

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

Thursday, 11 March, 1982

Time — 8:00 p.m.

CONCURRENT COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY

SUPPLY — NATURAL RESOURCES

CHAIRMAN, Mr. Harapiak (The Pas): We are presently on 4.(a)(1).

Mr. Minister.

MR. MACKLING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would like the Committee to recognize the staff that I have here. Some of you earlier were wondering about the Assistant Deputy Ministers and other staff and I will introduce them: on the far left, Dale Stewart, Assistant Deputy Minister; at the far end, Derek Doyle, Deputy Minister; Bill Podolsky, you met earlier; Nick Carter you met earlier; and in the hot seat here with me is Tom Weber.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are on 4.(a)(1).

The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, among the major concerns that the Water Resources people have had before them over a number of years is, of course, the whole matter of Garrison. I would like to invite the Minister to indicate to the Committee at this time a number of specific items resulting about which we have heard some general government announcements. I specifically would like to know inasmuch as we are dealing with the Estimates where is the funding that has been publicly announced to the Anti-Garrison Lobby Group coming from? Is it in this appropriation or is it coming out of Executive Council's appropriation? I would invite the Minister to take this occasion to flush out in greater detail some of his recent discussions that he has had in Ottawa and also to indicate to us precisely what this greater presence in Washington, or Manitoba presence in Washington, how that is going to function? I am, of course, specifically interested in whether or not the department either in this appropriation or in some other area of his appropriations is providing the funds and if they are clearly identified as such.

MR. MACKLING: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I thank the Member for Lakeside for his comments. There is not a great deal further by way of specific that I can indicate to members in respect to the arrangements at this date with the Federal Government. We have been in almost daily contact with the Federal Government with conversations and correspondence back and forth confirming the nicety of the detail in connection with our arrangements. I am hopeful that tomorrow optimistically, Monday certainly I think, that we should be in a position to confirm the nature of the agreement we made with Ottawa in respect to the arrangements for a presence in Washington dealing with Garrison. We are reasonably certain that in those arrangements it will have a twofold effect; we will be able to work closely and ensure that Ottawa is working along with us in respect to Garrison, and yet we will have a

separate identical presence in Washington on Garrison.

One of the things that we must do is work as a team in respect to Garrison. When I say that, I'm talking not just about the Federal Government and the existing Manitoba Government, I'm talking about the Official Opposition in this Legislature. I'm talking about all the parties in Ottawa. Now, I don't think we've made any secret of the fact that we expect that there will be all party parliamentary representation involved in submissions in Washington. There has been some discussion about that pro and con in the press from the federal side, but I think that the Federal Government will be quite in favour of that kind of effort. Similarly, I can see no reason, I see every advantage for all party representation from this House in respect to our efforts in Washington respecting the Garrison Project. This is an issue that — sure it's political, it's an important issue — but it's one that crosses political boundaries. I'm sure that the members of the previous administration reflected the concerns of Manitobans when they spoke out in connection with this development. There needs to be more publicity within Manitoba on this question and we are working to that end. We've established an office here in the building, as members know, and we are going to be spending some funds in respect to providing, if you would call a publicity outreach campaign, to inform Manitobans more particularly what our concerns are in respect to Garrison. One of the things that I think we must do and I don't think there is sufficient research into the question of the foreign biota affecting our fresh water fisheries, and we will have to address that problem.

In respect to the funding of Garrison, we haven't a line in the Estimates on that issue. We are hopeful that we'll be able to develop programs at a very reasonable cost, and I've been discussing that matter with Mr. Carter — as a matter of fact, as late as half-an-hour ago. Representation in Washington is expensive but then if we work out the details right, we want to make sure that we get the best for every dollar we spend. There isn't a separate line in the Estimates. We didn't know what to budget here quite frankly, because while we want to be very effective, we want to be very prudent in our spending. We're confident that there's enough slippage or base within the Estimates to deal with this. However, there is — and I certainly cleared this with my colleagues — the vehicle of Supplementary Supply for this. It is something that we couldn't put a precise figure on until we'd worked out arrangements. It is not going to be a horrendous amount of money in any event, but as I indicated in my remarks in the Legislature, I cannot see this as a limited program. It's not going to be just this year that we will be concerned with Garrison. The development down there is a phase development, a long-range development, and they have part of that development in place and even though the appropriations in the American Government maybe forestalled or aborted by our efforts at certain stages, it does not mean that proponents of the project are going to give up. They have a plan, they have a scheme and they are going to work towards the fulfillment of it. So, as I see it, it's not this

year only, it is going to be this year and next year and who knows how long after that. So we don't have a line in the Estimates on it, but I make no apology for that, because we couldn't quantify that with precision and, in any event, it won't be a huge amount of money in our expectation.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, while I have some other questions I would ask the Committee to allow me to defer to my colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain, for some further specific questions on the same subject matter.

ôêMR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. A. BRIAN RANSOM (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could elaborate on what he meant by separate identical presence in Washington, and although he acknowledges that there is no specific line for expenditures here, I believe that it previously had been stated in the press that it could cost at least \$150,000 to establish an office in Washington, and I note his reference to research being required as well. Would it be possible that the amount of money be required could be in the range of a quarter-of-a-million dollars?

MR. MACKLING: In dealing with the concerns in reverse order, Mr. Chairman, the figure of \$150,000, I don't know where that comes from. That is not within my best guesstimate. I would think that in this Budget year we wouldn't be spending that much; at this stage our arrangements aren't such that I can be certain as to the figures so I won't speculate on that, but I don't conceive of it being \$150,000, somewhat less than that, hopefully a great deal less than that, but I don't want to guess on the amount because the arrangements are not complete. In respect to my words, I don't think I indicated identical presence, a separate presence in Washington and I say that with deliberation because in our discussions with the Federal Government, the Federal Government's concern was that the Federal Government is charged with enforcement of International Treaty rights. They are the government that is politically constrained to represent the interests of Canada in the enforcement of those Treaty rights. They are, I think, justifiably concerned that the province would proliferate international presence and it is no secret that they have been concerned about the separate international presence of representatives to the Province of Quebec.

It's not merely a jealous guarding of their jurisdiction as I conceive it because in our discussions with the Federal Ministers they were genuinely concerned to fight Garrison and to bend every effort from the federal position to advance the right that we are defending, but in our indication, we have said that with Ottawa we want a separate presence and we're going to have a separate presence in Washington. We've used the word "office," really, we don't want to be hung up about the word "office"; we want people working in Washington for the people of Manitoba to ensure that we have people making representation there and looking out for our interests. Not that we don't trust that the Federal Government is going to be doing something, but we do want to have people

responsible to us so that we can get a direct feedback and have some direct initiative as to what is being done in Washington on our behalf.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister identify then what areas of failing that there were in the actions taken by the Department of External Affairs in years past? What exactly is it that is going to be done now that was not being done before?

MR. MACKLING: I wouldn't highlight any particular failure on the part of the Federal Government. I don't think that I would necessarily say they failed in Manitoba's interests. They have a diversity of concerns in respect to international matters between Canada and the United States. They are heavily engaged in the concerns about pollution of international waters, boundary waters — if I can say international waters in the Great Lakes — concerned about acid rain pollution and they have, I think, an ongoing difficulty in respect to the American Government and administration in respect to policies in Canada that have caused some irritation in the United States, energy policies, amongst one. They have ongoing concerns in respect to trade balances and, for our part, we are concerned that in this great range of problems that the Federal Government has, where they have to have initiatives dealing and treating with the American Government that Garrison be not the small issue that doesn't get the attention it deserves. That's why we were anxious that we have a presence in Washington, not that we're accusing the Federal Government of failure. I couldn't document that, but I think there's a feeling, an assessment, on the part of Manitobans that we want to make sure that a job is being done there and to do that, we should have a presence there in Washington.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister could advise us then on where he or his department has received advice as to the necessity of this kind of representation, because it strikes me that there has been some confusion — at least there has been confusion in my mind — because the information that I have, to a great extent, been gleaned from the media. I know that at one point it was promised that Manitoba would have an office in Washington and it was to be established with the full co-operation of Ottawa External Affairs. The next report was that Ministers from Ottawa were concerned that this was going to go ahead and then subsequently you and the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of Environment went to Ottawa, and there now seems to be some kind of an agreement coming close, but I gather the Minister still has concerns that he thinks can best be dealt with by a separate provincial presence. I'm just wondering where that advice came from.

MR. MACKLING: I can't indicate where the advice came from. I think that the New Democratic party, during the course of the election, and certainly there was a consensus of viewpoint that much more had to be done in connection with presenting Manitoba's opposition to the Garrison development. It is known that the Federal Government seemingly was not always aware of developments taking place in Washington, changes in appropriations. Not pointing a fin-

ger at anyone, it's a matter of utmost concern to Manitobans that an effective opposition be registered in respect to the Garrison question. I don't think it's productive at this stage, Mr. Chairman, and colleagues, to point fingers at anyone, either the past administration in this province or Ottawa or anyone else, and that will not be my position. My concern is that we act now and act as prudently but as decisively as we can to effectively oppose this development.

MR. RANSOM: Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that there is no effort on our part to direct blame towards anybody. This happens to be, as we all recognize, a crucial issue as far as the interests of Manitoba are concerned, and over the years there have been positions adopted, they were adopted by the Schreyer government and they were followed to a great extent by the Conservative administration. Certain actions were taken and others were not taken because of the possibility of weakening the position that the province was taking. I understand now that the province will be taking a different route than they had been taking before and therefore I think it is perfectly in order to ask for some justification as to why that route has been changed because should the route of action that's being proposed fail for the reasons that have been thought about and discussed for several years, then of course the ultimate result would be very serious for Manitoba. That's why I ask that question, whether it's action that's being taken on the basis of some knowledge of the situation or whether it's being one that's taken on simply the basis of appearing to be necessary to create more activity. Perhaps I could ask a couple of specific questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Alan Scarth, a lawyer for Manitoba whom is well known to many people and had been involved in the Garrison issue from its very first days — I believe he was probably one of the first people to bring the issue to the attention of the government — had served as an adviser to me when I was Minister of Natural Resources and had continued on as an adviser to the Member for Lakeside when he was Minister of Natural Resources. I'm just wondering if Mr. Scarth is still retained by the government?

MR. MACKLING: Dealing with the questions in reverse order again or the observations in reverse order, Mr. Chairman, in respect to Alan Scarth, Alan Scarth is no longer counsel in respect to the Garrison matter. We have employed a young lawyer, Barry Bergh with the firm of Pitblado & Hoskin, who is an environmental lawyer of high calibre. We've had and continued to enjoy a good relationship with Mr. Scarth whom we expect to from time to time assist us in the event that there is an area in which he can be of assistance to us. There is no difficulty in our change in that arrangement, so far as either this government or Mr. Scarth is concerned, not to my knowledge.

In respect to the concern about what causes a change, well, I guess this can be very subjective, Mr. Chairman, but we know that for a time it appeared that Garrison was halted; that changed. Litigation that had been taken by interest groups in the United States had been effective for a time. That has changed. We know that the administration in Washington has changed and with that change there seems to be more sym-

pathy for the proponents of the Garrison Project. We are concerned that we must do more than merely communicate with Ottawa asking them to defend our rights. I think we have to demonstrate to Ottawa that we are concerned with this issue to the point where we're prepared to meet with them on such basis as is necessary to initiate a presence for the province in Washington to join in the fight against this development. I think that it's fair for me to say that the Federal Government is not hostile to this; fairly welcomes our initiatives.

MR. RANSOM: Let me just put on the record, Mr. Chairman, that during the period of our administration we had excellent co-operation with the Federal Government, the Department of External Affairs, through Mr. Scarth as the legal adviser and, indeed, the co-ordinator of our activities. We were in touch on many occasions on a daily basis with Mr. George Rejean in the External Affairs Office in Washington and had established what we felt to be was an excellent line of communication that gave us very timely information, allowed us to take actions — I use the term "threats" in the terms of actions being taken — that could be threatening to Manitoba's interest. We were able to respond to those or react to them actually in advance because we had established that kind of relationship. I know that was followed by the previous Schreyer administration, that sort of direct relationship with the Federal Government.

It concerns me a little bit, that I see some changes in the attitudes of some of the actors that are involved in this. When Mr. Axworthy was the Member for Fort Rouge he had somewhat of a different position and in listening to the Minister's response here tonight, Mr. Chairman, I almost think that he tends to be more taking the position now that Mr. Axworthy used to take, and Mr. Axworthy seems to be taking the position that the previous Schreyer administration used to take. I might ask the Minister if he would be at all in agreement with this statement that Mr. Axworthy made on March 2, 1977. A debate was taking place on a resolution in the House and Mr. Axworthy said and I quote, "... but sometimes, Mr. Speaker, the correct thing is not enough, sometimes you have to be tough, and sometimes you have to be unruly, and sometimes you have to be mad, and simply being correct and proper in procedure might be okay if you're a debutante going to a ball. But, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to a ball on this one, we are in a hell of a political fight and if these guys across there don't recognize it, then I think we are going to lose the problem." I'm wondering what the Minister's reaction would be to that sort of sentiment.

MR. MACKLING: Well, I think if the honourable member was listening to what I said in this House recently I indicated that I thought that our resistance to the Garrison Project would not be an easy matter, that it would be a tough fight and a protracted one, but that is not to indicate that I think the opponents of Garrison have to be unruly and mad. You know, when you are mad, if you look in the dictionary you are in grave trouble, because you are not in possession of your senses. I don't think we want to lose our cool in connection with our opposition. We have operational

and decisive and forthright, thorough, yes tough, but understanding of the American position but deliberate and dedicated in our interest to protect our environment. I disassociate with myself and anyone who suggests that we are going to be unruly and mad. We are going to be tough, yes.

MR. RANSOM: Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, there isn't really a change in position, maybe that is what the Minister is going to announce in a day or two. Perhaps if I quoted from one or two resolutions that the House had previously passed and the statements that had been made by members of the New Democratic party previously, perhaps the Minister would indicate then that really the position hasn't changed. For instance, the resolution that was passed in 1977 said, among other things, that this government confirms and endorses these steps taken by the Government of Manitoba designed to place the province in the most favourable position before the International Joint Commission namely:

(a) In continued use of reasonable diplomatic means to deal with this problem and in obtaining progress through the use of such means;

(b) On the same resolution was in maintaining solidarity with and not undermining the Canadian Government in its external relations.

Then, Mr. Chairman, of course, the House, just two years ago, passed another resolution where it ended up — this resolution, by the way, was proposed by the present Premier — "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT this House support the action of the Manitoba Government and calls upon the Government of Canada to take whatever action is necessary to prevent the expenditure of further funds on the Garrison Diversion Project until such time as the outstanding bilateral issues relating to this project are resolved." That was the resolution of two years ago.

Then there were statements made by Mr. Bostrom, both when he was Minister of Natural Resources in 1977 and again when he was a member of the Opposition two years ago, and I quote those — on March 2, 1977, he said: "I must say, Mr. Speaker, that with respect to the position of the Manitoba Government, I believe that the Honourable Minister of Mines has taken the correct and appropriate action in this respect. He has followed the normal government channels through the Department of External Affairs to have the province's concern raised to the Government of the United States and we are hanging the claim for our protection on the International Boundaries Agreement." Then further, Mr. Chairman, "We are of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the policy and the program that we have pursued is one which, whether ultimately successful or not, will achieve the most favourable results. We have never had alternative policies suggested to us which we felt would be more advantageous." He goes on, Mr. Speaker, "It was also suggested to us by various environmental groups that we ally ourselves and actively support groups in Canada who wish to join with groups in the United States who are urging a "Stop the Garrison program" in the United States. We pointed out correctly that it would be fatal to our position to be involved in the internal politics of the United States and that we would only oppose the Garrison insofar as it affected the Red and

Souris Rivers." Those were statements by Mr. Bostrom in 1977 when he was Minister.

Then just a further short quotation, Mr. Chairman, that was made by Mr. Bostrom when he was the Member for Rupertsland and this was the 29th of May, 1980 following a statement made by the First Minister concerning communication with Congress at the time. Mr. Bostrom at the time said, "I would think, Mr. Speaker, with respect to this announcement that closer co-operation with the Canadian External Affairs Department would be more valuable than the Province of Manitoba attempting to put the case forward on its own." Further he said, "I would hope that the Premier and the Government of Manitoba is not simply attempting to grandstand on this issue"; and further, a quote again, "The Garrison Diversion Project is such a dangerous project to Manitoba that there should be no hesitation by government of any stripe to deal in co-operation with the Federal Government in order to more effectively oppose this kind of measure rather than attempting to do it on a province basis. One province means very little to the Government of the United States, but the Government of Canada means a lot more, Mr. Speaker." I would just ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, if he would anticipate that his announcement within the next day or two would in any way mark a departure from the policies that were previously undertaken by a New Democratic Party Government and representatives of the New Democratic Party in opposition?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, and colleagues, one will have to await the announcement for that evaluation to be made and I couldn't make that evaluation. You will make the evaluation after the announcement is made.

In respect to the quotations that you have cited of former Ministers and MLAs and members of this House, I have no quarrel with those statements. There is no question but that this is an international issue and our Federal Government is charged with the responsibility.

However, in matters that directly affect our province, we are entitled, we are obligated I think as a government to be interested to the point where not only are we going to communicate with Ottawa, as we have and visited with Ottawa, but we are going to endeavour to work as closely as possible with Ottawa to ensure that the issue is defended to the best of their ability and ours as well. There is going to be a teamwork approach.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, can the Minister advise the Committee whether he regards the Boundary Waters Treaty as being the best defence or the only defence that is available to Canada and to the province?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the member is asking me to guess as to defences. My personal view is that the Treaty is our strongest defence. However, international treaties have been broken before; and then, of course, you might wind up with a reference to the World Court eventually.

Yes, I think that in our relationship with our American brothers, we want to rely upon our written under-

takings. The finest undertaking in respect to that is our international covenant enshrined in our Boundary Waters Act, I think that's the name of the Act, The Water Treaties Act. But, of course, any Act and any act of man is subject to the interpretation of men, and they may think things are possible under that Act that we don't think are possible.

Under that Act, there's a commitment that neither nation will do anything to affect the integrity of the water of the other country; they may quite rightly say we're not attacking the integrity of your water. Although we may firmly believe they are and we think that we can prove it, we may be right but lose.

So that while I think we have to work primarily through the Federal Government's initiatives, we want to buttress that and support that with political will on the part of the people of Manitoba; because the most successful way to convince those who have to make the decision is through political action and political effort. We think the people of Manitoba want to speak out on this issue and we want to be the focus of that. We want to do our utmost to make sure that our understandings on this issue are known by the American Government and those who are going to make the decisions.

MR. RANSOM: What other avenues does the Minister think might be available, then to Canada and to Manitoba? What other avenues of action might be available to protect our interests?

MR. MACKLING: I wouldn't speculate, Mr. Chairman, on other avenues. The avenue that we will follow is the political one.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the political one is another avenue separate from the Boundary Waters Treaty, through the diplomatic channels. The political route seems to me to be a separate one.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, when I said political I meant government to government, Canada to Washington, Manitoba with Canada to Washington. Of course, there are private special interest groups in the United States and Canada. We certainly don't want to discourage the initiatives that they are taking, but we as a province cannot be directly involved in those kind of initiatives.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I'm not quite clear on how the effort is going to be directed in Washington. Is it going to be directed towards ensuring that The Boundary Waters Treaty Act is honoured and respected, or is it going to be directed towards the internal political decisions of the United States with respect to funding, for instance?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, in respect to the position that Manitoba will want to see developed in Washington, it will be that any funding that takes place in connection with Garrison, will not be such that works will be brought into being, the effect of which will be to drain Missouri River Watershed or Missouri River Basin water into the Hudson's Bay Basin.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the concern that has always been expressed in the past that there was a possibility that by placing the question into the political arena within the United States, that should that battle within the political arena be lost, that Manitoba and Canada's position is then weaker than it was before that battle was lost. That is a position put forward by people who have been familiar with this situation for many years, both from a political and a legal point of view, and I know that that view is not held by the Member for Inkster, but I think it's a legitimate concern, Mr. Chairman, which has kept the province from going that route for some 10 years now. That is why I asked previously what type of information the Minister has that leads him to make these decisions, because I want to understand what is being done, we want to support the government in taking correct actions to protect the interests of Manitoba, and if we think perhaps there's a possibility that they're making incorrect action, then I would be remiss if I didn't point that out, raise those questions with the Minister.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member seeks to try and find some problem with what we're doing. I don't see the problem that he's trying to find. I think we are working with the Federal Government to register with those who make the decisions in Washington. Our concern is that any project that is developed in the United States, the effect of which is going to pollute Manitoba waterways, does not meet with our approval.

Now, if there's some problem with that, I'd like to hear it from the honourable member.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, now the Minister I think is attempting to cloud an issue that is — where we're placing perfectly straight forward and legitimate questions — he knows full well that the Government of Manitoba for the last 10 years has consistently taken the position that they didn't want that water transferred into Manitoba. The question has always been, what is the most effective way to protect the interests of Manitobans? Since two governments, one of NDP philosophy and one of Conservative philosophy have followed essentially the same route, I think it is a legitimate question to ask for an explanation of why the present government thinks that some different course of action needs to be taken and if the course of action isn't different, Mr. Chairman, then fine. I would be happy to hear that. I realize the Minister has some problem here in that he is unable to announce what his plans are for another day or two yet. I guess it's unfortunate then that we weren't discussing this afterwards. Those are the reasons why I raised the questions. I know that people who have long been involved in fighting this question in Manitoba are no longer involved.

So I ask then, Mr. Chairman, who within the government now is going to be responsible for the overall co-ordination of the province's activities with respect to Garrison?

MR. MACKLING: In reverse order again, Mr. Chairman, it will be the Minister of Natural Resources; in respect to any change, there's no significant change except that if you consider a change in the magniti-

tude or the scope or the effort of the opposition — diplomatic opposition — opposition registered through the Federal Government and through the Provincial Government with Washington, this opposition has been ongoing. We haven't indicated anything otherwise, but we are stepping up that opposition. So the change, if you must find change, is one of degree.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, the Minister says if I must find change; I'm not looking for change. I'm simply trying to find out what the change is that was promised by the ND Party when they were fighting the election.

I believe the Minister of Environment stood up in the House two days ago and said that was a political promise; that we would have an office, a presence in Washington and there will be. I'm simply trying to determine whether it's only a political promise or whether it is a well thought out position that in fact is going to strengthen the hand of the province in Canada. Indeed, if it is, we certainly offer our full support to the Minister in carrying on the fight that's been carried on for 10 years. The Minister, Mr. Chairman, said that he personally will be co-ordinating the activities. I was wondering specifically if there would be a senior civil servant assigned to it or is the Minister going to personally co-ordinate all these activities?

MR. MACKLING: The exact details of the co-ordination of this opposition has not been thoroughly identified. I'm not in a position to comment on the arrangements with the Federal Government at this time, but at this end I will, through my office, be the focus of the opposition.

MR. RANSOM: If I understand it correctly then, there has not been a person designated within the provincial government to be the focal point of activities that co-ordinates with the Department of the Environment for instance, within our own province; plus the information the office that's now being established here in the building; the new legal advisor that the Minister has, and who now will be in daily touch with the External Affairs Office in Washington, if that sort of thing is necessary. Have those details been worked out yet?

MR. MACKLING: My Ministry.

MR. RANSOM: Well, Mr. Chairman, simply I recognize that everything that happens within the Ministry is the responsibility of the Minister, but has he designated the Deputy Minister is going to be the senior person or an Assistant Deputy or Director? Has any person of that nature been designated?

MR. MACKLING: As I understand it, when the Minister is charged with the responsibility he uses his staff; his most immediate staff is his Deputy Minister.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, then who do public groups go to or public individuals? Should they have a concern about Garrison now and they want to have discussion with someone in the government? Do they go to the information office that's been established in this building?

MR. MACKLING: It would depend. Certainly that is available and the first contact may well be with Miss Claudia Engels. From that point they have my entire staff, particularly my Deputy Minister, who has been in almost daily contact with Ottawa, available.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, perhaps this question was answered before and I may have missed the answer. Does the Minister intend to provide funding for groups in the province that are opposed to Garrison, such as the Action Committee?

MR. MACKLING: We have indicated to groups that are interested in this matter that we welcome their interest; their concern. To the extent that we can, we will facilitate their need for pamphlet material, if we have pamphlets that are available. We'll facilitate their group in providing any information that we have and help them co-ordinate any activity, but it doesn't involved direct funding.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I think I only have a couple more questions that I'd like to ask the Minister.

One would be — and he may not even want to answer this question — but in view of the fact that we have had over the years the assurance of both the executive level of government in the United States — I suppose the assurance has always come through the executive level of government of the United States — that indeed they would honour the Boundary Waters Treaty. Does the Minister fear that there is a possibility that the Treaty might not be honoured?

MR. MACKLING: I won't speculate on that, Mr. Chairman, I think I've indicated that treaties can be interpreted in different ways and we want the Treaty interpreted in the way that we think best protects the interests of the people of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member from Turtle Mountain, do you have another question?

MR. RANSOM: Well I guess I have two more. The Minister made reference to the International Court. Has that possibility been examined lately or is that just a general reference that the Minister is making.

MR. MACKLING: The latter.

MR. RANSOM: Finally, Mr. Chairman, does the Minister have any indication or any information concerning the probability of the Garrison Project being de-authorized within the next few months?

MR. MACKLING: I would like to give you an affirmative speculative answer to that, but I won't speculate. We're going to be involved with Ottawa in initiatives in respect to that and we'll remain optimistic.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Pembina.

MR. DONALD ORCHARD (Pembina): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Since the change in administrations in Manitoba, has the Minister or his predecessor written directly to External Affairs in Ottawa confirming by letter — I realize there has been telephone calls and

discussions — the continued opposition of the new government to Garrison?

MR. MACKLING: We have been not only in telephone conversation, but telex communication and we have, my colleague, Mr. Cowan and my colleague, Mr. Scott and I met with the Federal Government in the person of the Honourable Mark MacGuigan, Minister of External Affairs, the Deputy Minister of Environment and with Mr. Axworthy, who is the Member of Parliament and Member of Cabinet from this province, and we had an extensive discussion outlining our concerns, not only in respect to the whole question of Garrison, but how we best co-ordinate our activities in opposition to that project.

MR. ORCHARD: So then I take it, Mr. Chairman, that in terms of a Minister-to-Minister letter as a means of formal communication that such a letter hasn't been part of the communications that have gone back and forth between governments at the official Ministers' level?

MR. MACKLING: I wouldn't make that assumption, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORCHARD: Could you possibly confirm whether that assumption is correct or incorrect during the course of the Estimates?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, after the arrangements are confirmed with Ottawa I will feel much more at liberty to table the correspondence and documentation that the members might be interested in.

MR. ORCHARD: In your conversations and discussions with External Affairs in Ottawa, have you received any advice from them that the new government in Manitoba should make direct written correspondence to officials in Washington indicating that the position vis-a-vis Garrison has not changed with a change in government.

MR. MACKLING: I don't believe that in conversations and in our communications with Ottawa they asked us to communicate directly with the Embassy registering those views. I think that the position of Manitoba in respect to Garrison is known. It's been confirmed for a period of many years and the position has been unchanged to the knowledge of the Federal Government and to its Embassy in Washington, with whom also we have had communication.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't offer that as any criticism, but I think the record would show that when the administration changed in the United States we reaffirmed our position with them as quickly as possible to avoid any potential confusion, shall we say. I only ask those questions of direct communications both with Ottawa on a formal basis, via letter, Minister-to-Minister, would be to me one of the most appropriate means of communicating that in fact the position of the new government remains as firm and as adamant as was its predecessor government.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I believe we have

indicated that not only in writing but in respect to our physical presence in Ottawa and in our discussions with Embassy officials and officials of the Federal Government.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, the Minister has indicated certain concerns that he has, and if I interpret it correctly was really asking all members of the Manitoba Legislature to treat this issue not as one of political motivation but one of concern for Manitoba and its future welfare. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, that is the kind of support that a Minister in your government can expect from the Opposition. Any questioning that we undertake is to determine just what course of action the new government intends to take.

We want to be sure that partisan politics don't become a part of the Garrison Diversion and I suppose, Mr. Chairman, if I might gently draw to the Honourable Minister's attention that when first questioned in the House, I think if he were to re-read Hansard he might chastise himself about getting slightly political in answers to questions that were placed to him by members of the Opposition. It is not our intention to criticize you at this stage for that, but I just want to tell you that we intend not to make a crass political issue of the Garrison Project; we intend to work with you and we will live by your advice and trust that it will be reciprocated.

On the specific topic of the election campaign undertaken by the New Democratic Party it was mentioned of the need and indeed the intention of the New Democratic party, should they become government, to establish an office in Washington. I realize the Minister has indicated, let's not get hung up on the term "Office" in discussions tonight, but could the Minister indicate to me, in the think-tanking that went into that election promise, how many people did the New Democratic Party envision necessary to maintain an adequate presence of a Manitoba Garrison Office in Washington?

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know how to answer that question and not offend what the honourable member's concern is to ensure that there is not political consideration given to these questions. I think if I answer that question I'm going to be doing disservice to the position that the member has indicated in the preamble to his question. I think that the time for political posturing of any kind in respect to this question, if there was a time, is not now. We are charged with a responsibility to deal with this question. I am not here to chastise the previous administration in any way. I am not going to reflect on what the previous administration did or didn't do, nor am I going to be critical of the Federal Government for what it has done or failed to do. I don't think we have anything to gain in that kind of an inquiry. I think we're here with a mutuality of concern and to re-examine why someone said this or why someone said that may have some historic value, but I'm concerned about the future, Mr. Chairman, and I don't see any value in that.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I want to apologize to the Minister if in my country perspective of what is important and what is unimportant, I think it is quite important that Manitobans who may or may not have

made their decision on how to vote on the basis of a commitment by a political party during an election of an office in Washington, I think that it would be enlightening for this Committee when we are reviewing this government's intentions on Garrison, and how they are going to present the Manitoba case, to at least have some idea of what was the thought process, the conclusions drawn by the New Democratic Party whilst they were in Opposition to come up with the election promise of establishment of an office in there.

I think that is only a reasonable and fair question to ask at this time. I don't see anything particularly political about it, if you had an intention of five people, two people, one person. It is important to Manitobans now to have an idea of what predicated that election promise and on what basis the decision was made to make that as an election commitment.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I have indicated already that the New Democratic Party during the course of the election made a commitment based on its assessment of what was needed to be done to address the problem of mounting evidence that the Garrison project in the United States was going ahead. That undertaking was to fight as effectively as possible that development and the way perceived was to have a direct presence in Washington, and with that commitment I don't disagree, I believe that was and continues to be a sound decision.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that the Minister believes that was a sound and a fair decision, but as my colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain, pointed out it was somewhat different from the position put forward by the Official Opposition in discussion on the resolution concerning Garrison in May of 1980. It would be certainly most enlightening to know how the New Democratic Party position had changed and just what was envisioned in that change in terms of people and presence in Washington, and if the Minister is unwilling to share that information with us tonight that is certainly his prerogative, but the questions stem from the fact that it is a change in position that the Official Opposition held prior to the election and quite magically, shall I say, it became an election commitment which was not part and parcel of New Democratic Party opposition policy.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I had indicated and I don't know where the honourable member was when his colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain, was asking me these same questions, but I again will endeavour to indicate that the Garrison Project and Manitoba's position vis-a-vis the Garrison Project has not been static. It has changed. Changes have occurred in the United States, the developments of proceeding apace, funds that had been blocked have been freed. There is new importance, there is new urgency in registering the most effective opposition we can to that development.

Now, the change, as I have indicated to your colleague, in our position is one of degree. We have never said that we accept Garrison. The NDP administration prior to your administration did not even say we accept Garrison, they resisted Garrison, so your

administration resisted Garrison. We are resisting Garrison, we are resisting to a greater degree. Our change is one of degree, we are going to fight a little harder, we perceive, is the way we are going. There is no difference. The difference is one of how you go about it. It is like the difference between, Mr. Chairman, having the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain ask a few questions, evoke these answers, and then having a succession of the same questions put; it is a question of degree. If you want to register, if you want to keep on indicating some concern, you can do it over and over again. I'm not saying that takes away from your concern, but it is all a question of degree.

MR. ORCHARD: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of degree and I suppose in the eyes of the Opposition we want to know to what degree the new administration is stepping up there fight against Garrison. One thing that would be most helpful, which was the reason I asked you what did you have envisioned when you set out your platform election promise to set up an office in Washington, what did you envision in terms of staff, etc. etc. Now, you haven't answered that and I appreciate that is your prerogative. But if you are stepping up your degree of objection to Garrison, we want to know what you had envisioned so that we can get a handle on how many dollars you are going to spend. Here we have a Minister who is saying that things have changed, the government has changed, there is a greater degree of opposition to Garrison, there is an election promise of setting up an office in Washington and we come to the Estimates, Mr. Chairman, and the Minister has made no provision whatsoever for the funding. The Minister himself cautioned us when he started out on Garrison that he did not want politics to be made of this item, that he wanted us to work together in fighting Garrison, which we have done for the last ten years, with the Schreyer administration while we were Opposition and with the Lyon administration while the NDP were Opposition.

Here we have a Minister come along after an election promise has been made, he cannot give us the background as to what predicated that election promise, as to what the intention of the New Democratic Party was in terms of setting up an office; how many people, full-time staff, part-time staff, American staff, Canadian staff, what technical expertise, none of that information is available and he tells us that things have change that they have stepped up their opposition to Garrison. I repeat, we come to the Estimates of this Department and there is not even a guesstimate of an expenditure to help renew this fight against Garrison, this renewed and stepped-up fight against Garrison.

The Minister himself said about 10 minutes ago that the political will must be demonstrated by the Province of Manitoba, that the political will must be demonstrated. Well, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to the Minister that any Congressman and any Senator in the United States, who is astutely watching the new Government of Manitoba and what their position is going to be on Garrison, (1) has not received any formal communication from this new government, (2) is going to peruse the Estimates that come down two days ago and are going to see that there's no money

set aside for this Garrison office that was an election promise. Now, if the Minister thinks that we should demonstrate our political will, I suggest he go back to the drawing board and enter a line in this Estimate Book of his demonstrating his political will in terms of providing some funding for this stepped-up opposition. Because to date, Mr. Chairman, we have words and words only.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member is concerned about a line. I think that actions speak louder than words and we have already in the course of the short time we have been in office, by our communication with the Embassy in Washington, by our communications with the Federal Government, both by telex and by telephone and by personal visit, demonstrated initiative in this matter.

For the honourable member to say that Congressmen are going to be concerned because they don't see a line in our Estimates, I wish that were true. I wish that Congressmen and the United States of America Senators had an appreciation for what goes on in Canada like the honourable member perceives. The difficulty that we face is that many of our southern colleagues, if I can call them that, Congressmen and Senators have no perception of this country or of this province or its waterways, or insufficient perception of it, or the problems that we face in respect to this problem. We perceive that we have a real need to educate and explain to Congressmen and Senators throughout the length and breadth of the United States, that it's imprudent and unwise to divert water badly needed in the United States, divert it north into Canada. We have a great educational job to do. Then for the honourable member to be concerned to know what motivated the precise thinking? How many bodies were conceptualized as being in Washington, six people, seven people, two people? How big an office? How many dollars in the budget? It's what we do that counts.

I perceived in the questions of your colleague, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, a concern that we were going to be spending too much. Now if we had a line in the Budget for \$500,000, I can tell by the tone of the questions you'd be critical that was too much money. On the other hand, when I indicate that we are developing a very pragmatic and a very reasonable approach to costing and we're not going to commit ourselves to spending of large sums of money where that isn't warranted, there seems to be some criticism that we haven't put an arbitrary sum of money in the Budget. You can't have it both ways, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ORCHARD: Mr. Chairman, we are not asking to have it both ways; we are asking to have it one way. We want to know, basis an election campaign promise, which the Minister tells us now, let's not get politics involved in this; and lo and behold, his party comes out during an election campaign to appeal to a lobby group against Garrison by saying that we're going to have an office in Washington, which tonight he can't tell us how many people, how much space, what it's going to do. Now, you know — (Interjection) —

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would the Member for Roblin-

Russell like to — excuse me. Would the Member for Roblin-Russell like to give on the Speaker's list? — (Interjection) — Well, then, let the person speak.

The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: — (Interjection) — Maybe you can excuse yourself, then read it. There are proceedings going on now.

The Member for Pembina. — (Interjection) — Not allowed. If you want to read it, read it to yourself. If you want to read it out loud, there are other rooms in this . . .

The Member for Pembina.

MR. ORCHARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Minister has said again actions speak louder than words. It's what we do that counts. Mr. Chairman, that is why I reiterate the hollowness of what the Minister is saying. He's saying action speaks louder than words with no money in the Estimates. It's what we do that counts with no money in the Estimates.

If I were an American Congressman taking a look at a new government in the Province of Manitoba who is espousing during an election campaign that they are going to set up a lobby office in Washington, that they were making great words of concern, and then had absolutely no provision in the spending Estimates of his department to carry out that office location in Washington, I would question seriously if the words had any teeth in them. The teeth should have been put in the Estimates of spending to clearly demonstrate to Manitobans that you are serious about your election promise and to clearly demonstrate to the Americans even though my honourable friend has some concern that Americans don't know what goes on in Manitoba. I can assure you that the Americans know today that there is no provision for any funding of Garrison in your Estimates after you had made that election promise.

I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that your words have just meant practically nothing when you haven't put any money which translates into action on the Garrison Project and the office you promised in Washington. You've destroyed, in my estimation, the efforts you've put in in the last three months by failing to have any presence in dollars and cents in the Estimates of this department.

The Minister says that had he put in \$500,000, we would have objected because he was spending too much money. I don't know where he got this impression from any member of the Opposition tonight. We have not asked him whether he was going to spend what amount of dollars. He said \$150,000 and there was not one murmur of questioning of that figure by anybody in Her Majesty's Opposition here tonight. For him to make that kind of blatant assumption that we would have decreed that he was spending too much money if he had one-half million dollars in there is not factual, and it's not based on anything that has taken in this Committee tonight.

What we would have appreciated, Mr. Chairman, was the Minister doing as he has said twice tonight, that actions speak louder than words; it's what we do that counts. He has done nothing and that is what

concerns us in this renewed and invigorated and expanded action that his government is going to take against Garrison. It translates into nothing according to these Estimates and that is of great concern to Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition and it is of great concern to those Manitobans who listened to an election promise of increased action. I'd like to know how the Minister can sit there and not be concerned about the public perception of what his government is doing on Garrison.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, you'll pardon me if I smile at this stage because the honourable member continues to say that; I thought that I'd made it clear that I think it's time, you know, that we look forward and not look backward on this. I have invited all colleagues in the House to join in respect to the concern and how we best approach it, but the honourable member continues to flog the question of the absence of a line in the Estimates.

Well, in the days ahead, Mr. Chairman, before this Session is out, the honourable member will have an opportunity to review what progress we are making in respect to our initiatives in respect to Garrison. The initiatives in respect to Garrison will not be over next week; they'll not be over next month; they'll not be over next year. The honourable member will have ample opportunity to make an evaluation, a political evaluation, closer to the favourable day that he wants. If he wants to make political gain on this issue, he'll have ample opportunity for that. At this juncture I am not the least bit defensive about the fact that we don't have a line in our Estimates. We will be spending money. I am hopeful that the honourable members will appreciate and approve of the dollars we spend in connection with our initiatives.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, once again the Minister says he wants us to look forward and not backward, and we looked forward in the Estimates to some provision for funding for the Washington Office for the increased lobby against Garrison, and let me assure you we have a lot of backward looking to do because it's not in the Estimates and that is what causes the Opposition concern.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Chairman, allow me to, at this time, for the record indicate my disappointment that Mr. Allen Scarth is no longer providing counsel to this Minister and the government on this particular matter. Mr. Scarth, aside from being very capable, the issue was a very personal one to him. I know that the kind of advice he provided to Mr. Green, to Mr. Schreyer, to Mr. Ransom and to myself was of the highest quality. I can recall all too often being called Saturday morning, Sunday mornings at the ranch, or him being in my office before office hours at quarter to eight to be on top of anything that was breaking, either in Ottawa or in Washington or in North Dakota, on this matter. I certainly would be remiss if I didn't acknowledge the services to Manitobans by Mr. Scarth in this instance.

I make a point of saying that not to reflect in any way about the capabilities of a Mr. Birt, whom I don't know, I accept the Minister's statement that he is highly

qualified to carry on this work. As we all know, this is a matter that isn't going to disappear tomorrow, next month, or next year, to use the Minister's own wordings; it's been with us for 10 years and will likely be with us for another number of years, and so that continuity of advice, continuity of counsel, continuity of those persons most knowledgeable in dealing with the personalities involved seems to me to be of utmost importance, and that obviously Manitobans have lost in the fact that we no longer have the services of Mr. Scarth in that capacity.

Mr. Chairman, I will not repeat what my colleagues have so capably dwelt on. Under the questioning of my colleague, the Member for Turtle Mountain, the Minister could not really indicate any serious change or could not point out a change of policy from that which previous administrations have held in this matter. I think Mr. Minister, upon reading the record of tonight's questioning, will have to come to that same conclusion; so therefore we are left really with what the Member for Pembina has pointed out. We are dealing with the Estimates of government spending, and in particular the Department of Natural Resources. We have no firm answer as to the scale of assistance to be offered. What we have been very much aware of by the Minister in the Chamber, and through the media during the election and post-election, that, and I can't find a different word for it, but a considerable amount of electioneering grandstanding has taken place for which we have not been able to attach any particular dollars, because that is a way that we measure, in dealing with the Estimates, a government's commitment to a particular program.

Mr. Chairman, I put those remarks on the record. I am genuinely disturbed that a person with the kind of dedication, who has demonstrated his capability in serving administrations of different political hues, such as Mr. Scarth, is no longer actively involved in the ongoing discussions that we will have to have. It would seem to me that he would have been a very natural person to have been involved in whatever setup that the Minister intends to create. When asked precisely what kind of a group will be co-ordinating and heading this new group, again we have very vague and indefinite answers.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make one other comment. The Minister indicates the necessity of educating American Senators and Congressmen, and I couldn't agree with him more; not just on this issue but the abysmal ignorance of our American colleagues on Canadian affairs keeps demonstrating itself over and over again.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this government is more concerned about educating Manitobans who need precious little education on the matter of the Garrison. We know what it's going to do to Lake Winnipeg. We know what it's going to do to our water quality and we know what the problems are in the terms of Manitoba, so are we setting up the office in this building to educate Manitobans, to politicize Manitobans about the matter, or are we genuinely and seriously worried about educating those people that are most in need of that education, American Senators and American Congressmen?

It seems to me that when my Leader, a few years ago, took the trouble and the time, both in pamphlet

form, in letter form, and by direct visit, that was perceived at the time to be the kind of action that the Opposition took some offense to. Mr. Chairman, I want to see that action directed to the American Congress, the American Senate. Those are the people that, in the final analysis, are going to interpret the Boundary Waters Treaty in a way that will not be harmful to Canada. That's where the education needs to be directed quite frankly, not to too many people in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I'm satisfied, having put those comments on the record, to have this matter move on. I should indicate that, of course, there are many other members that will want to speak on this and/or other items having to do in this appropriation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't planning to speak on this issue again until the Minister indicated that I had somehow indicated that he might be spending too much money on this subject. That was never indicated in my questioning, Mr. Chairman. My questioning was directed to try and determine what the government intended to do, and if possible, to offer some advice if I felt that what they were doing might weaken the position instead of strengthen it, because having been a Minister of the department for some years, I have had some exposure to the various arguments related to this issue. I was in no way reflecting on the possibility that they might be spending too much money.

But let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, what I have determined from listening to the discussion. The Minister has identified, he says a need for more research in Manitoba. I don't know what that is supposed to be, what research is required, because the study group that reported to the International Joint Commission established what the possible damages were to Manitoba and determined that the risk was simply too great to accept and any further study in my view is not going to prove very much. Our case is already about as strong as it can be as a consequence of the report to the International Joint Commission, but the Minister has said more research is needed, although he hasn't explained to us what research that would be or what purpose it's going to serve.

I have heard no clear statement from the Minister about what they are going to do with a presence in Washington; how the people are going to operate there in Washington compared to how the interests had been represented before. I have learned that there is no money present in the Estimates to establish that presence, to do any of the research that the Minister says is necessary. I have determined that they have a new legal advisor working on this question. I've determined that there is no person within the department who can be named who is co-ordinating activities with respect to Garrison.

The one thing I have learned that has been done, is that there has been an information office established to tell Manitobans about the problem with Garrison. It has always been my concern, my understanding for the past four years, that Manitobans understand this issue very well. They know that it is not in their interest, they know they are opposed to it, and they

want their government to know what they are doing in attempting to oppose it. Mr. Chairman, my confidence has not been heightened by listening to the answers of the Minister.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have indicated in answers to the extensive questions by members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition that we are making provision for the spending. There will be money provided. We haven't got the precise dollar figures worked out because the arrangement with Ottawa have not been confirmed. I have indicated in my answers that my Deputy Minister and the entire Ministry of Natural Resources is in being and capable of dealing with the matters in connection with Garrison.

When the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain questioned me about the cost, he indicated was it going to cost as much as \$150,000.00. If I implied from those questions that he was concerned about whether or not it was going to cost all that much, then I may have been in error. He seemed to be implying a real concern as to whether or not we would have to spend that kind of money. I indicated in my answers that what we did have to spend would be carefully spent. I did perceive some concern about how much this was going to cost and I didn't feel that there's anything wrong with that questioning. But to suggest that we haven't provided any money in align is, I think, being a little nice about the question, because there's no doubt in anyone's mind as to the fact that government does frequently — it's commonplace — for a program to be initiated without there being a budgetary provision made. It's provided by special warrant. My honourable friends have done that time in and time out during their term in office and to question our doing it now, I think is being a little different.

Now, the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain is concerned about what I talked about with research; well Senator Mark Andrews has accused us of not being specific in respect to our concerns in respect to biota transfer and my department has confirmed to me that we need more specifics in respect to the biota problems, because there wasn't a great deal of work done in that respect earlier and there needs to be more work done in that field.

Now, in respect to the generality of those concerns again, Mr. Chairman, I've indicated that we are prepared to make every effort to make sure that we have as far as possible a non-partisan approach to the problems. I've asked the honourable members not to look back. If they continue to want to look back, alright then, Mr. Chairman, I'll be quite content to have Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition informed, but just looking on, if that's the position they want to take. —(Interjection)— No it's not a threat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Morris.

MR. CLAYTON MANNESS (Morris): I'd like to ask the Minister, have there been or will there will be any additions to External Affairs offices in Washington, so that those persons can deal directly with this issue?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

MR. MACKLING: I'm not in a position to comment on those specifics until later on as I've indicated.

MR. MANNES: What guarantees or assurances have we received from Ottawa that they will devote greater diplomatic efforts to this whole effort?

MR. MACKLING: I can't speak for Ottawa, but I can indicate that at our meeting with the Ministers that I referred to, they indicated a genuine concern in respect to Garrison; recognized the changes that had occurred in Washington in respect to it, and agreed with us that more should be done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Member for Roblin-Russell.

MR. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin-Russell): I thank you, Mr. Chairman, I just have a couple of brief questions. I am most concerned about this matter being in the Throne Speech and not aligned in the Estimates that are before us. I maybe shouldn't blame this Minister because he was only appointed in the last little while to the portfolio. In his earlier remarks, Mr. Chairman, in the debate, he told this committee that he's going to ensure that Ottawa is working with us. I think that's verbatim, as he put it. Could he give me an idea as how he's going to proceed with that type of liason with Ottawa to ensure that they're working better with us than he did before? Does that involve more dollars? Does it involve a new approach or is it something that hasn't happened before?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I don't know how the Honourable Member from Roblin-Russell expects me to answer that question when I have refused to answer similar questions of his colleagues. I am not in a position at this stage to indicate the nature of the particular arrangements that will be in effect with the Federal Government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell with a further question.

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Honourable Minister mentioned he's going to set up an all-party representation from this province. Is that in Ottawa or is that in Washington? He mentioned that it's going to be all parties, that's the Progressives, the Liberals, the Conservatives and the NDP; and how many?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I indicated at the outset my concern that this not be a partisan issue; that we not look backwards but look forwards in respect to this. I really haven't changed my thinking on that, although I have been concerned about the nature of the questions that have been put to me tonight.

MR. McKENZIE: If I may, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister told this committee that he's setting up an all-party representation and I think it's only fair for the committee, because we're expending taxpayers' dollars, to indicate to the committee if he can. Is that

going to be, this committee — are they are going to be federal people? Are they going to be MLA's? Are they going to be legal people and where is he going to set the committee up? In Washington, in Ottawa or just in this building?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I don't know where the Honourable Member was to have heard me say that I was going to set up an all-member committee. I said no such thing. I said that in my expectation it will be desirable that there be all-party representation from time to time on this question. I didn't talk about all-party committees or associations.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, then is this an ad hoc committee, may I ask the Honourable Minister?

MR. MACKLING: No committee.

MR. McKENZIE: No committee. So basically it's kind of a smokescreen, may I ask the Minister? But actually the committee is not going to be set up. There'll be all-party representation, is that the way he said it? But actually it is not going to be an active committee with an appointed chairman, et cetera.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member will have to await the development of that kind of thing. I have indicated what I perceive to be possible, and among things possible with goodwill, I can see joint representation being made in respect to this matter. With a lack of goodwill that may not occur.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Roblin-Russell, any further questions?

MR. McKENZIE: The Honourable Minister can be assured of the goodwill of this MLA, I guarantee him. But on the other hand I have a duty to the taxpayers that I represent in my constituency who want to know what we are doing with the taxpayers' dollars and how we are spending them, and we have these spending Estimates before us. We don't have a line on this subject matter, the Minister refuses to tell us how much money he is going to spend. He doesn't have a figure and yet there it is in the Throne Speech, "Manitoba will be represented in Washington." Washington, it said and I think I have some justification in asking these questions. Now can I ask the Honourable Minister, Mr. Chairman, this publicity program that he is going to put on as was raised earlier, I don't think there is a man, woman or child in this province, in fact of all of Canada, that doesn't thoroughly understand the Garrison problem. So I am taking it for granted that those dollars will be expended some place outside of Manitoba, because I have not yet seen anybody in this province that doesn't support the Schreyer government or the Lyon government and their position on Garrison, Mr. Chairman. So I wonder what kind of a publicity campaign is he proposing and if he is going to campaign in Washington he needs more bucks than he is talking about here tonight. Just on behalf of the taxpayers in my constituency alone, I am not worried about the other MLAs, what kind of a figure is he looking at for this publicity campaign?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I have resisted and I will continue to resist trying to precisely identify for my colleagues here the cost of publicity campaigns; we will of course want to be effective, but we will want to be prudent. On the other hand, I must disagree with the honourable member that everyone knows and completely understands the issues in respect to Garrison. I would like that to be the case, but I think it is important that Manitobans who travel to the United States, and where there are American visitors coming here, are able to articulate our concerns in a rational and in a reasonable and in an informed way to help the understanding of Americans in respect to our concerns. I think that we owe it to our citizens first to ensure that they are informed as to where the problems lie and how we are proposing to deal with them.

MR. McKENZIE: I thank the Honourable Minister, Mr. Chairman. I wonder then, could the Honourable Minister advise the Committee before they closed off this department, would he come out with a public statement of the expenditures that are expected, roughly, in fairly broad figures, that we can take back to our constituents and say, we apologize, the line is not in the Estimates that are before us, but these taxpayers' dollars in this province are going to be expended to set up this Washington office? I would like to tell the people in Roblin-Russell — I don't know about the other MLAs — what it is going to cost us. Before we close off these Estimates, will the Minister give the Committee that assurance?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, about a month and a-half, two months hence, something like, that we had a debate on the Budget. I am reasonably confident that by that time we will have confirmed the arrangements certainly with the Federal Government. We will have a better assessment as to what our publicity costs will be and I think at that time, I will be able to give some precision to the overall costs.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, am I to take back the words to the people in my constituency that we are giving this Minister a free rein. He has not a line in his Estimates; no, he can expend whatever he wants. It is in the Speech from the Throne; it was an election promise and this government has not got the courage or the audacity to tell this Committee what it is going to cost. Is that the kind of a government that we have in this province today, Mr. Chairman?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, the House has to approve Supplementary Estimates, Supplementary Supply, and during the course of the Budget the honourable member will have ample time to inform his constituents through his rhetoric in the House as to the excesses in our funding.

MR. ORCHARD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to make any further comment, but the Minister has made one statement in there that governments — I think he meant specifically our administration — frequently institutes new programming without Estimate funding and often does it by special warrant. Mr. Chairman, that is one thing I think I am knowledgeable enough about our budgeting procedures and our

estimate procedures; that is something we did not do in a matter of the importance of Garrison. I want to recall once again to the Minister that it was an election promise by his government; it was a Throne Speech commitment and I don't find fault with him personally because he is new to this department. But I do find an extreme fault in failure with the Estimate process that his colleagues went through in that they are going to leave this Minister with the lame and the weak excuse that frequently programs are introduced and funded by special warrant when, (1) it was an election promise and one of considerable high profile; (2) of sufficient profile to this new administration to mention specifically in the Throne Speech and to fail at any commitment whatsoever to funding. I cannot accept that from this Minister and I regret that his colleagues have hung him out to dry on this one in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, I just have a problem with this in that what we have gotten so far is nothing but purely political motivation upon the new government and no desire, no commitment, no plan in how they are going to carry out an election promise. I do not believe that they had the slightest idea as to what they were committing themselves to in the election, because they have since met with the Federal Government and I believe been straightened out. We'll see when this announcement is made in the next couple of days and I am deeply disappointed, as I know the Manitobans who are concerned about Garrison are disappointed in that to date we have had words, words, words and no action and no funding.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, we have had words tonight; we have had questions tonight. I have indicated what we have done thus far, I will be indicating shortly further on that. Since these initiatives are new, there is nothing cast in stone about how much this is going to cost. We are going to be pragmatic in that, and so I am not in a position to say it's going to cost \$500,000, \$250,000 or \$50,000 and we are going to spend, but we are going to spend wisely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, in respect to the need to educate Manitobans, it may very well be that the Minister is correct in his statement in that regard, but I must say that during four years of being in government, I never encountered one person in Manitoba, not one Manitoban, who was in favour of the Garrison Project. I think Manitobans are universally opposed to Garrison, so I'm not entirely sure what is going to be gained by an educational effort for Manitobans. Perhaps, if you're planning to educate Manitobans so they'll serve as Ambassadors to the U. S. so they can explain it better, that's a possibility. I hope that we'll be able to demonstrate that actually happened.

I also heard Senator Andrews' comments about the no research indicating what the impact of Garrison would be. I had great difficulty in understanding how he could possibly make that kind of comment, Mr. Chairman, and it struck me that what had to be done there was that the technical report of the Committee that reported to the IJC, would have to be placed before Senator Andrews, because in my view it demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt that there was

the possibility of very significant damage to the fisheries and to the waters in Manitoba and that risk was unacceptable. I think there is a danger — and I hope that the Minister will take this as a very serious concern — I think there is a danger in succumbing to the suggestion that more research is required, because by doing that and by beginning more research, you will be acknowledging that there is some substance to what the Senator has said.

I always took the position, Mr. Chairman, that the report which had been done for the International Joint Commission was the ultimate analysis and projection of what the impact of Garrison would be. I think that the Minister would be well advised to continue to stick to that report and nothing else and don't acknowledge for a minute that there is necessity of additional research. You don't need additional research to demonstrate to Manitobans that they don't want this project. Manitobans, every man and woman know that they don't want this project. What you have to convince Senator Andrews of is that we already have that information and that it has been determined by the International Joint Commission that there is an unacceptable risk to Manitoba.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I think that to the extent that we improve the knowledge of Manitobans in respect to this issue, we strengthen our position and I think that's necessary. I think that there may be a great many people who know about Garrison, and I would agree with the honourable members that anyone that knows about Garrison is not favourably inclined toward it. What we want to ensure is that as many people, as many Manitobans as possible, know about it; and knowing about it, then will be opposed to it. There are people, I'm sure, in this province that really don't understand what it's all about. We want to enlist the help of everyone in respect to that.

Regarding the research, I agree with the honourable member that we don't indicate to Senator Mark Andrews or anyone else that the evidence that was presented to the International Joint Commission was inadequate. However, I am indicating here that my understanding is, through my Department staff, that we can improve upon the knowledge we have in respect to the effect of the foreign biota in our system, therefore, the better to prove our argument in respect to the reaction, the destruction of our fresh water fishery. I'm not saying that there wasn't sufficient, I'm saying that we can improve the argument by looking and by researching further. That's my understanding.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, I warn the Minister there is a danger involved in that because the report which was made to the International Joint Commission was made on the basis of information gathered by some of the best brains available in both the United States and Canada. There was agreement amongst experts from both sides of the border on that technical report; and it was accepted by the International Joint Commission. Unless further research is done in the same way, then you risk concentrating the discussion on the validity of your research and not on the issue that the International Joint Commission has clearly identified, which is that the risk is there and it is unacceptable.

MR. MACKLING: I don't want to argue this at length. It has been indicated to me that we could improve the extent of our research in respect to the effect of the biota in our system.

It's not to say that the evidence that was placed before the International Joint Commission of itself is not sufficient, but if we can add to the quantitative proof that we have in respect to the reaction on our fishery, that will supplement our case, rather than take away from it.

MR. RANSOM: Mr. Chairman, if Manitoba can attempt to add to the information that is there, then North Dakota can attempt to detract from it and to prove you're wrong. This is a point that has been very carefully considered over the years since the International Joint Commission Report was made and I simply urge the Minister to look very carefully at this question for himself and not to be unduly swayed by people who may not have the depth of understanding of this issue that is necessary to really make the decisions that are going to be in the best interests of Manitobans. I know it is always easy to call for more research. That's sort of a standard thing to do is to call for more research. I ask the Minister to examine that question very carefully before he makes that decision.

MR. MACKLING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, the honourable member can be assured that a very careful assessment of that will be made before any decision is made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My concern was along the same line. I read the article that appeared in the paper on the statement that Senator Mark Andrews had made that Canada had never done a scientific study and that the effects of the Garrison Dam on Canada could not be based on scientific fact because we had not done the study.

I wonder, has the Minister sent a letter of objection asking withdrawal from Senator Mark Andrews for making a statement such as that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

MR. MACKLING: No, Mr. Chairman, I have not. I don't think I'm going to get ugly with Senator Andrews.

MR. BROWN: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that we're asking the Minister to get ugly with Senator Mark Andrews, but it seems to me when somebody obviously is making a statement which is not based on fact, it should be drawn to his attention that there is such a study; that we're talking about scientific facts and possibly a copy should be sent to Senator Mark Andrews, a copy of the study, along with a letter asking him to withdraw the statements that he had made. It can be done in a friendly way.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think maybe the member may be right; maybe it could be done. I really do think it's like carrying coals to Newcastle because I'm convinced that Senator Andrews knows that there was a study, he knows the results of that and we're involved in not merely a difference of opin-

ion. He is determined to have his way in respect to that project and he's saying things that I believe he knows to be not completely correct.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're on 4.(a)(1).

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, there are so few things that go down these days. I'm intrigued why the salaries of the administration of the Water Resources Department is down by some \$7,000.00. Did Mr. Weber actually take that pay cut or is there some other explanation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister.

MR. MACKLING: We've got a problem, just a moment. I'm advised that one position was reclassified down, that's what happened.

MR. ENNS: Can you confirm, was that Mr. Weber's position?

MR. MACKLING: I can confirm it was not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4.(a)(2)—pass; 4.(b)(1).

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, on this item, on Water Licensing, I'm sure that you want to have a fairly intensive discussion. I'm looking at the time, it reads 10 o'clock, I wonder whether or not there's a disposition on the part of the Committee for the Committee to rise. It's up to the members of the Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN, Jerry T. Storie (Flin Flon): I would like to direct the attention of the members to the Gallery on my left where there is a group from the 42nd Wolf Cub Pack. They are in the Seven Oaks Constituency and under the direction of Mr. Lloyd Price.

SUPPLY - COMMUNITY SERVICES AND CORRECTIONS

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would direct your attention to Page 24 of the Estimates Book we're on 1.(e)(1) Salaries.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. At the time of the dinner hour break the Minister was responding, I believe, to a question, or perhaps a position that I put to him, with respect to the challenge of carrying out the requirements of the regulation for standards of care in Guest Homes and Guest Home facilities throughout the province; the obligations of the province and the department to meet requirements that are encountered in this field from the point of view of the health care of the residents, in addition to the physical safety of their surroundings. I had raised the point at the time, Mr. Chairman, that the previous government, the government of which I was honoured to be a member,

wrestled with this same challenge and I recognize that there is no easy answer to it but certainly, easy or not, the answer does not lie in theory. There is no disagreement, I am sure, on either side of this House, that the responsibilities that need to be discharged in this area are essentially the responsibilities of Public Health nurses, Community Health workers and the like; nor is there any disagreement that we have a substantial, whether it's sufficient or not is open to debate, but a substantial field capability of Public Health nurses and a somewhat less substantial field capability, but a significant one nevertheless, of Community Health workers. But the question is, whether, in view of the caseloads that all those dedicated professionals carry in the Community Services field, they are able to cope with the responsibilities that have been laid on them by implication, through the establishment of regulations governing the operational standards of guest homes. This was, if not question number one, it was at least question number two or three that we faced some two years ago when we first addressed the need for standardization of levels of operation and care in the guest home field. The Minister has reminded us that we do have such professionals in the field and I accept this, but that doesn't answer the question as to whether they can cope with this additional responsibility.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, I think I had asked him about the whole area of nutrition and proper diet which was another matter of concern when we were looking at this subject. I want to say that I am not arguing for a moment that something is not better than nothing; certainly something is better than nothing, and certainly before there were standards and regulations it could be argued that in some guest homes, and in some guest home environments, there was nothing in the way of what we are discussing here to ensure the proper environment and proper monitoring of medication and the general physical well-being of guest home residents.

So, whatever we do is a step of progress and I don't dispute that, but we were reminded by the Opposition of the Day two years ago, and quite legitimately, that there were needs out there in the guest home population and once the government, and we certainly had the support of the Opposition of the Day in doing it, once the former government did move in this direction, we agreed with the consensus of the Legislature of the Day that those needs had to be part and parcel of the guest home package that was being put together. The Minister certainly would not have accepted from me or from my colleague, the former Minister of Community Services, the rather bland answer that we have Public Health nurses and Community Health workers in the system. I am sure he wouldn't have accepted that, in fact, I know that at the time he did not accept that, although his responsibilities were in another area at that time, and I simply put that position to him now; nor can we accept that kind of generalization from him. What has got to be done if standards and regulations are going to work, what has got to be done if indeed we are serious about improving the level of the guest homes in the province, what has got to be done if indeed we mean that the living environment and the atmosphere for those residents in those guest homes is to be up to a certain

standard, that their health is as important as their bed, is that we have to put personnel in place who can get round to those guest homes and follow up on the persons in the residences in question insofar as they need monitoring, in respect to their health.

So I return to that question at this point, Mr. Chairman, as we return to the consideration of this item. What is the government doing? What has the Minister got in place now to put the proper personnel into the circuit, into the system, to monitor those homes, to follow up on discharged patients, to follow up on post-mentally ill patients, to follow up on the person who has to take 3 types of pills 3 times a day and who, because it's human nature among a lot of us, will not take them in that proper sequence, will not take them in that proper order, unless someone is watching to see that he or she does so? And what is being done to ensure that they are getting at least two meals a day and that the meals are adequate from a nutritional point of view? That's a fair question because it was put to us two years ago; in fact, it's a central and fundamental component of this whole concept, otherwise we might as well have standards and regulations. We might as well operate on the free-wheeling, carte blanche basis in the guest-home field that existed prior to the development of the regulations and the standards.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I'm not quite sure what the specific question was that the honourable member was raising.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, my question is what is the Minister doing to make sure there are enough people and the right people in the system and in the circuit to make this whole concept work?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Sherman, I think this is a bit repetitive. I don't mind discussing it further, but I tried to assure the Honourable Member for Fort Garry before the supper-hour break that we had indeed, and as he knows, a fairly broad range of personnel in the field from different backgrounds with different particular skills in the guest home field.

Well, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated also, this was one reason we thought there should be an increase in the staff and I would be pleased therefore, I'm sure I can look forward to the members support, when I advise him and other members of the House that we found it necessary to increase the regional personal services staff by 20. It's going from 250.5 staff years to 270.5 staff years. We think that's a considerable increase in staff and I think it should go some way to relieving the concerns that have been expressed by the member for Fort Garry.

Perhaps this is an appropriate time to give the member this listing of SMYs as we call them, as I promised him before the supper break. If he has some specific suggestions with regard to guest-home inspection and upgrading I'd be pleased to get them. As I am advised by staff, the matter is in hand and we're proceeding expeditiously. One of the problems, as the member knows, is the matter of identifying them; where are they out there? I believe we read off some figures showing that to a large extent we have 163 identified and we've had 106 applied for a licence

so that to a large extent we've zeroed in on the number that we think are out there that have to be reviewed and inspected and licenses issued. As I said, 19 licenses have been issued, 87 inspections are commenced over and above the 19, so that's 106. The 106 is the total applications for licenses received and that breakdown: 87 inspections commenced, 19 licenses issued. Perhaps the Page would like to give this information on staff years to the member.

MR. SHERMAN: I would like to thank the Minister for that list, Mr. Chairman, that is important to the general view of the Estimates for this whole department, thank you. I appreciate receiving it.

I want to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, whether the 20 or 20.5 staff man years that are being added to the regional field service delivery system in this connection or represent personnel who are assigned to the office of residential care, to the guest home field or whether they are part of a general expansion in regional field services staff.

MR. EVANS: The staff we've been talking about are for the general operations in the field, whatever they may be, not specifically for guest homes. As a matter of fact I think that that would be totally inappropriate to have 20 people just to be, as I said rather facetiously before the supper hour, "guest home inspectors." As I gather, that is not necessary.

But you're right, there is an overload of cases and so on to some degree and this is one way of coping with it and this is what it is. It's simply a general increase of the field operation in order to better cope with the case load that they've got. In doing so, we're able to cope with other problems as well as the guest home licensing.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, it's a bit difficult to stick precisely to the line that we're supposed to be on in the examination of these Estimates because of the transfer of a certain number of responsibilities and functions over to help so I will try to stick to the line, but I have to refer to a couple of other things in order to put the questions that I want to put.

The Minister has said that the field service delivery system complement is going to be expanded by 20 SMYs in regional personal services which we haven't come to yet, but I have to refer to it because of my question and that's a welcome initiative. But Regional Personal Services had an SMY complement at this time last year, or very recently at the current time, Mr. Chairman, of 750, provided all those positions were filled — there might have been some vacancies — but the establishment was for 750; 726 was the situation a year ago; then 24 were added in the past year for a total of 750.

The 24 that were added in the past year were the best that the government could get out of an initial request by the department for something like nine additional staff man years in Regional Personal Services and certainly 24 was a welcome addition, but it represented one-third of what the Minister's own officials sitting in front of him felt was needed in the field. It was all that could be funded and financed at the time. They were required because of needs in the regional field delivery system generally right across

the spectrum whether it was Public Health Nursing or whether it was Child and Family Services or whether it was Employment Services. So what the Minister is proposing to add now in this year's increase are another 20 SMYs who are needed in those general services. The Minister suggests that I am being repetitive but I am trying not to be but I have to come back to the basic question as to how he proposes to conduct and enforce these standards of care or monitoring that are required in the guest home spectrum.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: I just want to remind the honourable member that he is not cognizant of the fact that in 1978 the government in which he was a member had a very serious cutback in staff and they were either positions deleted — maybe some of them were vacant — but there were approximately 100 SMYs deleted as a restraint measure. Now that was both Health and Community Services, I believe. But nevertheless I don't know whether the situation at that time was such that that kind of a cutback was warranted. I think that's where a lot of the overload, the heavy case work that the member talks about, perhaps that emanates from that large cutback at that time.

But the fact is, there was a deletion of about 100 staff positions in 1978 and mind you, since then there has been some increase and here is another bit of an increase now. I believe the Minister of Health may have something to say about some additional staff increases in the field still trying to make up for the cuts that occurred three or four years ago.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, that may be although it's not precisely accurate in the implication that it makes. But even if it were precisely accurate, the fact of the matter is there was no guest home program at that time. Whatever reductions were made at that time were made through a process of attrition; they were vacancies that were not filled. I would suspect there're some vacancies in the establishment right now. I recognize that the establishment of 750 no longer applies to this department. Approximately 500 of them, I presume, have gone over to Health, leaving it around 200-and-some-odd, perhaps 250 in this department. But I would estimate that there are probably some vacancies right now in that establishment. There certainly have been vacancies in the north, in regional personal services, that our government tried very diligently for a period of a year to fill, in various sub-offices of the Norman and Thompson regions.

The problem that the Minister and the government face today is that there is a new services being created within the system now, and that is the Guest Home Standard And Monitoring Service. And if he is suffering from what was a fairly tight rein on the Regional Personal Services field staff during the early years of the previous government's administration, and he feels that he still has something with which he has to cope in that regard, then I simply suggest to him that it underscores the import of the question that I originally put. If he feels that Regional Personal Services was not at a level and a complement and an establishment in terms of SMYs that was required, and that the previous government did not meet the necessary

target in terms of numbers of personnel — well, he was given the opportunity on November 17th, 1981, to do something about it. We could debate that all night; he may be right, he may be wrong; I may be right, I may be wrong; but he obviously feels that Regional Personal Services didn't have enough people in it. We felt last year it didn't have enough people in it.

We went originally, in our preliminary Estimates process, to looking at a request for an increase of some 90-94 personnel and the best we could get, and the Minister fully knows the process one has to go through, was 24. Now, if he feels that the Regional Personal Services complement has been short-changed, does it matter how it was short-changed, or who it was short-changed by? He's the Minister now, he belongs to the party that is the government now, he had obviously some dispute with the position that we took. Is he going to do anything about it? Because I don't think with the objectives and the concepts that we're striving to achieve in the guest home system, and he was a member of the Opposition that put it to the government to which I belong, very bluntly, and very clearly. And I don't think with those objectives that he's going to be able to meet them, at the level of personnel that he's contemplating.

Particularly, I think if he had 20 new SMYs going into the guest home field it would be an excellent start, Mr. Chairman, perhaps sufficient to cope with what has to be done. But they're going into the regular functions of the Regional Personal Services Branch, and the time they get to spend on guest-home care, and the monitoring of the conditions under which guest-home residents live, will be the tag end of their work shift. It'll be the end of the work day, and the end of the week, and it'll be that extra load, and that extra job that they just haven't got time to do properly. I think he should be giving very serious consideration to establishment, in order to get this system off the ground and working properly, of a team of social workers, a multidisciplinary team of social workers, that is assigned specifically to follow through for the next year to ensure that the guest-home intentions, and objectives do find themselves solidly established. Once that base is built, it would probably be relatively simple to spread the work load among the case loads of the regular personnel in the Field Services delivery team.

But something has got to be done to get the program established and moving; perhaps a special unit, a special team, and a special commitment for a year or so, is worth considering. I think he's going to have difficulty on the basis of the numbers of personnel that he has specified are included in the request that he's making in these Estimates.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister, where for example, are the community mental health workers going to come from? There will be community mental health workers needed, post-discharge personnel needed to look after hospital discharges, and the mental health field is one of the crucial fields requiring that kind of personnel. Where are they going to come from? Are the staff man years that are being added to the field, the Regional Personal Services Team, going to include some community mental health workers, specifically?

MR. EVANS: First of all, the member is now asking questions beyond the office of residential care. We have a small staff in here of five people, and it's their job to organize the resources of the department, and particularly the field staff, to ensure that we can direct those resources, as required, to this particular problem that the member is referring to.

So it's really a question of organizing existing resources, and if the member wants to go on and talk about, who makes up the field staff, the regional staff, that something that we should discuss under the appropriate item, which is under Page 25, Item 3, Community Social Services Regional Operations. But when this program started, I gather that there was no particular identification of the need for new staff at that time, because it was recognized it was going to be a slow process. The department had already gone through a similar process in identifying and of making sure that 100 group homes for children were licensed and inspected, and up to the standards that we thought that they should be up to. So that process had already been gone through. Now, the same office in effect, is taking on this responsibility which started last year. I submit to the member that if he went out and hired a whole raft of personnel, an army of people, and you rushed out to look at just guest homes, I wonder what do they do after the initial licensing, and after the initial inspection and so forth. That is not necessarily the best way of getting the most efficient use of staff. It's far better to use the personnel that you have in the field who have expertise in different areas; people who know what the problems of the mentally retarded are, home economists or human ecologists as they are now called who know something about nutrition and so on, and we think that we can get the most efficient return for the dollar of staff resources in this way. The main thing is that we ensure that if there is a complaint out there, that if there is a problem that we know of in any community, that we zero in on it immediately. That, I understand has been done. To the best of our ability we have been meeting all complaints. It's a slow process admittedly. Part of the slowness is the identification of these so-called guest homes and it's proceeding and it seems to be proceeding well. To do what the honourable member suggests may be a misallocation of resources. At any rate, if he wants to get into the debate or review of what the field staff is doing, I suggest we discuss it under 3(a), Regional Personal Services.

MR. SHERMAN: That's acceptable, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister what changes there have been, if any, in the past few months, and what may be contemplated, if anything, in the way of change in the coming fiscal year with respect to this office's responsibilities for monitoring of residential group homes related, for example, to The Child Welfare Act and in the fields of mental health and mental retardation and in the field of the infirm elderly and the infirm elderly programs. Last year there were some additional staff that was provided specifically, Mr. Chairman, to deal with the increased involvement that the office had with facilities for the mentally retarded and the elderly. I would appreciate the Minister's advice as to whether that is being expanded in any way; whether it's going to continue to be pursued;

whether there were any other changes relative to the office's responsibilities to those group homes in the areas that I've referred to which are independent of the guest home field.

MR. EVANS: As I indicated to the honourable member earlier, we've successfully inspected and licensed up to 100 group homes for children although it's down to 88 now. There's been some disappearance of those types and that's deliberate. When you ask about what are we doing in the area of inspecting homes that house mentally retarded, many of these people are in these guest homes so I don't know how you can just separate or say you want to talk about being mentally retarded, for example, apart from the guest homes because quite a few are in the so-called guest homes. But as I said, I referred to the children; it's been an ongoing process that's well under way. It's a fait accompli or it's a task that has been completed but has to carry on. There's been a successful and thorough licensing to our knowledge of all such children's group homes. I don't know what else new that the honourable member would like us to undertake.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that the government should be entertaining anything new. I'm fully aware that some people in guest homes suffer from mental handicaps, whether it's mild mental retardation or mental ill health, but there are specific residential group homes that would not be classified as guest homes, that serve persons in the mental retardation community and the mental health community specifically. They're not part of the 163 or 165 guest homes which we are looking at, which are essentially are rooming houses, boarding houses. My question is simply whether the office of residential care is embarked on any different initiatives or any change, or contemplating any change, with respect to the monitoring requirements that they pursue in the fields of mental retardation and mental health and those group homes specifically.

MR. EVANS: I should remind the member that the regulations we have in place refer to these facilities as residential care facilities and as such, this term and regulations relate to all facilities serving over four clients. So it doesn't matter whether they've got problems with alcoholism; whether it's problems of mental retardation; whether it's children; whether it's mental illness cases or the elderly or whatever, any facility that has four or more comes under the regulations of residential care.

I'm reminded that the regulation relates to the size of the facility that exists. It's deemed to exist if there are four more; not the nature of the residence, the nature of their problem.

MR. SHERMAN: I'd like to ask the Minister whether those group homes are being inspected in the same way the guest homes are being inspected?

MR. EVANS: Homes in child welfare; they're all inspected — this is what I said a few minutes ago — and licensed. That's what you're referring to.

MR. SHERMAN: No, Mr. Chairman, that's not what

I'm referring to. I'm referring to the group homes for the mentally retarded and the mentally ill. I'm not referring to the 163 guest homes in this province which we identified. I know where those 163 guest homes are. I was involved in that process. I'm talking about group homes for those who are mentally retarded or post-mentally ill. The Minister tells me that they fall under the same regulations as the regulations for guest homes. If the guest homes were being inspected and required to meet standards laid down under those regulations for licensing — those regulations presumably are new insofar as the group homes for mental retardation and post-mentally ill are concerned — are those homes being inspected and requested to meet the same kinds of standards?

MR. EVANS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1.(e)(1)—pass; 1.(e)(2) Other Expenditures—pass.

We are going to move to Resolution No. 31. 2. Financial and Administrative Services, 2.(a)(1) Salaries.

The Member for Fort Garry

MR. SHERMAN: Would the Minister advise the Committee who replaced Mr. Peter Schmidt as the Director of this division, Mr. Chairman?

MR. EVANS: There is no one in this position at the present time, that person, I believe, left a couple of years ago, but this whole area is being looked at in terms of some reorganization that is deemed necessary within the department.

MR. SHERMAN: Is there a staff person who is carrying out the responsibilities of Administrative Services Director in the department?

MR. EVANS: There is someone who has a partial responsibility, well he has a responsibility in this area along with some other duties.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(a)(1)—pass; 2.(a)(2) Other Expenditures—pass; 2.(b)(1) Salaries.

The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, there is a fairly significant increase in the appropriation being requested under Personnel Management Services in 1982-83 over 1981-82, and I would ask the Minister for an explanation of it, please?

MR. EVANS: This emanates from the split in the department and, as the member knows, he was party to this so he knows perhaps more than I do, but there was an effort made to split the department fairly and adequately and so on but, after it occurred, there appeared to be an overload in this area so it was deemed necessary to add personnel and this is why those two are slotted for this area.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, there was a split in the department all right but it was supposed to come out even. Can the Minister advise the Committee what the SMY complement for Personnel Management

Services in Community Services and Corrections before the split? He has given me a list here and I appreciate it of the comparisons between 1981-82 and 1982-83, but I presume the 1981-82 figures are based on the establishment after the split. Could he advise the Committee how many personnel were included in the Personnel Management Services branch before the transition and the shift of some functions over to Health took place?

MR. EVANS: Our best recollection is the number 13, that is our best honest recollection, 13. This is something that would have to be checked but we think it is a fair recollection.

MR. SHERMAN: So there were 13 at the time when the whole branch was under Community Services and Corrections, Mr. Chairman, and the split took place and part of Personnel Management went over to Health. I know we are not on the Health Estimates, Mr. Chairman, but what I would like to know is how many stayed with Community Services and Corrections and how many went over to Health. I have to refer to the Health Estimates, Mr. Chairman.

MR. EVANS: Six went over to Health, seven and six equals 13.

MR. SHERMAN: We are now being asked to approve an increase in that seven to nine on the Community Services side and we may, by the time we get into Health, be asked to increase that six to eight on the Health side. So, in other words, we started out with a Personnel Management branch of 13; we split the responsibilities, we made the best efforts we could to ensure that it would not involve any increase in staff, and we may be sitting here tonight looking at an increase of staff from 13 in this branch to something above 50, maybe even 17 or 18. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman?

MR. EVANS: I am not sure what the member was referring when he said 50. You mean the total? Well this is on the list here. He has the information in front of him. If you are speculating, I'm not sure whether you were speculating or whether were simply referring to the statistics we have here. —(Interjection)— You can speculate as I can.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I think this is a fairly serious point unless the Department of Health has reduced its personnel in this branch by two. Yes, I am speculating on one end of the scale but I don't have to speculate on the other end, the Minister has quite honestly and directly provided me with the information and with the list that shows that on the Community Services side it has gone from seven up to nine; so I am speculating that maybe it has gone up by two on the Health side too. But even leaving that out of it, say the Health side is where it was, at six, we are now looking at a Personnel Management Service capability in the departments of Health and Community Services which was 13 and now is at least 15, resulting from a division of certain responsibilities between the two departments, when certainly one of the primary objectives of everyone involved, and I know that they

addressed it very conscientiously, was to carry out the split without increasing staff. I ask the Minister why it has been necessary to increase staff.

MR. EVANS: Well, I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that this group was overloaded before the split and they are still overworked and it's necessary for good organization, good management and for an efficiently-run department to have two more in this area.

I can assure the member, also, that no other increase that he sees before him, no additional staff listed before him, relates to a problem emanating from the split. The rest relates to services that the Department wishes to provide in administering the various program responsibilities.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, did the Minister say that he could assure me of that? Before we even get to some of these other areas of his Estimates, is the Minister assuring me of that? Is the Minister assuring me of that, before we even get to some of these other areas of the Estimates?

MR. EVANS: This is what I'm advised. In some ways it's difficult to ascertain, but this is the best Estimate, I suppose. This is the one area where additional people were required because of the split. We still only have nine people and remember there are roughly over 2,500 personnel in the department. It's a big department and, as the member also knows, they are scattered all over this province from Churchill down to Emerson.

MR. SHERMAN: But the Minister wouldn't have considered using those two positions for services in the guest home field or in Regional Personal Services Branch, eh? —(Interjection)— I'm just asking the Minister, Mr. Chairman, who told me a few moments ago that he's still struggling with an overload on the Regional Personal staff because of the skinflint approach of the previous government, whether he might have made better use of those two positions in the guest home field or the Regional Personal Services field than in Personnel Management Services?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairperson, if you don't have an adequate personnel division you won't be able to hire the necessary people. We thought that would attract someone's attention. I don't know how seriously I should take the honourable member in this respect. I wonder if he is really asking these questions tongue in cheek, where he is suggesting we better assign these two to Guest Home Inspection than Personnel Management.

The fact is without adequate Personnel Management Services you don't hire people. This is the part of the organization that surely slots or helps to slot the right people in the particular functions that we hope they will fulfill for us. The senior management, the senior people in the department, recognize that this has been a difficulty, that we have been overworked and understaffed in this area and, as a result, we've agreed to those two.

I might say that, in some ways, I find this rather an odd debate because what I'm doing is standing up, in a sense, trying to justify something that really relates

to a decision made by the honourable member and his government across the way, his former government, that's represented by the party across the way.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, that is precisely the point. The decision was made by the party on this side of the House, the Progressive Conservative Party, to work out a division of responsibilities between Health and Community Services that did not involve any increase in staff, and there were a great many people who worked very hard on that, both at two o'clock in the afternoon and at two o'clock in the morning, and two of them are sitting in front of the Minister right now. You know, perhaps to put it in the context of putting those positions in Regional Personal Services or the Guest Home field might be, as the Minister suggests, taking a rather lightheaded or lighthearted approach to it, but my basic point remains — I'm not splitting hairs over two SMYs because if the Minister needs SMYs in the Regional Personal Services field he's not going to get any argument from me — but we did say that we could handle the administration of the two departments created out of one without any increase in staff. I submit, Sir, that even though it's only two SMYs that are involved here, there's a principle involved and it's not a case of splitting hairs or being facetious; that principle was something to which a good many of us devoted a good many hours of energy. Now, the Minister says, well, the Branch was overloaded and they needed more people anyway. I'm not going to delay consideration of these Estimates over this point at this juncture, but I want to state very clearly and unequivocally for the record that the best intentions of everyone were to do it without increasing staff. We believe that we did it and I don't believe that the present Minister is following through on that objective and I regret that.

MR. EVANS: I'd like to advise the honourable member that before the split the Director of Personnel of this area, Personnel Management, had requested four of the Deputy Minister. —(Interjection)— He didn't which?

MR. SHERMAN: He didn't get them.

MR. EVANS: Well, he requested them and, regardless, it is felt that for good efficient management of the Department that it's necessary to have these two more Staff Man Years.

So, I would remind the honourable member, and perhaps I'm being repetitive, but this area not only hires people and ensures we get the best people, helps us get the best people, does all the other personnel paperwork that's required, everything from sick leave to handling grievances and to handling many many matters, transfers, promotions, etc., and there are a lot of people to look after. If we fall down in this area it seems to me that the whole area, the whole spectrum of branches, the whole spectrum of personnel might suffer. The whole organization could suffer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(b)(1) to 2.(d)(2) were all read and passed. 2.(e)(1) Salaries.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister when the Vital Statistics Branch is going to be shifted over to the Department of Health?

MR. EVANS: It is not offering a health service. It is providing as is described here, a statistical recording. It's a registration of various data related to various Acts, child welfare, change of name, marriage and so on as well as births and deaths. So it's deemed not to be a health function and it was decided previously, and I would have thought the honourable member would have been involved in this, but it was decided to keep this branch in the Community Services Department.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, there has certainly been discussion about the possibility of a shift and the Minister is correct when he suggests that I was involved in it. I must say that it was certainly the view held by many of us and I would say if it was my own view, that in the long run that Vital Statistics should be shifted from Community Services to Health.

Vital Statistics deals essentially with the fundamental yardstick, the fundamental index and indices of the health care of a society, of the status of health of a society. For that reason, I think a very powerful case can be made and indeed in discussion was made for having Vital Statistics in Health rather than in Community Services. Certainly the question had not been resolved but that's at the root of my inquiry of the Minister, Mr. Chairman, whether the intention of the Ministry is to continue considering the logic and viability of the argument that Vital Statistics should be in Health and whether that is a likely development in the foreseeable future.

MR. EVANS: No, it is not likely in the near future that we would transfer it out of the department. You could argue that it could be in some other departments as well. It deals at Consumer Corporate Affairs, the Bureau of Statistics — there is a Bureau of Statistics in the Department of Economic Development or wherever it is — you could argue maybe in the A.G.'s Department. I haven't heard anything the honourable member has said that would provide any basis for transferring it from this department to health. It relates to the statistics of births and deaths but from my experience, people who are interested in births and deaths are not necessarily people simply interested in health. A great number of people who are engaged in economic research market studies, they want to know population patterns, population changes, the net increase in the population, namely births over deaths as well as other data about population and I would submit that a great many people who are simply and purely interested in commercial marketing are as much interested in this as the medical practitioners are.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I have to take a similar declamatory position to that taken by the Minister. I'm not interested in whether it could be argued that Vital Statistics should be under the Department of Consumer Affairs or under the Department of Finance. I know there is a very strong case that can be made for having it under the Department of Health and at the

present time it's in Community services, that's all right. It certainly shouldn't be shifted to Consumer and Corporate or to Finance.

The argument for having it in Health is that it does deal, as I say, with the most vital indicators of the health status of a society, namely births and deaths, namely infant mortality, namely prenatal mortality, namely the difficulties on a regional basis of mortality rates and particularly infant mortality rates.

So as a former Minister of Health, the case I'm making is that there is a place for it in the Department of Health that is certainly logical in argument and it was a subject that was being considered by myself and the former Minister of Community Services at the time when our government was in office. I'm simply interested in knowing whether that same interest persists and whether those considerations are continuing to be given. I have my answer though from the Minister and that is, that there is no consideration being given to it, at least not in the foreseeable future.

But I want to very strongly make the point to him that I'm not looking for a home for the Vital Statistics Branch; I'm not looking for it to be shifted for the sake of shifting it to Consumer and Corporate Affairs or anywhere else. If it's not going to be in Health then fine, leave it in Community Services but it should be in Health.

MR. EVANS: The member is entitled to his opinion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 2.(e)(1)—pass; 2.(e)(2) Other Expenditures—pass. There is no further discussion.

BE IT RESOLVED THAT there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,896,900 for Community Services and Corrections, Financial and Administrative Services for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983—Pass.

Resolution No. 32, Community Social Services - Regional Operations, 3.(a)(1) Salaries.

The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister advise the Committee where the Administration for this division is now located? In the 1981-82 Estimates and in all preceding years there was an Administration Branch for Community Social Services Regional Operations, or Community Health and Social Services as it was then known. The Budget last year, the appropriation in last year's Estimates I believe, was \$215,000.00. Can he tell me where the Administration for this division is now located?

MR. EVANS: I see. As the honourable member should know, the Regional Services include personnel from Health as well as this department. The administrative staff is quite small and it was left in the Department of Health. My honourable friend was part of the government that was involved in that process and it's still there, so they are doing the administration. It's not within this department.

MR. SHERMAN: Well that's the answer I was hoping for, Mr. Chairman, that is precisely the way it was on November 17th. I have no guarantee that that's the way it is on March 11th, unless I ask the Minister.

Is the \$215,000 or whatever the equivalent this year

is of that figure, in the Health Department Estimates or is it somewhere else in the Community Services Estimates?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is obviously the Department of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, is that part of the \$107,000, obviously it would be more than that, but is that related to the \$107,400 that is shown as a transfer from Health to Community Services in the Reconciliation Statement on page 22?

MR. EVANS: Well, I don't think it would be 107,400, I believe it was the previous year, 1980-81. These refer to 1981-82. Was it in there?

MR. SHERMAN: No, but I am referring to a figure that was in 1981-82 and the Reconciliation Statement deals with things that were in 1981-82 and now have been transferred over to a different department for 1982-83, so I am still looking for that \$215,000, Mr. Chairman. It may well be in Health but that is my question to the Minister.

MR. EVANS: Well, this may be a bit irregular, but if you look at page 72 which covers the Department of Health, there is Item 3, Community Health Services, (a) Administration, and there is a figure of a \$180,000 for this year and it compares with \$146,400 last year. So it would seem to me that those monies would have been transferred in the previous year. That is page 72.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, the figures don't jibe exactly, Mr. Chairman, but anyway that would probably account for some of it.

In the reporting process, up from the regional field delivery system to the Deputy Minister of the Department of Community Services, what personnel are involved? Is the regional field system reporting directly to the Deputy Minister of Community Services for those functions and operations that fall under Community Services?

MR. EVANS: There is an arrangement. The Executive Director of Regional Services is located in Health, as we were talking about the Administration being in Health, but the Director of the Regional Service Branch or Division reports both to the Deputy of Health and to the Deputy of the Department of Community Services. So that is the tie in. The one person, the Executive Director is located in Health but he is required to report to the Deputy of this department as well as the Deputy of Health in regard to these field services.

MR. SHERMAN: So the regional field delivery system retains the eight regional directors and there is an Executive Director of that system to whom the regional directors report and the Executive Director of the system reports to whom in Community Services? He reports direct to the Deputy Minister. It hasn't been necessary to put any additional personnel in there between the Executive Director and the Deputy Minister. Is the Regional Director complement, the R.D. complement still at eight, or have there been steps

taken to divide Winnipeg Region into additional regions?

MR. EVANS: The answer is yes, eight; and no to the last question.

MR. SHERMAN: Has consideration been given to dividing Winnipeg and forming two new regions?

MR. EVANS: This has not been discussed by myself and the senior personnel of the department. There has been no suggestion brought forward by my Deputy that we consider this at this time and that has not been considered a priority by myself. Goodness knows we have a lot of other irons in the fire.

MR. SHERMAN: So for 1982-83 we are proceeding with eight regions in the conventional manner and eight regional directors in the conventional manner reporting through an executive director who then in turn reports to the two departments, Community Services and Health.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thought we laid out some pretty good guidelines.

I am very pleased, Mr. Chairman, to see that the Deputy Minister, Mr. Ron Johnstone, and that the Director of Agency Relations, Mr. Joe Cels are keeping the new Minister firmly on track. We will be watching, Mr. Chairman, to see that this situation continues because we did work very hard on a system that I think we all believe can work, will work and protects the integrity of those regional directors and the system. It doesn't require any expansion of personnel notwithstanding the fact — and I concede the point — that in the regional field delivery system we need more professional workers in the field.

Mr. Chairman, the Estimates for 1981-82 showed \$18.8 million for funding the Regional Personal Services Branch. That was simply the Regional Personal Services, Salaries and Other Expenditures. The total was \$18,794,000.00. On the basis of the print shown for March 31, 1982, in the 1982-83 Estimates, that funding figure totals \$6,304,000. So we are looking at \$6.3 million as against the previous year's \$18.8 million. The difference obviously is \$12.5 million and I just want to establish that that \$12.5 million went over to Health because we still haven't completed the total examination of that Reconciliation Statement.

That statement, Sir, refers to a transfer of functions amounting to some \$25 million from Community Services to Health. Now presumably, and I would just like the Minister's concurrence in this if this is the case, \$12.5 million of it shows up here in the switchover of various Regional Personal Services personnel to the Health side, is that correct?

MR. EVANS: The Honourable Minister, if he looks on page 73 of Health, he'll see that there's about 12.8 million as of this year, March 31, 1982, and I see there's appropriations suggested of 13,796,000.

But you know, in many ways I would suggest again, Mr. Chairman, that the Member for Fort Garry perhaps knows a little more about this than myself. He may have forgotten some of the numbers, but you know you're asking questions about reorganization and transferring of monies. That was surely agreed to

and decided upon at least a year ago, if not more than a year ago.

MR. SHERMAN: No, it wasn't, Mr. Chairman. The divisionals, the departmental split, of course, took place two years ago, but the whole regional field services delivery system remained on the Community Services side, and last year we worked on the realignment and restructuring of those services within the single unit framework, and only completed them and gained the concurrence of the respective departments and the respective regional directors and the approval of the government of the day, I might say, the approval of the Treasury Board of the day, approximately last June or July.

Then of course we were into the preliminary preparation of the Estimates but none of these figures had been established with any precision, and the Honourable Minister is familiar with the history that unfolded after that, so my side of the House is really being confronted with the specific details of this split for the first time. I agree with it and certainly worked on it, but I am just trying to track down the dollars, where they went and which way they went, and particularly the staff man years, where they went and which way they went.

Mr. Chairman, the print figure for '82 in the new Estimates Book on Regional Personal Services as I pointed out a few moments ago, totals \$6.3 million and the requested appropriation in this same area for 1982-83 totals \$7 million, an increase of approximately \$700,000. Is that relative entirely to the staffing increase in the field services delivery team requested by the Minister? He pointed out earlier that he is asking for 270.5 SMYs as against 250.5 for an increase of 20, and I would like to know whether that accounts in full, in total, for the increase in the appropriation being sought or whether there are some other factors in there too, Mr. Chairman.

MR. EVANS: Yes, it's essentially related to the new staff that we have been discussing, plus of course some adjustments for possible increments for merit increases.

The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with personnel in the field now who have to meet the case loads that we've alluded to in the earlier discussions. I wonder if the Minister can advise us whether the case load of the regional field workers in those services that are now specifically recognized in the new Estimates as being services related to the Department of Community Services and Corrections and not related to the Department of Health, whether the case loads of those workers have increased or have changed in any significant way from the previous year?

MR. EVANS: Yes, the increase, as I am advised, is essentially in the mental retardation area. For various reasons, the population of mental retarded people is increasing, partly because of better health techniques, new medicines and generally better medical knowledge. As a result, retarded people are living longer and retarded infants have a better chance of surviving. So the fact is that the mentally retarded popula-

tion is increasing in absolute terms in this province, and this is creating a demand for a particular — there are other demands — but this in particular is the one that I would emphasize. There may be some additional demand that I could zero in on in rural Manitoba in the field of child welfare and in the north, particularly in Northern Manitoba.

MR. SHERMAN: Have the case loads in the mental health field, as distinct from mental retardation increased, Mr. Chairman?

MR. EVANS: Yes, the mental health workers are in the Department of Health. It is a health matter as opposed to people who are retarded. Apart from the mental retardation, they are presumably normal people and don't necessarily require the services of the Department of Health, but mental health services are distinctly and definitely in the Department of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: So those, Mr. Chairman, will appear under the Health Estimates then obviously. Thank you.

The staff breakdown of personnel in the regional field services delivery system has always of course, Mr. Chairman, reflected a substantial concentration of personnel in the Winnipeg region and also a fairly heavy concentration in the public health nursing category. There have been some shortfalls in specific regions and in specific categories. Not long ago, there certainly were vacancies and needs particularly in the Thompson and NorMan regions and some other regions of Manitoba as well, with respect to community health workers and public health nurses and in some cases, personnel such as home economists and health educators. Is the projected increase in the staff-man-year totals for this branch calculated to address any specific shortages either of categories of personnel or of regions in short supply of professional field service workers?

MR. EVANS: As I said, the area that we have to zero in on for servicing, the area that requires more staffing is essentially mental retardation particularly in the City of Winnipeg, and also, as I indicated earlier the area of child welfare and particularly, in this case, in the north. If the member's interested — without referring to the 20 additional — at the present time we've 82 people working as child and family service workers; 52 people in mental retardation; 28 in vocational rehab; 13 miscellaneous, and then there's other general and administrative support staff of 40, and we've got some term staff of 31.

In the regional breakdown — that totals 250 — it fairly well reflects the population. The large chunk is in the City of Winnipeg; 96 out of the total is City of Winnipeg.

MR. SHERMAN: Are there any acute shortages of personnel in this field delivery system in specific regions or specific categories that the Minister is addressing or feels required to address at the present time? I draw on some of our own experiences, Mr. Chairman, in putting that question. There has been some difficulty, chronic in nature, of maintaining the kinds of personnel complement necessary in the pub-

lic health nursing field in particular in Thompson region. There's certainly in other parts of the North, I know from personal firsthand experience at Lynn Lake in particular, possibly at Leaf Rapids from time to time, not so much in the Snow Lake-Flin Flon area, but certainly at Lynn, there is a very definite and pronounced need for mental health workers, or at least a mental health worker. I know they're supplied on an itinerant basis in the case of some of those communities, The Pas and Flin Flon; in the case of others, Thompson, but it's an ongoing and continuing and chronic need.

We did not have all that great success in locating and maintaining workers in those specialized and necessary categories in some of those remote regions and communities, but it's a central objective for any Department of Community Services under any government of any stripe in Manitoba, as it is for the Department of Health, and I would appreciate some advice from the Minister as to whether there are specific targeted needs, vacancies, requirements of that sort by category or by region that he and his officials are attempting to address as we head into the new fiscal year.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, there is generally no large number of vacancies. There are always some. This is a normal natural phenomenon and we generally fill them on a regular basis, but I guess I'm repeating. The member asked what function needs the most attention and I indicated mental retardation service and child welfare. He asked about the region and on a regional basis I repeat the mental retardation staff needs beefing up in the City of Winnipeg. The other region that we're concerned about is the North, Norman, and in that case, it's child welfare. So those are the two regions, the North and Winnipeg. In Winnipeg, it's mental retardation; in the North, it's child welfare. That's essentially as I'm advised, the problem areas. The other areas apparently are well serviced.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, could the Minister advise whether the 1981-82 appropriations in this area is going to be fully spent?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I'm advised that it essentially will be spent, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3(a)(1)—pass; 3(a)(2) Other Expenditures—pass. 3(b) General Purpose Grants.
The Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Now, this is the point at which and I referred to this earlier, Mr. Chairman, home care services and External Agencies previously appeared in the printed Estimates. Home care services, of course, have shifted over to Health and they are specified in the Health Estimates, but External Agencies as such are not, and I know I put this question to the Minister earlier; I don't know whether he can answer it or not. But what I'm anxious to know is whether home care services as shifted over to Health, includes home care services and External Agencies.

There are External Agencies associated with home care as the Minister knows. They include the Age and Opportunity Center, for example, the Brandon Civic

Senior Citizens Incorporated, Meals on Wheels Seniors' Centers — that type of thing. All of those were originally under the Department of Community Services and my question is, have those been shifted over to Health? There's no specific reference to them in the Health Estimates.

MR. EVANS: There are included in the External Agencies that are funded in this appropriation; there are four that I guess had been previously in the combined operations, but are in here. One is the Age and Opportunity Centers. I believe there are nine centers in the City of Winnipeg, nine senior citizens' centers in Winnipeg; the Brandon Civic Senior Citizens Incorporated which is the Brandon equivalent of the Winnipeg Age and Opportunity Centers, and then there's the Home Welfare Association which is otherwise known as Meals on Wheels; and lastly, there's a category called Senior Centres. This is new item, a small item but new, to help fund a few in rural Manitoba; at the moment we're only funding Brandon and Winnipeg and the thought is that we might assist in a limited way at the present time.

Excuse me, I'm sorry, I stand to be corrected. The one that is funded is in the Town of Selkirk. It was funded last year and we're continuing to fund it this year. That's it, I'm sorry, I thought this was some new money. Of course, it's thirty and thirty, it can't be new money.

MR. SHERMAN: That's very helpful, Mr. Chairman. This is what I was looking for this afternoon, so those external agencies related to Home Care Services are staying in Community Services; although Home Care is going over to Health those external agencies are staying in Community Services. Is that what I understand from the Minister's response?

MR. EVANS: The Age and Opportunity Centres and the Brandon equivalent, the Civic Senior Citizens and the Selkirk Centre for Seniors, really has nothing to do with home care, as such. I don't know whether the honourable member has ever visited an Age and Opportunity Centre or has visited the Centre in Brandon. I can tell you I have been to the one in Brandon many a time to play my accordion and generally it's a recreational setting — (Interjection) — They're all pretty healthy out there in Brandon, at least, and they like to dance and if you drop in they'll be glad to have a dance with you too. Every Friday afternoon in Brandon they have a lovely orchestra and a dance. They play hit parades from 1914 — (Interjection) — and I have a difficult time in following some of those ladies, but generally it's a recreational effort.

It goes beyond that I guess in Winnipeg, they do get into legal aid, personal issues and there may be some ancillary service relating to housing, and maybe some home situations, but generally they offer a broad service. You might argue that they're good for general mental health, for everybody's mental health, to have recreation, but their services are rather broad and I think you could argue, as apparently has been argued in the past, that these particular agencies should remain funded by this department because they are community services.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, I don't really care to what they are related, all I'm trying to do is find them. The job of the Opposition critic, as the Minister well knows, is to attempt to be able to understand and appreciate the various items and appropriations requested in the Department's Estimates and I may be giving the Minister more difficulty than someone else would in attempting to understand them, but he will have to bear with me on that. I'm doing the best I can. The job is complicated by the fact that we have transferred some functions between departments and it makes it very difficult. I don't really care where they are; I just want to know where they are; I just want to know where I can find them. It used to be that you could look under the Estimates of this Department and find Home Care Services and External Agencies. Now you cannot find that item under here, but you can turn to Health and find Home Care Services and my question is, where are those dangling external agencies? The Minister says that they weren't related to Home Care, but they were always listed as part of Home Care. The previous item in previous Estimates always was Home Care Services, (1) Home Care Assistance, (2) External Agencies and the External Agencies are the agencies that I just named and he just named: the Age and Opportunity Center; the Brandon Civic Senior Citizens; the Meals on Wheels; and the new Senior Centres. I just want to know where they are and where the \$300,000 being expended on them is?

MR. EVANS: I'm not clear as to which \$300,000 the member is talking about.

MR. SHERMAN: That was an 1981-82 figure; I don't know what the 1982-83 figure is because they're not listed anywhere.

MR. EVANS: The 1981-82 figure was \$300,000, as the member suggests, and this year it's \$452,900. I made reference to it in my opening remarks, how we've increased, for instance, the Age and Opportunity Centre from \$215,000 to \$350,000; we increased the Brandon Civic Senior Citizens Incorporated from \$24,300 to \$37,400; the Meals on Wheels goes from \$30,500 to \$35,500.00.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, did they appear under Resolution 31 3.(b) General Purpose Grants, is that where they appear and, if not, where do they appear?

MR. EVANS: Yes, that's where they appear. They are part of that total of \$1.6 million which has been requested on this year's Estimates. I mentioned four, in total there are 16 organizations in this appropriation that are receiving some assistance.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the Minister, so the General Purpose Grants item encompasses what we have come to know and love in the past as General Purpose Grants plus the grants for Continuing Care Services or what were originally described as External Agencies attached to the Home Care Services appropriation. Could the Minister then outline for the Committee the range of those General Purpose Grants? He says they

now total 16. I am familiar with the fact that there were formerly 13, Mr. Chairman, these four would bring it up to 17. I presume that he's subtracting the item previously included on the Four Nations Confederacy, but I can't assume that to be the case unless he confirms it. Is there any change in the overall list of General Purpose Grants from previous years?

MR. EVANS: The only change in this list, the list would be the same as the member had seen in previous years. The only change is the funding of the Four Nations Confederacy. The Four Nations Confederacy, of course, split between MKO, which is the northern organization of Indians, and the Four Nations proper, which is the southern organization. Those funds have been transferred to the Department of Northern Affairs. The Minister of Northern Affairs is the co-ordinating Minister dealing with these various agencies. That is for the block-funding type of programs.

Osborne House, which was added to the list, and there was one very minor one that was dropped, it was a very very small grant, less than \$1,000, and it was dropped because there didn't seem to be any purpose in carrying it on.

But I can give this information to the honourable member just to refresh his memory. Included here in the list is the Canadian Council on Social Development; the Social Planning Council of Winnipeg, which I'm sure members are familiar with; the old Grace Hospital Loan Payment, that's a special item, this is provision for a loan payment on mortgage assumed on the purchase of the old Grace Hospital, that's been around for some time, that's an odd one; the Volunteer Centre of Winnipeg; the Brandon Citizens Advocacy; the Citizens Advocacy in Manitoba Incorporated, which is essentially a Winnipeg organization; the YWCA Osborne House is the new one that I mentioned; the City of Winnipeg Rossbrook House; and the Thompson Crisis Centre, which was in previously; and then there's the Indian and Metis Friendship Centres which are located in several communities around the province; and then of course I mentioned the others dealing with the seniors previously.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, does the Minister's list also include the Canadian Association in Support of Native People and the Canadian Diabetic Association, and an item vaguely described as Community Projects?

MR. EVANS: The Canadian Association in Support of Native People, as I said, was very minor, last year it was only \$900.00. It's been dropped because there was no request made from that organization and, as the member knows, there are other monies going to the Native organizations through Northern Affairs and, as I said earlier, the Indian-Metis Friendship Centres are being funded on an extensive basis; so that one is dropped. The Community Projects, which is a general category - I didn't mention that because it's not for anything - it is sort of a general catch-all available for special needs that might arise during the year. The Canadian Diabetic Association, I believe the member asked about, is not in here. —(Interjection)— Yes, that's in the Department of Health.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, just so I have a grasp of the list, Mr. Chairman, could the Minister then provide us with the additions? He said there were 16. We've identified the four in the seniors category, which leaves 12 others. We're looking at a previous list of 13, from which two or three have been dropped, and I may have missed the additions that he referred to a minute or two ago. What are the new General Purpose Grants this year?

MR. EVANS: I'm not sure what you mean by new General Purpose? You mean the one that's called Community Projects? Is this what you meant by General Purpose? I'm sorry, okay, Osborne House is the only new one that we have on the list of 16.

MR. SHERMAN: How much is the intended grant to Osborne House, Mr. Chairman, and without going through every one on the list, which I wouldn't mind doing but I don't think it's necessary, but what is the general level of increase that the Minister is providing for in these grants this year?

MR. EVANS: The general level of increase ultimately is right in front of him. We're going from 1.2 million to 1.6 million, that's the bottom line; that's the bottom line for General Purpose Grants. But, some organizations are kept constant for some reason; others have been raised significantly because of the need that was demonstrated to us throughout the year, such as, the Indian and Metis friendship Centres. I indicated in my opening remarks we've increased substantially in this area from \$677,100 last year to a request this year of \$847,800.00.

Another area of percentagewise significant increases: the Thompson Crisis Centre, which has risen from \$49,200 to \$69,000.00. Again, it's based on demonstrated need. Age and Opportunity Centres, we were advised that they may have to close down some of their nine centres and we decided that we didn't want to see them close down some of the nine centres so we have responded by a significant increase from \$215,000, roughly, to \$350,000.00.

Specifically on the matter of the Osborne House. Osborne House provides operations for crises, it's a crises shelter for women and children who are victims of family violence. The fees will continue to be paid by the City of Winnipeg Welfare Department and the Provincial Social Allowance Program on behalf of their respective clients. But, nevertheless, this is a base or block or core funding of that organization. I'm also advised that in addition the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation pays an operating grant, pays the entire building operation costs.

There are other changes here but I've just sort of picked out some of the highlights; but I've given the total list to the member and indicated some of the more interesting changes.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, in the area of the External Agencies or General Purpose Grants in the Seniors Services Field, that is, those that were formally related to Home Care Services, the four that we've mentioned earlier — Age and Opportunity, Brandon Civic Senior, Meals on Wheels and Senior Centres. Those last year totalled, that is the fiscal year now ending, totalled

\$300,000.00. Can the Minister advise what those four would total this year? What's the increase over the \$300,000 where those four are concerned?

MR. EVANS: Let's make doubly sure. You wanted to know for the Age and Opportunity Centre, plus the Brandon Civic Senior Citizens Incorporated, plus the Meals on Wheels, plus the Senior Centre in Selkirk.

MR. SHERMAN: Right.

MR. EVANS: Okay, we'll just add this up and make a calculation here. We should have brought our calculator along. It goes from \$300,000 approximately, to \$452,900, or roughly \$453,000.00.

MR. SHERMAN: It goes from \$300,000 to \$450,000, a 50 percent increase, which is very good. Now that \$450,000 is added into the appropriation 32, 3. (b) that we're looking at because we have established now that they're added into the General Purpose Grants, so that \$450,000 is part of the \$1,601,000.00. The difference between those two is \$1,150,000, so the \$1,150,000 compares with the figure in the column on the other side of the page, which was last year's appropriation for the other agencies receiving General Purpose Grants and last year it was approximately \$1,240,000.00.

So although there have been some changes in the list, admittedly, the list of General Purpose Grants, independent of the four seniors agencies that we have just referred to, is certainly no higher than it was last year. In fact, it could be argued with some mathematical conviction, Mr. Chairman, that it's somewhat lower. Is that correct?

MR. EVANS: No, no that is not correct. I went over this but I can do it again. The Canadian Council of Social Development went up by 10 percent, from \$10,300 to \$11,300; Social Planning Council of Winnipeg is up from \$43,500 to \$47,900.00. Community Projects is a general item, that stays the same at \$20,000.00. The old Grace Hospital loan payment is down slightly but that's a mechanical thing, from \$22,600 to \$21,700, that's a special category.

The Volunteer Centre of Winnipeg is down because the cost for the project is decreasing and therefore there's less money required, so that's down from \$50,600 to \$30,200.00. The Brandon Citizens Advocacy is up substantially; the Citizens Advocacy of Manitoba is up; Rossbrook House is the same; Thompson-Price Centre I indicated earlier is up significantly from \$49,000 approximately to \$69,000.00. The Indian and Native Friendship Centre, as I said is up very substantially from \$677,100 to \$847,800, so there is a significant increase in the non-elderly category, if you can use that term.

MR. SHERMAN: Then, Mr. Chairman, is the Minister saying that the 1982 figure given here in the '82-83 print is wrong? The total shown for the year ending March 31, 1982 is \$1,244,000.00. The total shown for the projection for March 31st, 1983 is \$1,600,000.00. We're adding in \$450,000 for the seniors category which are additions to this list — they were formerly in another list — and a simple subtraction would indi-

cate that the figure for the Other Agencies this year has to be \$1,150,000, which is less than the \$1,244,000 showing.

MR. EVANS: Services to the Elderly rise from \$300,100 last year to \$452,900 this year. The other General Purpose Grants go from \$944,600 last year to \$1,148,300 this year. So if you add those two categories up the \$300,000 and the \$944,600 you get the \$1.2 million, and if you have the '82-83 request of \$452,900 for the elderly plus \$1,148,000 for the other categories in general purpose, you get the total of \$1.6 million. So indeed both categories, if you will, the elderly and the other have gone up substantially.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister then is saying that the \$1,244,000 figure in '82 print on the left-hand side of the page, should be \$944,000, is that correct?

MR. EVANS: No, I'm not saying that. It should be \$944,600 for General Purpose Grants other than the elderly, plus \$300,100 for the elderly. So if you add it up the elderly services is \$300,000 and you add that to the \$944 for the other and you get \$1.244 million. This print figure is correct. In my breakdown, as I've indicated to you, adds up to this print figure on the left and the right-hand side.

MR. SHERMAN: Well I think I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister then is saying that the \$1,244,000 on the left-hand side includes the \$300,000 for support to the seniors' agencies that were formerly associated with home care. Is that correct?

MR. EVANS: Yes.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, we established then that the \$1,601,000 appropriated for '82-83 checks out as the actual and solid projection for General Purpose Grants under this category of the Estimates to be expended and administered in 1982-83.

Now I just want to make the point, Mr. Chairman, that — and this is the reason why I want to get the figures correct because I want to add them up at the end — that this is the first of the 1982-83 grants to non-government social agencies that we have encountered in the Estimates thus far. You'll recall the Minister's press release that referred to \$71 million going to non-government social agencies. This is the first \$1,600,000 right here. I think it'll become abundantly clear, Mr. Chairman, that we are looking at a set of Estimates that provides \$40.5 million for non-government social agencies in the form of grants, and not \$71 million as specified in that press release. This doesn't have any bearing on the \$250 million being expended by the department — and I'm not questioning the \$250 million expenditure.

What I am questioning is the claim that \$71 million is going in grants to non-government social agencies. In fact, \$40.5 million is going in grants to non-government social agencies and \$210 million is being expended on very worthwhile government programs. There is nothing wrong with government programs particularly with worthwhile government programs but they are not grants to non-government social

agencies. This is the first \$1,600,000 here and we will be approaching three or four similar items of that kind as we move through these Estimates. I think you will see, Sir, and so will the Minister that the total is \$40.5 million and not \$71 million.

My last question on this item, Mr. Chairman, would have to do with the Four Nations Confederacy. I know the Minister in the province and the nation have entered into a new agreement on Indian child welfare with the Four Nations Confederacy. I am certainly prepared to discuss that with the Minister under the next section, Child and Family Services, although the Four Nations Confederacy did appear in the past at this point in the Estimates because of the fact that it was included in General Purpose Grants — it's no longer there — but it comes to the attention of myself and all members of the Committee because it had been the recipient of a General Purpose Grant in the past. I would like to discuss the new Indian Child Welfare Agreement with the Minister, either under this item or the next one.

It is my intention though, Mr. Chairman, provided there is no objection, provided there is concurrence on the part of the Committee to move at 10:00 p.m. that Committee rise, so I don't want to get into the Child and Family Services Resolution at this point and of course, that intention is subject to the concurrence of the Minister.

So if he wants to deal with the Four Nations Confederacy under the next Resolution rather than this one, I leave that to his determination, Sir. That being the case, I would invite you to call for passage of this particular Resolution, but I would want the Minister to understand that I want to deal with that Indian Child Welfare Agreement.

MR. EVANS: The Agreement was recently signed and I would be pleased to discuss it under the Child and Family Service category. I just want to make it clear however, and I am prepared to once this Resolution 32 is passed, I am prepared to call it a day or call it a night because tomorrow is an early start for us. I think that's a reasonable thing and I hope we can maybe carry on, assuming we're making reasonable progress through the Estimates throughout the months ahead, that we don't have to sit here till ungodly hours like 1:00 a.m. and 2:00 a.m. as has sometimes occurred over the past several years that I have been in this House.

I just want to make it clear, though, the member in his opening remarks made a very serious allegation that I was misleading the public or the House by referring to a contribution of \$71 million to outside agencies and that it wasn't \$71 million, it was more like \$40 million. I intend to extract from these figures and give the member a list to show you that it indeed is — and I trust members will note this — that indeed it does total well over \$71 million.

It is impossible for you or anyone who just looks at this and you are at a disadvantage, you just can't pick out all these grants. For example, some considerable grant money is under 4.(c), Maintenance of Children, it's a \$29 million item; there's a big amount of grant money there to the Children's Aid Society, for example.

So I want to reiterate what I said this afternoon in

my opening remarks, that we have provided in these Estimates a contribution to outside agencies totalling over \$71 million for the year of 1982-83 and we will give you the breakdown.

I indicated a general breakdown, \$34 million for services of children and families; \$12 million to child day care providers; over \$21 million to miscellaneous community groups but serving the needs of the mentally and physically handicapped. This is in addition to the \$37 million provided to the handicapped living in the community under the Social Allowance Program, so I am not even referring to that; over \$3 million to Employment Assessment and Training and Job Placement Services to Manitobans and over \$.5 million in grants to certain organizations assisting inmates of Provincial correctional facilities.

But I will provide that in more detail because as was reported on one of the local radio stations accusing me of misleading, in effect, by saying there was no such sum that could be possible to be paid out to External Agencies but indeed we will document that it is over \$71 million paid to outside agencies by the Province of Manitoba.

I say, I continually am amazed as a relatively new Minister in this area at the amount of money that we as a government, as a collection of taxpayers are paying out to all these agencies. I am not critical of it, I am just amazed by it. I am glad of it as a matter of fact. I think it speaks well of the people of Manitoba, of their concern over the years of looking after the mentally retarded, of looking after the elderly, of looking after children of the multiplicity of needs out there, a multiplicity of needs that I must confess that I didn't recognize existed in the degree to which it exists.

For example, the increasing amount of money required for mental retardation alone. So it's to the credit of the people of Manitoba that they indeed have the biggest united way going for them through the apparatus of the tax system, that we indeed are funding in a United Way many many worthwhile agencies and many many worthwhile causes.

So I repeat, this is a large amount of money, \$71 million but it indeed will be paid out in the year 1982-83 to these agencies.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will certainly look forward to Minister's approving that statement. I have no quarrel with the community agencies in the field who deliver the services to which he refers. I have no quarrel with the \$250 million budget under the Department of Community Services.

My quarrel is with the press release and with the wording of that press release and the intent that was behind it. The intention I repeat, is not accurate and it is not fair. The press release makes no reference whatever to funding. The agencies to which the Minister refers are agencies with whom the Provincial Government contracts to deliver services and funds. The reference in the press release is cast in such a way as to create the impression that \$71 million in grants are going to non-government social agencies.

The casual observer would compare that to the figure in the past under grants to External Agencies and General Purpose grants such as we have been discussing which last year totalled some \$39 million, and which this year total some \$40.5 million.

I am not quarreling with that increase. That increase is obviously what the government felt it could do. That is the comparison that would occur to the observer in the public. That is the comparison that occurs in the public mind when you talk about non-government social agencies.

If he wants to talk about \$71 million then I think the Minister should compare it to the money that has always gone, admittedly, because the province doesn't maintain all the professional workers in the Community Services field that are needed. Obviously, the province has to contract with agencies to deliver those services, but that's a standard ongoing historic procedure and that \$71 million should be compared to what has always gone into the maintenance of these kinds of services, but it's written and presented in such a way as to appear to be a blanket package of grants to External Agencies, and that is what I object to, Mr. Chairman.

Nonetheless, I shall look forward to the Minister's proving his point. I agree with him that I think we made substantial progress in the Estimates today and it certainly would be our intention to move ahead with them with as much reasonable speed as possible. There are a number of questions and issues that we would like to raise under the next Resolution dealing with Child and Family Services, and I would prefer if the Minister agrees, to leave that over because tomorrow is an early day and I am prepared to pass this vote that you'll be putting to us in a moment, Mr. Chairman, and after that I would ask his consideration for a motion that Committee rise.

MR. EVANS: Yes, well, we'll put the motion, but just briefly: you know, maybe the member's playing on words, maybe it's an argument of semantics more than anything else, but all the grants that are paid out, are paid out on a conditional basis. They're not just paid out holus bolus. Every grant to every agency is paid out with the condition that some service is provided of some kind, whether it be a meal on wheels, whether it be a day care service that we expect to be provided — whatever it may be, whether it be some foster home situation. It's got to be a service provided so all of those monies you could say are paid out on some understanding, whether it be a formal or detailed written contract or a general contract. All the money paid out is conditional — 465 day care centers, and all kinds of other agencies. I just used day care centers as one example, but there are many other organizations, many other agencies that are paid grants and have been. I didn't say that all of sudden we're paying out \$70 million, there was never any money paid before. I never said that. As a matter of fact, I would like to get the comparison.

There is a substantial increase, and I maintain that the Children's Aid Society is indeed providing a service but it's external to us; we don't have control over that administration as who would have control over the administration of our own staff. It's as external to us as a day care operator or some group home or foster home situation, so maybe the member's hung up on the semantics of the matter. I have stated before and I say it again, it's to the credit of the people of Manitoba that historically we have developed a fine system of being our brother's keeper.

It amazes me at the number of organizations that are funded by the government, by the people of Manitoba through this department; agencies who I thought were almost totally dependent on the United Way Appeal more or less, and it's coming into it very innocently and I find that for all these agencies that are supported by the United Appeal, which is very good, invariably they're funded by a great deal more money by the department, by the people of Manitoba, and that's fine by me. I welcome that. I have no quarrel with that, but I truly have learned something and I am almost amazed, not really, but I truly learned something and I think the people of Manitoba should be aware of the great job they're doing in helping people who are less fortunate. So we indeed will provide that detail for the members of the House and the Member for Fort Garry in particular.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 3.(b)—pass.

That completes the items to be considered under Resolution 32.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$8,684,900 for Community Services and Corrections, Community Social Services, Regional Operations for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1983—pass.

MR. EVANS: I move, seconded by the Member for Fort Garry that the Committee do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise.