we must recognize that there is a market which means that court reporters can be paid more money in other provinces.

What I am concerned by the provision that Government staff and not court reporters will be privately providing the service is that there may be some decreasing in standards. I do not say that will automatically happen. I do say, however, that if it is an attempt to cut costs and dodge the issue of paying court reporters what they deserve, then I suspect that it is going to backfire.

I have already had complaints. That is one of the reasons I felt compelled to stand on third reading today and advise the Minister of this, that I have had complaints from members of the profession both inside Government service and in the private Bar. That was interesting to me that it was not just private practitioners who have mentioned this, but Government lawyers who will remain nameless, who have mentioned that they are having increased difficulty in getting timely transcripts and indeed accurate transcripts. Of course the whole point of a transcript, and a certified transcript, is its accuracy. It has to be accurate or the whole point is lost.

One person in particular mentioned to me that the transcripts no longer were being certified. There was not the certification stamp which of course is vital to relying on those transcripts in further proceedings. They must be certified by the court reporter who was present and who can verify what was said in proceedings.

\* (1810)

I hope by the Minister's amendments here that there is not an attempt to by-pass the issue of keeping qualified court reporters in this province and indeed recruiting more qualified court reporters to this province. We do have a shortage. It is a serious problem. It is not one that people are banging down the walls of the Legislature over. It is one that has a restricted effect on a certain sector of the population, but the overall effect, I think is one that could hinder the delivery of justice in the province. I have nothing specifically against bringing this into the fold of Government staff.

I do say to the Minister, the quality of court reporting in this province must be maintained at the highest levels or the whole system suffers. I simply ask him to ensure that we continue to work to establish a training facility in this province, hopefully at Red River Community College where I know it has

been proposed, and which I know his colleague of many years now, the chief court reporter for this province has been lobbying him to provide. I do not know of the discussions with Red River Community College, but I would certainly hope that could be established in the near future. It has been on the books for many, many years. Also, I call on him to ensure that we are providing timely and accurate court transcripts.

Speaking for myself and the members of the private Bar who order these on a regular basis, money is an issue. They are very expensive, but oftentimes the most important issue is not so much how much it costs, but can you get it quickly and can you get it in an accurate form. I do not say that people will pay anything for these. I am saying that cost is a factor, but in my view it is not the major factor.

The major factor is an accurate transcript in a timely fashion and oftentimes in specialized proceedings these are needed overnight. People are willing to pay for that, but they do want that service and it must be available. I simply leave those comments with respect to this Act on the record for the Minister at this third reading stage. I understand, of course, and I hope he understands that we are obviously seeing this Bill passed into law today.

The only other comment I would make about this Act is to note that I am pleased to see that there are amendments being made to The Elections Act which will put it in compliance with the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

There are also amendments being made to validate certain past loans made by the Communities Economic Development Fund that have been found to be outside the mandate of that fund and is contemplated by the Act. That was I think a very interesting decision, and I followed that case. I am glad that the Government has responded in a timely fashion recognizing that some errors had been made in the allocation of those funds.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Agreed and so ordered.

**Hon. James McCrae (Minister of Justice and Attorney General):** I was sort of hoping to have just

a word before debate was shut down on this particular Bill.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave of the House to allow the Honourable Minister of Justice to close debate on Bill 22? Is there leave? Leave is granted.

**Mr. McCrae:** I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank my honourable colleagues.

The concerns respecting the change in this Bill to The Law Fees Act are noted. His concerns are the same as mine, accurate and timely transcripts and service to the public. We are taking every step possible to ensure that any complaints—we have had a small number of complaints, but we have had complaints too—our object is to ensure that those complaints are dealt with adequately, that service to the public is not unduly interrupted by the changes going on with respect to the delivery of timely and accurate transcripts to members of the public, which includes also members of the legal profession.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

**Some Honourable Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Agreed and so ordered.

### Committee Change

**Mr. Speaker:** The Honourable Member for Point Douglas, with committee changes.

**Mr. George Hicke (Point Douglas):** May I have leave to make a committee change?

I move, seconded by the Member for Transcona (Mr. Reid), that the composition of the Standing Committee on Industrial Relations be amended as follows: The Member for Swan River (Ms. Wowchuk) for the Member for Wolseley (Ms. Friesen).

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

\*\*\*

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Justice (Mr. McCrae), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

**Motion agreed to,** and the House resolved itself into a Committee to consider of Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty with the Honourable Member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) in the Chair.



## SUPPLY—MAIN SUPPLY COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

**Madam Chairman (Louise Dacquay):** Order, please. The Committee of Ways and Means will come to order, please. The resolution before the committee is as follows:

RESOLVED that towards making good certain sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the Public Service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1990, the sum of \$4,658,585,800, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

Is it the will of the committee to adopt the resolution? Agreed? Agreed and so ordered.

Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

## IN SESSION COMMITTEE REPORT

**Mr. Marcel Laurendeau (Deputy Chairman of Committees):** The Committee of Ways and Means has adopted certain resolutions, requests me to report same and asks leave to sit again.

\* (1820)

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia (Mrs. McIntosh), that the report of the committee be received.

**Motion agreed to.**

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS BILL 27—THE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1990

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld), that leave be given to introduce Bill 27, The Appropriation Act, 1990 (Loi de 1990 portant affectation de crédits), and that the same be now received, read a first time and be ordered for second reading immediately.

**Motion agreed to.**

## SECOND READINGS BILL 27—THE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1990

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Education and Training (Mr. Derkach), that Bill 27, The Appropriation Act, 1990 (Loi de 1990 portant

affectation de crédits), be now read a second time and referred to a committee of this House.

**Mr. Speaker:** It has been moved by the Honourable Minister of Finance, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education and Training, that Bill 27, The Appropriation Act, 1990; Loi de 1990 portant affectation de crédits, be now read a second time and referred to a committee of this House—by leave. Is there leave?

**Some Honourable Members:** Leave.

**Mr. Speaker:** Leave. Agreed.

**Motion agreed to.**

\*\*\*

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Downey), that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report of Bill 27, The Appropriation Act, 1990 (Loi de 1990 portant affectation de crédits); and Bill 26, The Loan Act, 1990 (Loi d'emprunt de 1990), for third reading.

**Motion agreed to,** and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider and report of Bill 27, The Appropriation Act, 1990 (Loi de 1990 portant affectation de crédits); and Bill 26, The Loan Act, 1990 (Loi d'emprunt de 1990), for third reading with the Honourable Member for Seine River (Mrs. Dacquay) in the Chair.

## COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE BILL 26—THE LOAN ACT, 1990

**Madam Chairman (Louise Dacquay):** Order, please. The Committee of the Whole will come to order to consider Bill 26, The Loan Act, 1990.

Does the Honourable Minister of Finance have an opening statement?

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** No, Madam Chairman.

**Madam Chairman:** We shall proceed to consider Bill 26 clause by clause. Shall Clause 1 be passed?

**Mr. Leonard Evans (Brandon East):** As I understand it, we are discussing The Loan Act and I would think it is appropriate to discuss the various topics at the beginning rather than going into section by section. So I just, while I am on my feet, advise Members of the House of my understanding and that is this is the opportunity for individual Members

to ask about Hydro spending, or capital borrowing, or for Agriculture, or for others.

**Mr. Jerry Storie (Flin Flon):** Madam Chair, I was intending to wait until we got to the schedules, but if we are going to discuss the general provisions of The Loan Act simultaneously, then I will direct my questions to the Minister of Energy and Mines (Mr. Neufeld).

The Government of Manitoba has set aside some \$6 million for the HBM&S modernization project. I am wondering whether the Minister can indicate first, when we can anticipate a formal announcement of the signing of an agreement between the province, the federal Government and HBM&S, and whether we can expect that before the new year?

**Hon. Harold Neufeld (Minister of Energy and Mines):** Madam Chairman, the probabilities of an announcement before the end of this year are slight. The Government has decided that, in the event that an agreement has been reached, there could be as much as \$6 million spent by the end of March of 1991, but no agreement has at this point been reached and I cannot say whether or not that agreement will be signed by March 31, 1991, at this point.

**Mr. Storie:** Madam Chair, this item then in The Loan Act Bill raises a number of questions. The Minister, in fact the first Minister (Mr. Filmon) in response to a question that I asked some months ago, indicated that the Province of Manitoba had its money on the table as did the federal Government, and in fact that the only impediment to the signing of an agreement was as a result of problems with HBM&S securing a loan for their portion of the agreement.

Is that in fact the case? Has the province stated its intention to HBM&S to provide the \$55 million in one form or another to HBM&S as the Minister has indicated on a number of occasions?

**Mr. Neufeld:** Madam Chairman, we have always indicated that we were prepared, providing all conditions can be met, to have our money on the table, but we have to recognize that in any agreement there may be some risks, indeed there will be some risks, and when the amounts involved are as high as this one of \$55 million, those risks are magnified.

We have to make certain that we minimize those risks and especially in areas where we believe we can foresee difficulties in the future, we must make

certain that those are covered. As we come to a conclusion, as we reach agreement on all the areas that have been and are still in doubt, we will have agreement and we will then make the announcement, but I cannot say today that announcement will be forthcoming by any particular time.

**Mr. Storie:** It is more than a little strange that the Government is indicating it is beginning the process of borrowing money, or making money available through The Loan Act, that may be required in this fiscal year. It is certainly unusual to say the least.

\* (1830)

Madam Chair, the fact of the matter is that this set of negotiations has dragged on far too long. I have expressed my concern on many occasions about the nature and the rate of this negotiation. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) says send money. The fact of the matter is that this negotiation is a good investment. This loan, this amount of money the Minister indicated the province may be making available, is a good investment. In fact, the return is probably as quick -(interjection)- well, the Minister of Agriculture is talking about security. The Minister of Agriculture is involved in sets of negotiations with respect to subsidies and support for agricultural communities for which there is absolutely no security.

**Hon. Glen Findlay (Minister of Agriculture):** Food security.

**Mr. Storie:** The Minister wants to argue food security; 10 percent of our production is for domestic food production, 10 percent. The fact of the matter is that this is one of the most secure things the province could do. HBM&S is not a fly-by-night operation. It is well managed. It is a sound organization and it is tragic, tragic that this Government has chosen to delay this project for more than two years.

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

**Mr. Storie:** You know the Members on the opposite side sort of say, come on. I would invite them to come up to Flin Flon, put on their work clothes and work side by side the workers in the smelter who are working in conditions that no one should have to tolerate, working in conditions that could be improved substantially 80 to 90 percent by the modernization effort that HBM&S wants to undertake.

Madam Chair, I want to put on the record as well that HBM&S is not asking for anything other than other mining companies have received from federal and provincial Governments in the past. The Government has indicated on a number of occasions that they are prepared to ante up, to provide this investment on behalf of the people of Manitoba. Instead of coming to a quick conclusion to the agreement, they have made the people of Flin Flon suffer through levels of pollution they should not have to suffer through, levels of pollution that have been a health risk and pose a health risk to seniors and people who are working in the plant on a day-by-day basis. It is unacceptable.

If the Government truly has the intention of signing an agreement, then for heaven's sake let us have an agreement. Let us not have any more game playing. It is not fair to HBM&S, it is not fair to the steel workers, it is not fair to the town of Flin Flon, and it is not fair to the residents who have to live there. Two years this has dragged on.

Madam Chair, the Government has had ample opportunity to do its due diligence, satisfy itself that the security that needs to be in place is in place, and it should be there. It is totally unfair for the province to be delaying at this point.

The Government is apparently putting aside some \$6 million in anticipation of an agreement. That means that this money would be spent, normally flowed out of The Loan Act into whatever structure this agreement takes, before March 31, 1990—'91, pardon me, 1991, the next three months of the fiscal year. I can only implore the Government to sign the agreement, let HBM&S get on with the business, satisfy the need for security of the 1,500 people working in Flin Flon and the 8,000 people in that community. Please, for goodness sake, for common sense, get this agreement out of the way.

**Mr. Neufeld:** There were a number of questions and statements, Madam Chairman, but I will deal with the \$6 million that has been put aside first. Surely in the event that we come to an agreement by March 31, or sometime before that, some monies will be required and the money has been put aside under The Loan Act to meet that need should it arise.

As far as security, and as far as a good commercial agreement is concerned, with respect to the monies that are to be advanced to Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, it is not a commercial

deal, let me make that absolutely clear, it is not a commercial deal, it is a social deal.

We have to though eliminate as many of the uncertainties that we can foresee, as we possibly can, and that is what this Government is doing. We owe it to the people of Manitoba, the taxpayers of Manitoba who will be putting up the money, to make certain that any uncertainties that we can foresee are eliminated, and that the risks associated with those uncertainties are eliminated, and that is what we are attempting to do.

There are three parties to this agreement. There is the federal Government and there is Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting, and there is the Manitoba Government. The Manitoba Government is putting up a substantial amount of money for the number of residents we have in this province, for the number of taxpayers we have in this province, and we have to ensure that they are protected to the best of our ability.

Madam Chairman, the Manitoba Government has indicated time and time again it is ready to put its money on the table, but there are conditions that we expect shall be met and we cannot in good conscience enter into an agreement when we foresee difficulties that put that money at risk. Those difficulties and those risks must be eliminated, and shall be eliminated, and we will in the end sign this agreement, but not until such a time as those conditions are met. Madam Chairman, I share the frustration, and I know that Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting shares the frustration that the Member for Flin Flon (Mr. Storie) has indicated that he has.

**Mr. Storie:** Madam Chair, the frustration that I feel is a frustration that the people who work there everyday, the families of the people who work there everyday, share as well. This is not the corporate frustration, this is an individual frustration. The fact is the lives of thousands of people directly, and thousands more indirectly, are affected by this decision.

The Minister responsible for negotiations seems to want to have 100 percent security. The Minister seems to think that he is a bank. The fact of the matter is that there are always negotiations, there are always deals to which there is no absolute certainty. The difficulty with this set of negotiations is while the Minister sits in his chair and negotiates, he does not have to deal with the very real workplace, health and safety issues that the people

who work there on a daily basis have to face. While we delay, the health effects of the fugitive emissions from the plant, the acid rain from the smelter and the smokestack continue to create health problems for individuals and for our environment.

The Minister has said in the final analysis we will have a deal, if I heard him correctly. He has said, on other occasions to myself and to others, that the Government is not going to stand by and see this project fail. I ask the Minister to expedite whatever remaining issues there are, to make sure that this deal gets in place. The Minister knows, better than anyone else, that HBM&S is working toward a very serious deadline. They have said that this project is going to take 30 months to complete.

As of 1994, HBM&S is going to have to meet new stringent SO<sub>2</sub> emission guidelines. They are going to have to reduce their emissions by at least 25 percent. The only feasible way for them to do that is to have the modernization in place. What that means is that as of June 1, the Government of Manitoba and HBM&S and the federal Government have to have this project under way. Every day we delay, we not only jeopardize that timetable, but in fact we leave the people of Flin Flon facing another summer, when this problem is at its worst, of discomfort and possible effects of toxins that the plant naturally emits. We have to resolve this, and I beseech the Minister to do what is necessary over the next couple of weeks to get this agreement signed.

**Mr. Neufeld:** In no way do I minimize the difficulties faced by the residents of Flin Flon. I understand the difficulties they are facing. I have been in Flin Flon, I have been in the plant, and I understand. We have placed certain conditions before the company, none of those conditions are punitive, none of those conditions will affect the day to day operations of that company. We must, as I said earlier, in all conscience insist that they be met. We will insist that they be met, and the company will in the end meet our conditions. In the end, when they have met those conditions, we will sign that agreement.

\* (1840)

As we sit here today, I believe they have an agreement with the bank, the details of which we have not yet seen, we were supposed to see them. They have a verbal agreement with the federal Government, but to my understanding that has not been finalized. It is not we and we alone who are

holding up this agreement. Having said that, we are urging the company to meet the conditions that we have placed before them. We are urging the company to finalize its negotiations with the federal Government and indeed with their own bankers.

As I said earlier, I understand the difficulties that the residents of Flin Flon are going through. In no way do I minimize that, as I have indicated, but at the end of the day, when that agreement is signed, when our money is turned over, we must be satisfied that all the conditions and all the risks that we foresee are covered to the best of our ability at least.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Madam Chairperson, I wanted to ask a couple of general questions of the Minister of Energy (Mr. Neufeld) with regard to the amounts shown on Schedule A. I understand as we will be discussing the details of the various requests and then perhaps pass the Bill in its entirety a little later. It shows a number of \$278,700,000 being requested as Incremental Authority, and I note that is substantially up from last year. The Loan Act last year only required \$138,400,000.00. I wonder if the Minister could explain why this is an increase that is being shown here, as I said, from 138 up to 278.7, considering the fact that there is also information on expenditure in the Schedule B, Expenditure Authority as of April 1, 1990 not yet expended or abated, which shows accumulation there of almost \$700 million. So I am just wondering if there is some explanation for this?

**Mr. Neufeld:** My recollection, Madam Chairman, is that the amount remaining from last year's appropriation was \$20 million and there was an amount of some \$108 million that might be generated out of current operations for the year. The total amount that is requested is, I think, \$278 million; that is correct. The total amount that Manitoba Hydro has indicated they may wish to spend is some \$406 million, if I add the 128 plus the 278. Those are the monies they request. The increase, I would have to go back to last year and see what they spent their money on last year, what they requested the spending of monies on last year. Indeed, we would have to see what monies they were carrying forward from the previous year and how much they spent in total last year. I have upstairs in my office—unfortunately, I did not bring it down with me—details of what the requests are for this year. They amount to some \$258 million in specific projects that they have detailed for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). None of those

projects include Conawapa. Then they have asked for what they term as bridge financing of \$150 million; and, when asked to give us details of that, they have a number of projects that they may wish to proceed with in the next fiscal period. They may not; however, if they do, they want to have the monies available.

Having said that they must, of course, come for permission before that money will flow. While they ask for money to be set aside, and the Minister of Finance sets that money aside under The Loan Act, they cannot spend at will. They must first come for permission to spend that money.

**Mr. Manness:** Madam Chairman, the Minister is correct. I will just give a little more clarity. The Capital Program for Manitoba Hydro—this is not Limestone now, this is just Hydro side of Limestone—this year is seeking a Capital Program of \$256.9 million. They are expecting to internally generate funds of \$108.2 million. They have a carry-over of capital from the year previous of \$20 million.

Their cash requirements in this Loan Act, their cash requirements are \$128.7 million. They are also seeking authority for \$150 million of bridge financing, given that The Loan Act has a long experience of not being passed at the beginning of the next fiscal year, but at times far into the next fiscal year, so adding the \$128 million and the \$150 million generates the \$278 million figure.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** I thank the Minister of Finance for that explanation. I appreciate then that what we have here are monies for a rather miscellaneous group of projects, nothing to do with Conawapa, no major project of any—it is a lot of money, but by Hydro standards, it is not. None of these are for major or really outstanding projects.

I wanted to ask the Minister whether any monies were provided for any modernization or adjustment of the thermal plant capacity in this province. As I understand it, we have not only a plant in Brandon, but also one in Selkirk which provides supplementary power at peak periods when the peak demand period occurs, particularly in the winter time. Are there any monies for any modernization or modification of the thermal capacity?

**Mr. Neufeld:** Madam Chairman, I have to speak from memory, but I believe there was some small amount. If the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans) would leave me two minutes, I will

get details from my desk that I have on the—I have details also on the others.

As far as this year's money is concerned—but I have it in better form—(interjection)—I have detailed numbers, yes. If you will leave me two minutes I will have that information down here for you.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Madam Chairperson, while the Minister of Energy is taking leave to get some additional information, I had a couple of questions on some other areas although those Ministers are not here. Maybe the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) can assist.

I am looking at the line for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. I notice in this case it is just the opposite. Instead of an increase, we have a rather significant decrease in the amount being requested. In The Loan Act last year, \$85.2 million was requested. This year it is down to \$20 million. Is there some explanation here? Is there some scaling back or is it because there are considerable monies not yet expended?

\* (1850)

Again, I refer to Schedule B. I note as of April 1, at least of 1990, the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation had an amount of roughly \$110.8 million not yet expended or abated, so maybe there is some tie-in or some explanation there. Basically, is there a diminution now of the construction program of this corporation?

**Mr. Manness:** Madam Chairman, the Capital Program in '90-91, the present fiscal year, is forecasted to be \$89.4 million. That is how much is estimated to be spent. The source of funding is made up of \$4.4 million on hand—pardon me, that was internally generated funds or cash on hand—leaving a cash requirement for '90-91 of \$85 million.

The corporation is also seeking another \$85 million for future commitments, leaving a total authority required of \$170.8 million, but then the carry-over brought over from last year in Schedule B—and the Member was talking, I think, about this—a number of \$110.8 million was carried over, leaving therefore a requirement in this Act of \$60 million. A combination of the \$60 million plus the \$110 million carried over leaves the authority required for 1990-91 and that is \$170.8 million.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Just a technical matter, I am a little unclear as to the matter of authority not yet expended or abated and being carried over. The

Minister made some to-do, I believe—last year was it, or was it the year before—about not carrying over. We are going to provide the monies. The Legislature will provide money for capital requirements, but we will not be carrying over, and I believe the last year eliminated quite a number of items, quite an amount of monies.

(Mr. Marcel Laurendeau, Deputy Chairman, in the Chair)

Why is it then that we have all this before us in Schedule B, all this—I think it is almost \$1.2 billion of unexpended or abated monies? There is an explanation for some of this, but I am surprised. I thought the Minister was determined to minimize this type of carry-over.

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am, but if the Member looks at the list at the \$1.2 billion in Schedule B, he will notice \$700 million of it relates to the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board - Limestone. In the case of a major project like that, we will not wipe that authority off the books until the books are closed and where we have a situation where Limestone is coming in at a capital cost much below the authority that was provided in the first instance by the former Government.

However, once the books are closed for Limestone which will probably be yet another, I am told by my officials, another year, year and a half, about a year and a half, at that time, if the \$600 million or \$700 million—it will be a lower number because I think there is still being a draw on that—but whatever is left will be, indeed, wiped off by way of Schedule B.

I think we have sort of set a rule of thumb for ourselves that if the commitment of funds is toward a large project, we will wait for the books to close, whether that takes a year or two years, and then remove the authority if it is no longer needed. In program areas we will carry over one year but if it is not used in the year after then we will wipe it away and, if it is needed, the Government of the Day will have to come into the Legislature and ask for the support.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Just to follow up on that briefly—I see the Minister of Energy (Mr. Neufeld) has his information—but just to follow up on this one then by way of clarification, program expenditures, if not disposed of in a particular area, you give them another year to deal with them. I would presume then, just to pick an example just at random here,

the Tourism Agreement, \$6.85 million, if nothing happens, if those monies are not expended—and I do not know how long this money has been around, so it is hard for me to generalize or come to the conclusion—within a given period of time, that money or part of it will disappear.

**Mr. Manness:** Yes, this is a perfect example. Here is a case where authority has been put into place. The Tourism Agreement has hit its conclusion, or about to and, as you know, by these agreements there is an additional year sometimes allowed for the cash to flow, but after that period of time, once the books are closed it is between Ottawa and ourselves on this agreement. If there is \$3 million or \$4 million that has not been spent then yes, it will lapse. It will lapse, but only after the books are closed as per the covenants of the agreement.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Fine. Well, we will follow the progress of this. We should be comparing these items year to year to see whether there has been much—or maybe the Minister can tell us—has there been much authority wiped out because of this new policy?

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Member for Brandon East has me stumped. I know last year we removed a significant portion, about \$800 million this year. This year we are removing \$800 million, and it is probably somewhere in here. I have not found it out, but roughly \$800 million of loan authority has been removed.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Another sort of a clarification question, and maybe I should know the answer, but I wonder if the Minister could elaborate or explain. Earlier today the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard) finally tabled his MHSC Capital Program. There is some reference to monies previously being spent and some reference to capital monies currently being spent on health care construction projects. It is very difficult to try to compare that indeed with information in the budget or indeed these schedules or with Schedule B but, nevertheless, there is no reference in Schedule A to capital authority being required for the Manitoba Health Services Commission. Yet in Schedule B there is reference to Manitoba Hospital Capital Finance Authority, \$80 million, so I am a bit confused.

\* (1900)

I know at some point health care capital is supposed to be separate from other capital

requirements, but yet you have it referred to in Schedule B although not in Schedule A.

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, this is required to provide funding authority as necessary for financing health care facility programs in smaller rural centres where the hospital districts are unable to arrange suitable long-term financing. The specific projects for financing are approved by the Manitoba Health Services Commission as part of the annual review of the five-year Capital Program. The previously voted authority relates to the 1972, and there is a two in brackets. I take it that was the second Loan Act.

The second Loan Act of 1972, \$23.5 million, The 1974 Loan Act providing authority of \$18 million, and The 1987 Loan Act providing \$38.5 million. This was what was left by way of authority from '70 to '74 in '87, totalling \$80.1 million, and they now are put forward on Schedule B. Are they removed now? Are they lapsing? No, but if they are not spent this year they will lapse—they will not lapse at all? That is the source of the authority, and I will find out how it is they will be treated next year once I find the proper place in my manual.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Again, perhaps I should know the answer, but could the Minister explain why is it then that we do not have requests, for incremental capital authority for the Manitoba Health Services Commission in this document? I gather there is \$80 million from years gone by for whatever reason, but regardless there is no reference to health. There is probably a technical explanation. This is really what I am asking the Minister.

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, again I said this is for small rural centres where the hospital districts are unable to arrange suitable long-term financing. Now there are sources of financing in other places. I mean whether other institutions of Government and/or—but there is a source of funding available outside of this. We do not have to come in by way of loaning.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** I gather the capital required for this is available from sources other than that which we are now considering?

**An Honourable Member:** Right.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** I see. It is possible that there may be some federal money involved in it and so on, but I will not belabour the point. Maybe the Minister does not have all the information anyway, but it is interesting that this is one of our major capital

areas, hospital construction, nursing home instruction, and so on, yet we do not discuss it when we are dealing with this particular legislation.

**Mr. Manness:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have to correct a terrible error I have made. I finally found my right page, Section F-3. The Member asked me for how much there was lapsing this year in Loan Authority. I said \$800 million. I hope the Member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr) did not hear this or it will give him a whole opportunity to go on Provincial Affairs and say I have erred again. It is not \$800 million, it is \$8 million, and composed of two figures, \$2.9 million of the Energy Conservation Loan Fund and that was surplus authority resulting from the decision to terminate the CHEC Loan Program on June 1, 1990, and secondly, Manitoba Data Services, \$5.5 million of unused authority. Of course, the Member would know why that was no longer needed. The number is \$8.4 million, not \$800 million.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** That is a considerable correction, like \$792 million in correction.

I do not want to belabour the point, but the Minister gave me an answer which was a little bit on the vague side. Specifically, where does Manitoba Health Services Commission obtain its capital money from? I could guess that some of it could be from borrowing through federal legislation, through federal programs -(interjection)- yes. There may be other sources.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** No further questions?

**An Honourable Member:** No questions.

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** No questions.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** Did I understand the Minister say he will get that information for us? -(interjection)-

Maybe in the meantime the Minister of Energy (Mr. Neufeld) can give us that detail he promised he might obtain for us on the various kinds of projects.

**Mr. Neufeld:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, as I indicated before I went for this information, I must apologize for not having had it here, but I was out of the building at another meeting and I came directly into this Chamber.

I indicated that there were some \$406.9 million that had been budgeted by Manitoba Hydro into this year's Capital Program. Of that amount \$128.2 million will be generated from within, and \$20 million is held over from the 1990 Loan Authority. So that

leaves us with \$278.7 million to raise, and that is a figure that is in The Loan Authority Act.

Now, I will deal with the \$406 million as being the total amount for cap, for the 1990-91 Capital Program. They break it down in specific issues, specific areas, specific projects, in the amount of \$256 million, and I will give you the major items in as great a detail as they give them to us. That is, for domestic items, which is \$95 million; for the Limestone system, and that is a system as a whole and not the generating station, is \$38 million; Bipole I, the arc valves, is \$31 million; building construction is \$20 million; mitigation payments is \$20 million. That is the \$20 million that was paid, I believe that is the one that was paid to Grand Lac, Easterville and -(interjection)- yes, that is \$20 million, and I am just rounding off all the numbers.

They have got \$20 million in here for Winnipeg regulation and Churchill River diversion projects, which may or may not go ahead. Upgrading of generating stations is \$11 million, and they have got an item in here that they put in every year, head office expansion of \$20 million. That totals \$256.9 million.

All of these, as I indicated earlier, Mr. Deputy Chairman, would have to be approved before they went ahead. They want to make certain, I suppose, when they request of the Minister of Finance loan authority they have not missed anything. I must say that if they have missed something, they will get that in the next item which they call authority required for future commitments or bridge financing, \$150 million, one number. Now, I have no specific projects for this and dollar amounts.

I have projects that they may wish to go ahead with, and I can detail those for you. There is a diesel upgrading. There is the southern system improvements. There is a line and central system upgrading, transmission lines, hydraulic rehabilitation, thermal life insurance, fire protection equipment and housing in Gillam. Those are very, very broad projects, and I guess they are not even projects at this point. They are monies that they think they may need, and they request it. I have to add again that this is not a request for spending. This is a request to make sure that monies are available in the event if they wish to have capital projects proceed. So I hope that clarifies it for the Member.

**Ms. Rosann Wowchuk (Swan River):** Seeing that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay) is in the House, I would like to ask him a question.

Last week, Mr. Deputy Chairman, we had an announcement from the Minister of Agriculture that farmers in 17 municipalities would be receiving payments as a result of the appeals in the 19 -(interjection)- pardon me. I am sorry, am I asking a question in the wrong department?

**Mr. Deputy Chairman:** No, no.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Okay, if I could start again, please.

The announcement was made that farmers in 17 municipalities would be receiving assistance as a result of the appeals for the 1989 Crop Loss Compensation Program. Since that announcement has been made, I have been receiving numerous phone calls from people in my constituency who are dissatisfied with the results.

(Madam Chairman in the Chair)

The reason they are dissatisfied is because there are some areas that have experienced similar conditions but have not received compensation. For example, right in the Swan River Valley the R.M. of Swan River is receiving a payment. The R.M. of Minitonas is not receiving a payment. Now both those areas are identical. The Swan River Valley cannot be divided up. Both areas have the same weather conditions and suffered as much. Farther down, you have the R.M. of Ethelbert getting compensation but the LGD of Mountain and the Mossy River municipality did not get any compensation.

\* (1910)

The other concern is that these people feel that the weather conditions in the fall were not taken into consideration. They ended up harvesting in very poor conditions and ended up taking off No. 3 wheat which has very little value, where down south they were taking off No. 1 wheat and probably ending up with the same dollar value. The people who have contacted me are also concerned because they were under the impression they would be able to present their cases to the Appeal Board. Had they been able to do that, they might have shed a different light on it.

I would like to ask the Minister what steps is he prepared to take to redress this unfair situation in which farmers who are experiencing the same devastations from drought and other difficult



weather conditions are not being compensated equally?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chairperson, I guess I find it unfortunate the Member takes the position that there has not been fair treatment of her constituents through the course of the Crop Loss Compensation Program which was set up to target assistance to those areas of the province that really did lose crops in 1989 for conditions beyond their control.

When the program was designed, the information available in crop insurance was used to establish those R.M.s that had less than 90 percent production in terms of the 1989 production versus the 15-year average. They received the highest level of support. The next level of support between 90 percent and 95 percent was the second payment, and the third payment between 96 percent and 99 percent of the long-term average.

In her area of the province, as I recall the figures, the R.M. of Swan River was around 101 and Minitonas about 116, something to that effect. We set up the appeal tribunal which we felt was a good way for the kind of information she is putting on the record today to be addressed by the peers of the farm community. So we appointed six farmers to that Appeal Board, one of whom came from her area. We purposely did that so the area was represented on the appeal tribunal.

**An Honourable Member:** Who was it?

**Mr. Findlay:** Bill Hart, a councillor -(interjection)-pardon?

**An Honourable Member:** Billy Hart.

**Mr. Findlay:** Billy Hart, yes.

They were given the mandate to assess all information that anybody wanted to present to the Appeal Committee. As I recall—again I am trying to go by memory here—there were roughly 40 or 45 R.M.s that made application, and their information was received by the Appeal Committee. They sent out a particular form that asked them all to use that form so there was consistency of type of appeal, and they assessed every bit of information, from whatever angle the farmer wanted to present it, or the R.M. wanted to present it, and they addressed the situation.

She is talking about a wet fall and lower grades, and they used that. They used an element in the calculation with regard to lower yields to help assess those communities she is talking about.

To say that the residents in her constituency were not fairly treated is clearly an unfortunate statement, because they really were. The Appeal Committee Report that I received, I agreed with it 100 percent. They had done all their homework. They looked at it from every which way they could, and they—including the Member from up there, who knew he would have trouble back home trying to explain to people why there was not more money coming here.

In the truth, and in the comparative analysis of the people up there versus all the people down here and the people in south-eastern Manitoba, they did not justifiably deserve a payment unfortunately.

I know the attitude often is that there is money going around from Government, everyone wants a piece of it. In true fact of fairness I believe the program was done right and responsibly.

I will tell the Member that in the future, programs that will be put in place by the federal Government and the provincial Governments across this country will be targeted programs, targeted to hurt.

I know, and she will probably shake her head, no, in a minute, but the residents in her area in the fall of '89 had water, feed for the cattle and grain in the bins, they did. People in south-west Manitoba had no water, they had no feed and they had very little grain in the bins, so they were really hurt. They were hurt in years prior, too.

The amount of money we were able to put into that area in this program is nowhere near sufficient to offset the hurt. Your area unduly did receive some rainfall that caused some crop damage in the fall, but yet there was a volume taken off.

I remind the Member that the percentage grade distribution over the years—we went back. When we initially looked at this program, we went back over 10 years and looked at the Wheat Board records for grades in the Swan River Valley.

The average for No. 1 wheat over a 10-year period is 14 percent. In 1988 you had a very good harvest, and 47 percent of the wheat was No. 1. That was 47 percent, a one year versus a 10 year average of 14 percent.

In 1989 when you say the grades were low, 10 percent of the wheat was No. 1, so it was barely below the long-term average. Compared to the year before, 1988, it was way down, so if you look at a small snapshot, you say it is terrible, but you look at the average for the area, because of the kind of

weather patterns that are up there, higher yield, lower grade is traditional up there.

I will have to tell the Member that everything I have seen, the way we run the program, putting the peers in place in the Appeal Committee was the most responsible way to put the money out in rural Manitoba to address the hurt where hurt really occurred.

I will have to remind the Member that every farmer in Manitoba had access to the Manitoba Interest Rate Assistance Program, which made available roughly \$2 an acre to every farmer in the Province of Manitoba who decided to take that money.

There were two programs in place, Crop Loss Compensation, which was targeted, and the Manitoba Interest Rate Assistance Program, which was spread out for all farmers across Manitoba. Those members in her constituency did receive that program equal to everybody else across the province.

**Mr. James Carr (Crescentwood):** Madam Chair, I would like to ask the Minister of Energy and Mines some questions about the borrowing for Manitoba Hydro -(interjection)- go ahead.

**An Honourable Member:** No, that is fine.

**Mr. Carr:** All right -(interjection)- the Minister now knows the present given to him by the press gallery.

Madam Chair, some weeks back we tabled a document in the House that showed the five-year capital plan of Manitoba Hydro. That plan showed that \$132.9 million was to be spent on the Conawapa project by March of 1991.

I would like to know if the Government's borrowing authority for Manitoba Hydro had included that \$132.9 million to satisfy Hydro's need for that money for Conawapa for 1991. If not, just exactly what is the relationship between the Minister and Hydro as it prepares its borrowing requirements for the year, just to clear up the confusion over the \$132.9 million?

**Mr. Neufeld:** I am sorry I have missed the party, but I will make certain, Madam Chairman, that on my way from here I will stop off at the party room and pick up my gift. The multicultural tree ornament is beautiful.

Now, to the question posed by the Member for Crescentwood. When Manitoba Hydro requests money through The Loan Act each and every year, they send out a wish list and ask for monies for

projects that they may proceed with, and projects that they think they may proceed with, and projects that they know they will proceed with. As far as the \$406,900,000 that they have included in this year's program, it includes \$150 million which is not specifically earmarked.

As far as the \$132 million that the Member indicated might be spent on Conawapa, some of that money had been spent. This was the monies that they might spend up to and including March 31, 1991. Included in last year's Loan Act was \$25 million that has not yet been spent for Conawapa. There is no money specifically earmarked for Conawapa in the amounts requested in this year's Loan Act.

**Mr. Carr:** I would like to ask the Minister what is included within The Loan Act for the expenditure of—what is it—\$30 million or \$35 million on the transmission line and road construction into the Conawapa site, or is that the \$25 million which is unspent from last year?

The Minister will remember from debate at committee, we had some difficulty in determining exactly what Manitoba Hydro intended to spend by March of 1991, and even more confusion by March of 1992. That aside, we are interested in knowing if the expenditures expected for the road and transmission facility are part of the \$25 million left over for last year or included in this Loan Act.

**Mr. Neufeld:** We have two issues. We have the monies that Hydro wishes to have put aside for itself for capital expenditures and monies which they are indeed spending on capital items. The \$132 million that Manitoba Hydro had planned to spend to the end of 1991 included the \$25 million that was in last year's Loan Act and possibly some monies that they expect to generate from within, which I mentioned to the Member for Brandon East (Mr. Leonard Evans). The Member for Crescentwood may not have been here, but there is some \$108 million that they expect to generate from within, so they do not have to receive loan authority for those monies, but have the ability to spend it on capital projects.

The money that we are requesting, or Manitoba Hydro is requesting under the Loan Authority is money that they think they may be spending on capital projects, but it does not include all the capital projects it may be spending money on.

**Mr. Carr:** I think that is okay. Would the Government of Manitoba, through the Minister, approve of any

borrowing for the Conawapa project in advance of all the necessary environmental approvals being in place?

**Mr. Neufeld:** The question, Madam Chairman, is whether we will permit Manitoba Hydro to spend any money. Once the money has been spent, money must be paid. If the money is going to be paid, it may have to be borrowed, if it is not generated from within. Certain work has to be done before the project can proceed and, indeed, before perhaps the environmental process has been completed and before the environmental licences that are required have been issued.

\* (1920)

I would say to the question from the Member for Crescentwood (Mr. Carr), as and when the monies are spent monies will be found for this payment, and it may indeed be before an environmental licence has been granted.

**Mr. Carr:** Clear enough, Madam Chair. I would like to ask the Minister about the \$20 million in mitigation, which is included in this Loan Act authority. The Minister, I think, told us in his statement that this was for Grand Rapids and Easterville. How about the Northern Flood Committee arrangements? I know that there is something over \$100 million that has been spent and more yet to be committed. Is that money, in addition, borrowed on behalf of Manitoba Hydro by the Government of Manitoba?

My understanding is that this is a three-way split, that this contingent liability is not only Manitoba Hydro's, but it is shared equally between the Governments of Canada, Manitoba, and Manitoba Hydro, so I do not understand the \$20 million in mitigation. Is that part of a three-way formula? Is that provincial money? Is that Manitoba Hydro commitment? Could the Minister clear that up for us?

**Mr. Neufeld:** The money that may have to be paid out under the Northern Flood Agreement, as and when the agreement is reached, is not included specifically in this request from Manitoba Hydro under The Loan Act. When that agreement is reached and the amounts are known, the split will have to be decided. That split has not been definitely decided between Manitoba Hydro, the Manitoba Government and the federal Government. There is not yet agreement as to the split.

We thought at one point that we had an agreement with respect to the total amounts that would be paid in one form or another. We thought that we would enter into an agreement with the bands and the communities without regard to the source of the monies. However, that agreement has not been reached, and the payment by Manitoba Hydro at this point has not been provided for. It will be as and when it is required to be paid, but whether or not that will happen in 1991 we are not sure.

**Mr. Carr:** I am sorry, Madam Chairman, I would like to try to clarify the answer. There has already been a settlement with certain bands in Easterville, Grand Rapids and others. That announcement has already been made by the Government. Is that the \$20 million that the Minister refers to in this Loan Act? It is. The Deputy Premier (Mr. Downey) shakes his head no, and the Minister of Energy (Mr. Neufeld) says yes. Why is it then that the Minister says that as and when these agreements are reached, when we know that the agreements have already been reached with these bands, and the figure is \$21 million? So why is the Minister having difficulty coming to terms with a commitment through an announcement that has already been made by his colleague?

**Mr. Neufeld:** I am sorry if I misled the Member for Crescentwood, but I was thinking in terms of the agreements with the five Northern Flood bands. The agreements reached with the communities as a result of the Grand Rapids flooding were not included in the Northern Flood Agreement. The Member for Crescentwood referenced the Northern Flood Agreement and the amounts that might have to be paid out under that agreement. Those amounts have not been identified as yet, and those amounts are not included in any request by Manitoba Hydro. Those are the monies that I was referring to.

**Mr. Carr:** How is it determined what projects will be financed through borrowing from the Government, what projects will be financed through internal appropriations of Hydro, and what uses are put of the HydroBonds issue which raised some several hundred million dollars? How is it determined which projects are funded by what pool of money?

**Mr. Neufeld:** The monies that were realized under the bond issue, or the monies that are provided by the Manitoba Government, or the ones that are indeed raised internally, are not separated for specific projects. The monies are all put into—the

capital funds are spent, and the money is received from wherever they happen to—if there are monies internally, they will be used first. If there are not monies internally, they will be borrowed from the Manitoba Government.

I believe that the monies that were borrowed under the Manitoba HydroBonds issue were put on deposit with the Manitoba Government, and those monies will be used up first. The last, the third, will be the monies that are realized through the Loan Authority.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Madam Chair, if I could get back to my question to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Findlay). I would like to indicate to the Minister that I feel that—he says the farmers have been treated fairly. I think that there was a lot of confusion over the whole program.

Had the people not been given the expectation that this was going to be a grain assistance payment to subsidize for low prices rather than a drought payment, which was the message they got very early on in the year, there might not have been this confusion that there is right now. In other provinces, as the Minister knows, it was paid right across the board, and that is what the people in Manitoba expected as well. That is what created the false expectations amongst people, perhaps.

On the appeal process, farmers were under the impression that they would have a chance to present their case to the Appeal Board, and that did not happen. I wonder whether that was the intention that farmers could present their case to an Appeal Board.

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chairperson, the Member talks about the program need to offset low prices. It clearly was not. The program is called Crop Loss Compensation Program. So that is exactly what it was for and for 1989. Prices were not as low in 1989 as they are now. So there was no intention for low prices. If they heard that on some station in Saskatchewan, this is Manitoba unfortunately.

She says that other provinces paid it across the board. Yes, Saskatchewan did. They paid it across the board, and the hard-hit areas of Saskatchewan are not very happy with that, because the people who had a good crop also got a payment. There is no justice in that system. Alberta used not exactly what we did, but they did scale their payment out to the more hard-hit areas, less targeted than what we did, but there was some targeting in Alberta also.

The Member asks if farmers had the right to appeal. The appeal was set up to be done on an R.M. basis, but the Appeal Board told me that they received appeals from anybody who came in, anybody who was prepared to submit on behalf of their R.M., a farmer, or a group of farmers, to submit on behalf of the R.M. They received those applications. It was set up to be done on an R.M. basis, because that is how the payments were done. That was the geographic area in which we could develop definitive data to determine those who were eligible and those who would not be eligible because they did not experience a crop loss.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Madam Chair, just for clarification then, was there a hearing process where the board went out to take hearings, or were they just done at a central location? Could the farmers go out to appeal?

\* (1930)

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chairperson, as I recall how the appeal tribunal worked, they sent a standard application form to each R.M. The R.M. council could take the leadership, or a group of farmers had the right to come in and take leadership in terms of filling out that application form. Some of the appeal members, board members, went around and talked to anybody who wanted to talk to them about the process of what kind of information they had to submit in order to substantiate their case.

Some staff people they used also went around and explained the process in those areas that were, obviously, going to be making an appeal. There were people up in the Swan River area doing that, to explain to the farmers how they had to fill out the form, but the appeal tribunal used the information submitted in those standard forms and supplemented by whatever they wanted to submit, in their process of establishing who was eligible and who was not in terms of the appeal.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Madam Chair, then I guess that is probably where some of the confusion came in because this was all happening during the middle of harvest, and farmers were under the impression they would be able to appear somewhere to appeal their case. That has not happened.

I want to ask the Minister, what is he prepared to do to redress this situation where certain farmers feel they have been treated unfairly with this assistance? They are suffering from drought and difficult weather conditions. Is he prepared to meet

with some of these farmers who want to raise their concerns to him?

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chairman, I think I have explained the process in my first answer. It is a long process of what was done, trying to be able to be sure that everybody was treated fairly. The appeal tribunal was set up. If they believe they were not fairly treated, then they have to go to the appeal tribunal because it is not in my hands to make judgments on the appeal tribunal. If you want a pure and clean and true appeal process, then you cannot come to the Minister and ask him to override the appeal tribunal. If they believe they were not fairly treated, the chairman of the appeal tribunal is prepared to hear them at any time if they want to contact him, Mr. Gary Saban.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Given that farmers in these areas were excluded from the payment and are facing difficult economic times, what representation is the Minister prepared to make at this time to the federal Government, to assure that farmers will receive assistance such as a deficiency payment or some further payment for this coming spring year? There has to be some money in the farmers' hands if they are going to put a crop in.

**Mr. Findlay:** Madam Chairperson, I think the Member is clearly aware of the elaborate process we have been working on over the past year with the task force on safety nets which has developed a principle of GRIP and NISA which is being looked at now as to how it can be implemented and how the various provinces can participate.

The federal Government has been very adamant that if they are going to deliver any more ad hoc assistance into western Canada, which is clearly needed right now—there is no question it is needed—it has to be done through a structured process. The federal Treasury has demanded that it can no longer be just ad hoc and spread out. It has to be through a structured process so the money that is paid out is targeted to those who are hurt, and that is what we started last year with that Crop Loss Compensation Program.

Farmers have to understand that if they are hurt, they are going to be helped. If they are not hurt, they are not going to get help. That has to be understood. I hope the Member will work with me in that process to help farmers understand there are not enough tax dollars for everybody to get a windfall. It has to be those who are hurt. Okay?

In the process of GRIP and NISA, the federal Government is clearly talking about a method of delivering some ad hoc assistance for the spring of 1991 through the GRIP-NISA process. They have talked about it. I have talked about it for some time, and the need is there, basis low grain price that we are experiencing right now. Pretty well all of western Canada had a pretty darn good crop, and certainly all of Manitoba did.

Now the market access has improved somewhat because grain is moving. The cash advance system, which was reinstated on the urging of all the provinces and the producer organizations across western Canada, is there to have put a cash injection into western Canada that probably will take them through until the spring. I would have to say it is probably in the vicinity of \$1.5 billion that has gone out in that cash advance system. By next spring—you are right—there will be a shortage of revenue, shortage of cash, to put the crop in. Through the GRIP-NISA process and the third line of defence, which will be the new name for any ad hoc assistance, if the mechanism is there, we are in a position to deliver.

That process of talk and negotiation continues. We are going to have another Ministers of Agriculture meeting across the country probably in late January or early February in Saskatchewan, and the officials are to present some options as to how that can be done at that time.

**Ms. Wowchuk:** Is the Minister saying that on the payment that is going to be made this spring, in order to get a payment, the farmers are going to have to participate in NISA and GRIP in order to qualify for the third-option programs?

**Mr. Findlay:** Yes, that is the mechanism that was advocated by the 19 farmers out of 33 on the task force that was put in place, and it is the only mechanism in which the federal Treasury is prepared to do that. The answer is yes.

**Mr. John Plohan (Dauphin):** Madam Chair, before I address a couple of questions to the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), I just want to ask the Minister of Agriculture, since he was just up, to explain the additional capital authority for the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation.

I understand last year the authority was set at \$10.5 million. This year it is at \$66 million. That is nearly \$56 million more, and yet there has not been

that large an increase in loans to farmers. I wonder if he could clarify why the difference?

**Mr. Findlay:** There is an ongoing capital authority there, and last year it was deemed that was enough to keep the pot of money there that would be needed for borrowing. This year it is deemed there is an additional size of pot that is needed to keep the funds there for the borrowing that might be expected.

One of the reasons that there is basically more borrowing being done at MACC than many of the other institutions right now is certainly our interest rate is lower, maybe a point and a quarter below the other rates available in the marketplace, and the Young Farmer Rebate Program that is in place is very attractive. Any young farmer loaning money for whatever capital purpose wants to get it from MACC, so we are doing a fairly brisk business. I would have to suggest that we will exceed our annual average of \$30 million, and it is money put out for good reason to help primarily young farmers and farmers that have net assets of less than \$250 million.

**Mr. Plohman:** I appreciate that the Minister would like to espouse the virtues of the program, the Young Farmer Rebate Program, but the overall budget for the Agricultural Credit Corporation this year was down from last year, not up. So there was not additional borrowing or program dollars in the budget for that program, but in the borrowing authority the Minister has indicated that there is an ongoing authority, and that the amount last year was sufficient to get the corporation through the year. This year we are starting to run it down to such a point that it is deemed advisable to get it back up to a larger level. This may be sufficient for a couple of years of authority. Would that be correct?

**Mr. Findlay:** Certainly for all of this year and for a portion of next year. In terms of the appropriation that was in the Estimates, that is for the interest rebated to the young farmer on their loans, the roughly two point whatever million it was. This is for the actual capital authority. If they borrow \$100,000, this is where it comes from. If they get an interest rebate through the young farmers' interest program, that comes out of the appropriation. That is what he saw in the Estimates. Although they are the same loan, they are two entirely different items.

**Mr. Plohman:** There would a correlation between, because obviously the amount of loans would

determine how much the interest would have to be forgiven or paid on that.

\* (1940)

Could the Minister—just a final question—indicate why the chairman of MACC has left, Neil Potter?

**Mr. Findlay:** The easiest way to say it is that over the course of time the board has been assessing the capability of the general manager and deemed it appropriate that some separation be worked out.

**Mr. Plohman:** This is as a result of the Government's initiative as opposed to the individual wanting to leave. Is that correct?

**Mr. Findlay:** The corporation is operated by a board, and it was a decision of the board.

**Mr. Plohman:** Perhaps we will have an opportunity to discuss that more at another time. I wanted to raise with the Minister since we had agreed—and I think the House Leader for the Government is here—that we could discuss a number of issues in this loan authority, The Loan Act, not directly related to borrowing.

I wanted to ask the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer) whether he has followed up on the copy of the letter that I sent to him that was addressed to the chairperson of the Dauphin Ochre School Board with regard to the lack of services, as deemed by the board, for people, for students, for children who are reported as abused, perhaps sexually abused or other, by teachers or other sources in the schools.

The feeling was, when I met with the school board, that they were not getting sufficient help and assistance and support from the Child and Family Services in Dauphin. They were totally unsatisfied with the 30-day appeal procedure that was put in place for the way they were responding to individual cases. What they needed was active, complete support when cases are reported. I sympathize and empathize with what they are saying, because surely when a teacher who is responsible for reporting a suspected case of abuse does indeed do that, it is necessary to provide immediate support and protection for that child, yet they did not feel that was forthcoming. Has the Minister investigated that at all? Could he provide the Legislature with a bit of an update on that situation?

**Hon. Harold Gilleshammer (Minister of Family Services):** Yes, I am aware of the issue that the

Member raises. Certainly, it is a very sensitive area that has to be dealt with appropriately. I am told that agency staff met with the special ed co-ordinator for the Dauphin Ochre School Division, and they assured me they have worked through all of the issues that were before the board and with the agency involved.

**Mr. Plohman:** I have not talked with the board and the special education co-ordinator and the superintendent in the last week or so, so I would not be aware if something has been worked out. I would be rather surprised, though, if indeed that was the case.

Did the Minister have an opportunity to meet with the board about their concerns from their perspective as opposed to—I understand he was in Dauphin and he met with the staff there. Did he have an opportunity to meet with the people who were indeed complaining about the kind of support, so that he could get their story first-hand on this?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I was in Dauphin about three weeks ago and met with a number of service providers, but the school division board was not one of them. I discussed it with the staff at Child and Family Services in Dauphin, and they assured me they had discussed all outstanding issues with the special ed co-ordinator. I have not talked to the board chairman, superintendent or special ed co-ordinator, but my understanding from our staff up there is that all outstanding issues between the board and the agency were dealt with.

**Mr. Plohman:** In the letter I had sent to the Minister and also copied to the Minister of Education (Mr. Derkach)—I have received a copy from the Minister of Education of his letter to the chairperson of the board dealing with the issues of education concern. There was one issue dealing with the Minister of Family Services, and that was the support services from Child and Family Services. I do not know that I asked directly for investigation by way of that letter, but I asked the Minister. I phoned his staff as well, his assistant, and talked to her about this situation and was looking for a response.

Can the Minister give a commitment to follow up in writing with a response to me or a copy that he might send to the board on this situation?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I do not believe my office was contacted by the board. The only correspondence we had was from the Honourable Member, and I believe we have replied to that. If the Member has

not received the letter as yet, it is forthcoming. Again, the board has not raised the issue with my department. My department has been in contact with the special ed co-ordinator to work out the specifics of any problems between Child and Family Services agency and the school division.

**Mr. Plohman:** Just to clarify, there is no Child and Family agency there. It is the department in Dauphin. They have been in contact. It depends what level the Minister is talking about. They maybe have not been in contact with the Minister's office other than through my letter. They have been in contact with the Minister's staff on numerous occasions to try to get them to respond and were not satisfied, therefore were going to another level, therefore talked to me and asked me to get to the Minister and say to the Minister, look, we are not satisfied, could he please intervene and look into this and investigate the situation with a view to determining what is wrong and correct it, because they are not satisfied with the working relationship at the local level.

It may be, perhaps, that the local staff are saying, well, everything is okay now, and they are telling the Minister that, but that is not what I got from the board. So there has to be some substantial changes in order for them to be satisfied. I think the Minister may well want to look a little further into this rather than just accepting the word of the local director on the issue.

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** I find it difficult to understand if the board has a specific issue that they feel unhappy about, that they have not contacted my office. I can tell you there has been no correspondence to my knowledge from the Dauphin Ochre School Division superintendent, special ed co-ordinator, chairman of the board. The only correspondence we have is from the Member, and we have replied to that. I spoke with our department people up there, and they have indicated to me that in their discussions with the special ed co-ordinator over specific cases, they have satisfied the concerns of the special ed co-ordinator.

**Mr. Plohman:** Just for the Minister's information, the people of the Dauphin Ochre School Board took the steps of contacting their MLA to ask him, myself being in the situation, to contact the Minister on their behalf. So the Minister should not assume that everything is fine because they did not go directly to his office. They used their MLA, and that is

appropriate. So I just asked the Minister to respond to that particular situation.

The other question I would like to ask the Minister, and I take it he is going to give me a written response to this issue that I have just raised, is the issue of the current status of the Herman Opp case, Terry Opp, and the situation raised by their grandparent, Gladys House, who has written many letters to the Minister's predecessor and now to the Minister. Is the Minister actively looking into that case and the way it was handled at the local level in Dauphin?

**Mr. Gilleshammer:** Rather than respond to the school board, I did respond to the Member in writing. The school board has not taken it upon itself to raise the issue directly with me. The specific case that the Member is asking about, rather than get into details here, if you wish, I can get details from the department and give you an update on those.

**Mr. Plohman:** I would appreciate that. I will discuss that with the Minister. This is a long, ongoing and involved case. I do not wish to discuss it in the Legislature necessarily, but I do think that there is a reason to feel that there is some validity to the concerns that are being raised by the individual family. I believe there is, on the basis of that, some merit to the Minister giving this his personal attention. I would just urge him to do so.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** I have a question in the field of industrial development, so I guess I have to address it to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness). It is one concern I have here.

\* (1950)

Last year in The Loan Act was an item of \$15 million for Industrial Opportunities Program. This year there is another request being made for \$3,147,000 for that same program, yet I note in Schedule B that program has barely spent that money which was allotted last year. Of the \$15 million allotted last year, there was less than \$120,000 of that spent. There is according to the Document B here, \$14.8 million. Over 95 percent of it is not spent yet, and yet there is a request from the Government for another \$3.1 million. Is there an explanation for that?

**Mr. Manness:** Madam Chairman, there is most definitely an explanation, and as soon as I can find it, I will share it with the Member. I should indicate to the Member while I am looking for this, that he wanted to know the source of funding of hospitals. In most cases, hospitals go out and borrow their own

money. What has been set up for the \$80 million—and by the way, that \$80 million will not lapse. It will be kept there in case, in the program announced by the Minister of Health (Mr. Orchard), some hospitals have difficulty in attaining their own source of financing.

With respect to the Industrial Opportunities Program, the Industrial Opportunities Program has outlined a gross capital requirement of \$15 million for '90-91, which is designed to encourage the location of major industrial projects to Manitoba or expansion of existing operations in our province. In addition to the '90-91 Capital Program, bridge financing of \$6.3 million is provided in case of delays in The '91 Loan Act. That is the same answer given by the Minister of Energy (Mr. Neufeld) with respect to the \$150 million, bridge financing and Hydro.

Those who are involved in entities of Government no longer trust this Legislature to have The Loan Act passed by April of the beginning of a year. To safeguard against that, there is building in some contingency funding. The incentives, of course, include various types of loans or loan guarantees, interest subsidies, equity investments, land development, personal development, and other forms of more direct financial assistance.

So the program anticipated in '90-91 is \$15 million. Internally-generated funds or cash on hand was \$3.2 million. The cash requirement, therefore, in '90-91 is \$11.7 million. Adding the \$6.3 million bridging to move us into the next fiscal year leaves the capital authority required of \$18 million, and yet we carried in from last year \$14.8 million. The difference between \$18 million required under this Loan Authority and the \$14.9 million carried forward represents the \$3.1 million the Member sees. That is how the numbers balance out. It is anticipated in '90-91, \$15 million will be loaned for the objectives under the Industrial Opportunities Program.

**Mr. Leonard Evans:** I thank the Minister for that. I am not trying to belabour it. I am not criticizing the program. It just seemed on the surface that money was provided, hardly been spent, and yet we are being asked for more. So I gather there is a time-lag effect here, and the department does have the applications in process. Therefore, this is deemed to be a suitable amount of money, so that is fine. We will pass.

**Mr. Kevin Lamoureux (Inkster):** Madam Chairperson, I had a few questions that I was



wanting to ask, but because of the time, I do not think I will be able to ask all the questions I was wanting to.

I will ask the Minister of Culture and Heritage (Mrs. Mitchelson). We had a discussion during the Estimates process in terms of the whole concept of community libraries, and I was a bit unclear in terms of how much of a commitment she has to ensure that some of the community libraries—and I am referring to the City of Winnipeg—are going to be there in the years to come. I would like her just to comment very briefly on that, and then we will have to pick up this conversation at a later point, because we are ever so close to eight o'clock.

**Hon. Bonnie Mitchelson (Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation):** Madam Chairperson, I think I was fairly clear during the Estimates process in saying that the City of Winnipeg has a responsibility to serve its community through the library system. They spend a fair amount of money in the City of Winnipeg on library delivery, and we as a provincial Government spend about \$1.8 million in a block fund which funds only about 1 percent of their library system in the city of Winnipeg.

Madam Chairperson, it is the city's responsibility to deliver that service in the way they think best suits the needs of the people of the city of Winnipeg. I have indicated, too, that just because there is a physical library, a building with books in it, in one area or another of the city, that does not mean that we are going to have more literate people in the city of Winnipeg. It is not the bricks and mortar and the books sitting in a room that make people more literate. It is the programs and the education system that we have in place that are going to make people more literate.

So the City of Winnipeg has to determine and decide where they need libraries to best serve the needs of the people who elect them.

**Mr. Lamoureux:** Madam Chairperson, very briefly, is the Government committed to community-based libraries in the city of Winnipeg? If they are, what action are they willing to take if the city did decide to close down some of the community libraries? I will cite the one, for example, in Brooklands.

**Mrs. Mitchelson:** Madam Chairperson, it is absolutely a responsibility of the City Council of the City of Winnipeg to determine how many library branches they are going to have to meet the needs of the people who elected them. If in fact they make

some of the wrong decisions, or close some library branches, or open new ones, or whatever they decide to do, the people of Winnipeg will determine next election what they will do with those councillors who made those decisions.

**Madam Chairman:** Clause 1—pass; Clause 2—pass; Clause 3(1)—pass; 3(2)—pass; 3(3)—pass; 4(1)—pass; 4(2)—pass; 4(3)—pass; 5—pass; 6—pass; 7(1)—pass; 7(2)—pass; 8—pass; 9—pass; 10—pass; 11(1)—pass; 11(2)—pass; 12—pass; 13—pass; Schedule A—pass; Schedule B—pass; Preamble—pass; Title—pass.

Is it the will of the committee that I report the Bill? (Agreed)

### BILL 27—THE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1990

**Madam Chairman:** The Committee of the Whole will now consider Bill 27, The Appropriation Act, 1990 (Loi de 1990 portant affectation de crédits). Does the Honourable Minister of Finance (Mr. Manness) have an opening statement?

\* (2000)

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** No, I do not.

**Madam Chairman:** We shall proceed to consider Bill 27, clause by clause.

Clause 1 through Clause 10—(pass); Clause 11 through Clause 14—(pass); Schedule (a)—(pass); Preamble—(pass); Title—(pass). Is it the will of the committee that I report the Bill? Agreed. Committee rise.

Call in the Speaker.

### IN SESSION

### COMMITTEE REPORT

**Mrs. Louise Dacquay (Chairman of Committees):** Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill 26, The Loan Act, 1990, and Bill 27, The Appropriation Act, 1990, and has directed me to report the same.

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

**Motion agreed to.**

### House Business

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Government House Leader):** Mr. Speaker, I would wonder if you would not look at the clock for a few minutes, so that we might continue to finish our business.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is it the will of the House not to see the clock? It is agreed. Agreed.

### REPORT STAGE

#### BILL 27—THE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1990

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Highways (Mr. Driedger), that Bill 27, The Appropriation Act, 1990; (Loi de 1990 portant affectation de crédits), as reported from the Committee of the Whole be concurred in.

**Motion agreed to.**

### THIRD READINGS

#### BILL 27—THE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1990

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Family Services (Mr. Gilleshammer), that Bill 27, The Appropriation Act, 1990; (Loi de 1990 portant affectation de crédits) be now read a third time and passed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave for third reading of Bill 27? Agreed.

**Motion agreed to.**

### REPORT STAGE

#### BILL 26—THE LOAN ACT, 1990

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Rural Development (Mr. Penner), that Bill 26, The Loan Act, 1990, (Loi d'emprunt de 1990) reported from the Committee of the Whole be concurred in.

**Motion agreed to.**

### THIRD READINGS

#### BILL 26—THE LOAN ACT, 1990

**Hon. Clayton Manness (Minister of Finance):** Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Culture, Heritage and Recreation (Mrs. Mitchelson), that Bill 26, The Loan Act, 1990; (Loi d'emprunt de 1990) be now read a third time and passed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Is there leave for third reading of Bill 26? Agreed.

**Motion agreed to.**

\* \* \*

**Mr. Speaker:** The hour being after 8 p.m., this House is now adjourned and stands adjourned till 10 a.m. tomorrow (Friday).

# Legislative Assembly of Manitoba

Thursday, December 13, 1990

## CONTENTS

### ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Committee of Supply  
Dacquay 3026

#### Tabling of Reports

Annual Report, Environment,  
Workplace Safety and Health  
Cummings 3026

#### Oral Questions

Goods and Services Tax  
Doer; Manness 3026

Judicial System  
Chomiak; McCrae 3027

Remand Centre Construction  
Edwards; Cummings 3029

Environmental Laws  
Edwards; Cummings 3029

North Dakota Waste Disposal Site  
Cerilli; Cummings 3030

Cross Lake, Manitoba  
Harper; Cummings; Driedger 3030

Manitoba Nurses' Union  
Carstairs; Orchard 3031

Anesthetist Shortage  
Carstairs; Orchard; Filmon 3032

Fuel Price Increases  
Storie; Neufeld 3032

CKY Television Strike  
Ashton; Filmon 3033

#### Non-Political Statements

Newsmaker of the Year  
Ashton 3034  
Downey 3035  
Carr 3035

#### Concurrent Committees of Supply

Workers Compensation 3036  
Canada-Manitoba  
Enabling Vote 3044, 3049  
Status of Women 3044  
Legislation 3052  
Executive Council 3052  
Allowance for Losses and Expenditures  
Incurred by Crown Corporations and  
Other Provincial Entities 3052  
Flood Control and Emergency  
Expenditures 3053  
General Salary Increases 3053  
Natural Resources 3053  
Health 3060

#### Committee Report

Committee of Supply  
Dacquay 3091

#### Report Stage

Bill 6, Business Practices Act  
Manness 3091

Bill 18, Statute Law Amendment  
(Re-enacted Statutes) Act  
McCrae 3091

Bill 20, Statute Law Amendment  
(Taxation) Act, 1990  
Manness 3091  
Storie 3092

Bill 22, Statute Law Amendment  
Act, 1990-91  
McCrae 3093

#### Third Readings

Bill 6, Business Practices Act  
Manness 3093

Bill 18, Statute Law Amendment  
(Re-enacted Statutes) Act  
Manness 3093

Bill 20, Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act, 1990 McCrae	3093	<b>Committee of the Whole</b> Bill 26, Loan Act, 1990 Bill 27, Appropriation Act, 1990	3096 3112
Bill 22, Statute Law Amendment Act, 1990-91 Manness Edwards McCrae	3094 3094 3095	<b>Committee Report</b> Committee of the Whole Dacquay	3112
<b>Supply - Main Supply</b> Committee of Ways and Means	3096	<b>Report Stage</b> Bill 27, Appropriation Act, 1990 Manness	3113
<b>Committee Report</b> Committee of Ways and Means Laurendeau	3096	<b>Third Readings</b> Bill 27, Appropriation Act, 1990 Manness	3113
<b>Introduction of Bills</b> Bill 27, Appropriation Act, 1990 Manness	3096	<b>Report Stage</b> Bill 26, Loan Act, 1990 Manness	3113
<b>Second Readings</b> Bill 27, Appropriation Act, 1990 Manness	3096	<b>Third Readings</b> Bill 26, Loan Act, 1990 Manness	3113